

**CO-RE – 2 WATERHOUSE SQUARE  
ST MUNGO'S MEETING  
24 JANUARY 2024**

**Meeting date:**

Thursday 18 January 2024 at 2.30pm

**Meeting place:**

The Lodge at St Ursula's, Brooke Street, EC1N 7RB

**Attendees: REDACTED**

(SD) began by explaining that he has very little knowledge of the planning relating to this site and that his main concerns are for very vulnerable guests and the potential for any new drinking establishments.

He explained that residents at St Mungo's have a history of rough sleeping and non-engagement along with addictions and mental health issues. He said that the ethos of the Lodge is to keep people off the streets in warm beds in the service and link them with other services. He explained that some guests stay for long periods and others are gone relatively quickly.

SD then gave a breakdown of guests currently staying at the Lodge – 38 men and 2 women ranging in age from mid-30's to late 70's. He said that guests are very proud of the Lodge.

(MC) explained that he acts as a liaison between local residents and the Lodge and that a lot of hard work has been undertaken over the years to make it work well between the Lodge, its guests and the local community.

(SW) then ran through a presentation of the proposals – copies of this presentation were left with SD and colleagues.

Following the presentation, SD commented that the area is generally very quiet and that the proposed new entrance on Greville Street / Leather Lane may change the volume of people in the area. Once SD had properly orientated himself, he realised he had mistaken where the entrance is proposed for and that this would not actually have much if any impact.

MC said that there is sensitivity in traffic going through the square and that while residents like it, it attracts gangs because it is quiet and there are five entrances which can be used as a means of escape. He said he is worried that disturbing the status quo could cause concerns. He said it's what happens on weekends and at night that causes the difference. SD added that at night and weekends



there is only one person at the Lodge supporting the 40 guests which is worrying for the safety of residents and staff.

SW and the team explained that the proposals will include improved security and surveillance as well as natural surveillance.

MC brought up light pollution from the proposed glazed part of the building and SD said that parking is a nightmare and it causes issues when they have contractors coming to do repairs. SW said that no vehicles associated with the building would be parking on the streets.

SD said that existing public realm is not very nice and that it would be lovely for this to be improved with some trees included.

The volunteer in attendance asked about noisy works and timings. The team explained that noisy works will be subject to two hours on, two hours off in a number of slots throughout the day and restricted to taking place between 8.30am and 5pm from Monday to Friday (excluding Bank Holidays). If works are required outside these times, the contractor will need to apply for a special license which is subject to Camden Council's approval.

MC said that there are three main areas of concern. These being:

1. The potential for a bar(s) – citing that the terrace of the Argyle Pub is controversial locally and they do not want any more of that type of thing
2. The potential loss of natural light with some rooms impacted more than others
3. How contractors and lorries are managed with a focus on keeping access for emergency services.

(AN) explained that there is one single unit that could potentially be a bar but that would still need licensing. He also said that there hasn't been a decision on whether the team want this to be a bar but that the intention is to apply for a flexible use for the particular unit.

He explained on daylight and sunlight that there was some confusion at committee regarding whether the Lodge had been assessed. He said that it had been assessed under the name of the Evelyn Buildings and treated as 'residential' with all findings within BRE guidelines. (DH) added that any impact would be below the guidelines of perceptibility.

The team explained that there will be condensed report produced outlining this and that the intention is to share this with the Lodge, LBC officers and Planning Committee members when ready. *This has now been shared with the Lodge.*

On construction impact, AN explained that the team has put forward what they believe could be good solutions but that it will be impossible to discuss in full detail until a contractor is in board and that it will need to go through a consultation and sign off process. (DJH) added that the team would consult the local community on a detailed draft of the Construction Management Plan (CMP) once it is ready. DH said that while the team will be meeting regularly with the community, we would also be happy to facilitate separate and regular meetings with the Lodge to address and mitigate any specific concerns they might have.

MC said that there are also concerns coming from the use of the proposed terraces. AN explained that these will be conditioned and team agreed to follow up with what those conditioned hours are likely to



be. This has now been shared with the Lodge and the proposed hours for the external terraces is that they shall not be used outside of 8am-9pm Mondays to Saturdays.

The meeting was brought to a close and DJH said that the team very much sees this as the start of many conversations going forward and that if there is anybody else at the Lodge or St Mungo's more generally who would like to discuss the proposals with us, we would be happy to do so.

END