

Minutes January 22nd, 2025

Meeting: January 22nd 8.15am online to discuss the amended planning application by Simten (2024/4662/P) and servicing strategy issues at 1 Museum Street

Attended by

Trevor Shonfeld – MSCLG and BRAG (chair)

Martin Reed - Arup

David Kaner MSCLG and Covent Garden Community Association

Helen Stone - MSCLG

Eleanor Wright – Simten

Isabel Moreira - DSDHA

Referred to below by individual's initials

TS opened the meeting and introduced the participants

EW explained that the application had been amended because the original component for their DSMP was authored by the prior owners and was found unsuitable for the current development

The meeting continued with the agenda

Prior to the meeting, Arup had provided written responses to items raised by MSCLG.

Capacity: The demand/supply balance

EW explained that the use of the ground floor of the development (Class E) was heavily guided by the Council and Simten followed that guidance

DK had reviewed the Arup document and there was broad agreement on the number of deliveries, and the meeting agreed to work with the 50:50 food :nonfood assumption

DK's review was based on calculations that suggested the average dwell time for visiting vehicles to 1 Museum St would be 17 minutes. Arup (Rachael Gore, unfortunately on leave) estimated 12 minutes, though the figure had not been justified and DK asked where this figure was from? The parties agreed that **IF** the dwell time was 12 minutes, 1 Museum St would work, i.e could handle the deliveries expected. **IF** the dwell time was 17 minutes, the plan would not work.

The parties noted the actual dwell time would also depend on whether or not facilities management staff would manage deliveries. If they did so, dwell times would be shortened

but, with multiple recipients involved it would be complex to operate. The DSMP should address whether a facilities management team is to be provided.

Discussion turned to the on-street service bays: at Shaftesbury Ave/Grape Street and on Museum St. DK noted that significant use of these bays for deliveries represented a big change from the previous plan. DK noted that proposed long hours of use would be disturbing for residents, both early morning and late in the evening.

DK observed that it is difficult to estimate dwell times for these unmanaged bays as they may be occupied when it is wished to make a delivery. Also, vehicles waiting for a space cause hazards for pedestrians and other users.

MSCLG had asked for the capacity and current usage of these bays, but the figures had not been provided by Arup. HS observed that the Grape St bay was over-used already, in that businesses and residents often found it full when they wanted to use it, and vehicles spilled over into the adjacent square. DK pointed out that the Museum St bay was heavily used by the Post Building already.

MR commented that the Arup estimate of dwell time had been carefully estimated by colleague Rachel Gore and he considered them reasonable for use in the capacity projection. Estimates concerning use availability of the public service bays had been based on figures provided by LB Camden. MR or EW agreed to obtain a copy of these figures and forward to DK.

Arup stand by their proposals subject to LB Camden's agreement.

Before leaving the matter of capacity and dwell times, HS raised the question of traffic on High Holborn possibly lengthening dwell times in the 1 Museum St bay, due to delays in delivery vehicles being able to enter and exit as their swept path from the eastbound lane showed intrusion into the oncoming westbound traffic. MR did not think this would cause much problem as average traffic speeds were only 10-15mph. DK added that there would be additional traffic arising from Camden's future "Livable Neighbourhood" plans which would put Bloomsbury Way traffic (except public service vehicles) on to High Holborn. TS noted that other Holborn developments were imminent, such as Berkshire House which would also increase congestion.

The meeting agreed there were many variables that might be considered. But this was difficult because of the varying degrees of uncertainty about any projection drawn from them.

For the purpose of this meeting the discussion continued using the best estimates by the parties attending.

Measures to ensure sufficient capacity compared to demand

DK indicated that keeping the dwell time in the managed bay to 12 minutes or less was key to providing sufficient capacity, and consideration should be given to how the DSP could be used to keep it as low as possible.

DK noted that an alternative approach would be to consolidate deliveries.

Consideration needs to be given to the question, what if the chosen plan does not work? DK recommended that it should be flagged to LB Camden to consider this when they review the Final DSP.

Management of Waste from Vine Lane units

Arup had estimated, based on the 50/50 ratio of catering/other retail occupancy, that this would be 1.88 cubic metres of waste every two days. This concurred with DK's estimate of approx. 900 litres per day.

The meeting considered various options to better provide for the management of waste collection from the site generally. MSCLG members objected to the practice of leaving waste in the street for untimed collection

MSCLG members expressed particular concern that the volume of waste from the currently unknown mix of restaurants, take-away and food and beverage outlets is an uncertain projection. Collection should be catered for by some means of local collation to an onsite (basement?) storage area for onward collection and treatment by an appointed contractor and NOT left to the serious vagaries of on-street collections

Swept Path analysis

MR apologized for the omission of traffic lanes in the swept path drawing, and the omission of the swept paths for westbound deliveries and exits. HS expressed concern that Eastbound departing vehicles would dangerously encroach on the west bound traffic lane.

MR shared on the screen two swept path drawings, one for eastbound, the other for westbound.

EW: Arup will amend the drawings and forward a copy to HS

Follow up

1. EW to forward LB Camden's estimate of the service bay capacity to DK
2. EW will convene an offline meeting to review waste management. Simten will review the current proposal and suggest a solution that will avoid holding waste on-street. This will be communicated in writing to MSCLG.
3. EW to alert LBC about what they need to consider re the final DSMP.
4. MSCLG will respond in writing to 2 above

MSCLG will need the Simten suggestion in time to respond to the amended S73 planning application

Minutes taken by Helen Stone and Trevor Shonfeld