

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

At a meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held on **WEDNESDAY, 11TH SEPTEMBER, 2024** at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall, Judd Street, London WC1H 9JE

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE PRESENT

Councillors Heather Johnson (Chair), Edmund Frondigoun (Vice-Chair), Sagal Abdi-Wali, Lotis Bautista, Nasrine Djemai, Tommy Gale and Liam Martin-Lane

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ABSENT

Councillors Andrew Parkinson, Tom Simon and Sue Vincent

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda for the meeting. They are subject to approval and signature at the next meeting of the Planning Committee and any corrections approved at that meeting will be recorded in those minutes.

MINUTES

1. APOLOGIES

No apologies for absence were received.

2. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF STATUTORY DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS, COMPULSORY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND VOLUNTARY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS IN MATTERS ON THIS AGENDA

In respect of agenda item 7 (1&2), 100 and 100A Chalk Farm Road, Councillor Djemai declared for transparency that she had spoken to both the applicant and the person making the deputation objecting to the application in her capacity as ward member, however she was able to consider the application with an open mind.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Webcasting

The Chair announced that the meeting was being broadcast live to the internet and would be capable of repeated viewing and copies of the recording could be made available to those that requested them. Those seated in the Chamber were deemed

to be consenting to being filmed. Anyone wishing to avoid appearing on the webcast should move to one of the galleries.

Development Management on-line forum

Members were also informed that officers were facilitating a Development Management Forum online on Monday 23rd September at 7pm. The developer would present amended development proposals for 100 Avenue Road which would be followed by a question-and-answer session. A briefing for Members would be provided at a later stage.

4. REPRESENTATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE

RESOLVED –

THAT the written submissions and deputation requests contained in the supplementary agenda be accepted.

5. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DECIDES TO TAKE AS URGENT

There was no such business.

6. MINUTES

Consideration was given to the Minutes of the previous meetings.

RESOLVED –

THAT the Minutes of the meetings held on 11 July and 1 August 2024 be agreed and signed as accurate records of the meetings.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Supporting Communities.

7(1) 100 AND 100A CHALK FARM ROAD LONDON, NW1 8EH

7(2) RELATED APPLICATION

Consideration was also given to the information contained in the supplementary agenda as well as the deputation referred to under Item 4 above.

Invited to comment on the residents' objections about the overbearing height and scale of the proposals and how this had been addressed, the applicant remarked that all views from the consultation had been taken into account including community feedback, discussions with Council officers and Design Review Panels and a balanced view had been taken which involved maintaining the density of the site because of the benefits it delivered around affordable housing and public realm enhancements but moving the height to areas of the site where it was less harmful overall.

Responding to a follow up question about developing positive relationships with the community, the applicant commented that the theme emerging from the public consultation was how the area was being enhanced from a public realm and public safety point of view.

The Planning Officer also commenting on how the application proposals had responded to community feedback informed the Committee that the location and layout of the wheelchair accessible student homes had been changed and the units had been redistributed to improve the quality of the accessible accommodation in response to concerns raised during consultation.

Responding to further members questions, the Planning Officer provided the following information:

- The podium garden at the back of the building would be covered by a management plan and only be accessible for students and permanent residents which could only be accessed by fob entry to the building.
- There were benefits to the wider community from this project which included employment and training benefits. Officers had secured construction, end use apprenticeships and work placements with the applicant. The student housing would be managed to mitigate against negative impacts on the community.
- There were two commercial spaces being provided at ground floor level, one of which was intended for office use and smaller businesses while the other was for retail café use which would bring activity and compliment the town centre function.

Commenting further on the benefits of the application to the wider community during the construction stages, the applicant highlighted that they had academy initiatives within their business which trained local people through the construction stages helping them into construction jobs.

In terms of the Construction Management Plan the applicant already had a full team working on the coordination, with detailed discussions going on with Roundhouse, TfL, Thames Water and St George. Should planning permission be granted further discussion would continue with the wider community. The applicant intended to circulate newsletters, regular notification events and a monthly working group to provide a regular flow of information.

The Head of Development Management highlighted and reminded members that while it was helpful to understand more about the applicant's background and how their business operated, weight could only be placed on what planning benefits were being secured in the section 106 and the value of those benefits justified against the Council's planning policies.

Answering further questions, Officers provided the following information:

- In relation to one offsite residential parking space being provided for 3 wheelchair accessible units, this was policy compliant in line with London Plan standards which stated that all developments in London should aim for at least one accessible car parking space. This had also been considered acceptable in light of the excellent public transport accessibility levels on the site.
- In terms of blue badge holders, it did not mean that people who held one would be deprived of parking spaces if they were required, it was more around securing upfront necessary parking spaces.
- In terms of whether the bus stop on Chalk Farm Road would be moved, there did not appear to be any plans to move it significantly, it was just a question of the exact location as there were plans to review the public realm in that area and improve the infrastructure with respect to accessibility requirements minimising any kind of conflict between different modes of transport.
- In relation to the contribution to a feasibility study towards a new step free entrance at Chalk Farm Station, in officers' discussions with TfL it was understood that as it was on privately owned land it would involve commercial land acquisition. Work was due to commence imminently and any step free access would have to be accommodated alongside the proposed development.

In response to a question about natural surveillance and on-site security, the applicant informed the Committee that a draft Student Management Plan had been submitted with the planning application, a final plan secured by Section 106 would outline how the building would be run on a day-to-day basis. Advising that there would also be a number of security and staff on site. Also, when events occurred at the Roundhouse there was an ongoing commitment to have Roundhouse security staff on podiums adjacent to emergency exits. The final details of all the measures would be in the final Student Management Plan when submitted.

Providing further responses to members questions, officers explained that:

- In relation to the internal lighting conditions and whether students would live in rooms all year, it was correct that there were no way officers could know that students would not live there all year, part of the Camden Local Plan policy was that the Student Management Plan prioritised the demand for students who wanted to live there all year.
- It was however important to look at any shortfalls in quality, lower lighting levels, in the context of the overall scheme and taking account of the fact that students had a choice about where they rented accommodation. These were private students' flats, the affordable flats where there might be less choice involved generally had higher lighting levels.
- There was not a specific conversation with the applicant about locating the kitchens on that part of the floor where there was less light, there were only 24 kitchens which were associated with the cluster flats so if the kitchens were located there, it would only have addressed the issue of a minority of the shortfalls.
- In terms of consideration being given to the potential overlap of construction with other developments in the vicinity, part of the Construction Management Plan objective was to consider the cumulative impact of developments. The Plan was expected to demonstrate how disruption to the local road network could be avoided whilst having a collaborative approach with other developments happening at the same time. The CMP would be reviewed by Transport Officers who had oversight of the road network and help to avoid any disruption.

The Head of Development Management informed the Committee of the need for an additional or modified condition for Thames Water on water capacity. Explaining that either the wording of an existing condition could be modified to include this or a new condition added which would demonstrate adequate water infrastructure.

On being put to the vote it was, with 7 votes unanimously in favour:

RESOLVED –

That conditional planning permission be granted subject to a section 106 legal agreement following:

- (i) Referral to the Mayor of London for his direction:
- (ii) Finalisation of detailed wording for conditions following consultation with the Mayor; and completion of Section 106 Agreement
- (iii) Grant conditional listed building consent.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment
 Borough Solicitor**

7(3) UNIVERSITY COLLEGE SCHOOL FROGNAL, LONDON NW3 6XH

Consideration was also given to the information contained in the supplementary agenda relating to the written submission referred to under Item 4 above.

A member commented that they were pleased to see that there was public access to some of the proposed new buildings and recital rooms querying whether there were any plans to allow children from the local state schools to use the new facilities or whether there were any schemes in place which allowed for these kinds of partnerships.

In response the School Headmaster commented that they were pleased to work with as many state school pupils and colleagues as possible, adding that a partnership scheme was already in existence which invited pupils into the school, explaining that the enhanced facility would build on that partnership work.

Responding to further member questions, officers provided the following information:

- Public access would be secured through the Public Access Plan which would be secured by Section 106 legal agreement and allow for further discussions on these topics.
- The building would have double glazed windows.

Invited to comment on the longevity of the development and whether there would be need for further changes at the site, the applicant's architect informed the Committee that they were very committed to the site in the long term, the school had been on this site since 1906 and would shortly be celebrating their 200th anniversary. It was fair to say that the school had a great commitment to the area of Hampstead and the local community with no intention of moving from there.

Commenting further they explained that the development that was proposed did not involve any increase in pupil numbers. It was more about the improving the quality of the accommodation and facilities that would serve the school and other members of the community, in terms of the development of the site it had gradually developed over time.

The Head of Development Management advised the Committee that an applicant could not be compelled to say that they were never going to expand a facility in the future, noting that there were lots of developments across the borough where sites got increasingly added to over time and they had to change or adapt. Adding that it had been disappointing that a building which had only recently been built on the site was to be demolished because the quality was not good enough for it to have the longevity that the Council wanted from schemes. However, the work officers had done with the applicant team on the scheme was to ensure that it was a development as good as it could be in sustainability terms and would have a long-life span. Members needed to be confident that it was a good quality scheme and had longevity.

The Planning Officer also highlighted that the classroom area had been designed to be flexible so it could be internally reworked in the future to meet a wide range of the school's future requirements.

On being put to the vote, with 7 unanimously in favour of the officer recommendation, it was

RESOLVED –

THAT

- 1) Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and Section 106 legal agreement, as set out in the agenda.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment
Borough Solicitor**

7(4) THE COTTAGE, 10 LYNDHURST ROAD, LONDON NW3 5PY

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Upon being put to the vote, it was 7 votes that unanimously

RESOLVED –

THAT planning permission be granted subject to conditions and a section 106 legal agreement as set out in the agenda,

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment Borough
Solicitor**

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

There was none.

The meeting ended at 8.48 pm.

CHAIR

Planning Committee - Wednesday, 11th September, 2024

Contact Officer: Sola Odusina
Telephone No: 020 7974 6884
E-Mail: planningcommittee@camden.gov.uk

MINUTES END