

**Q) What are the numbers of social housing coming forward and why has this not been made clear? What is a definition of affordable housing and will there be any studios or student units?**

**A)** There are 87 social housing units on the site at present, these would be replaced with 106 affordable housing units, and the total amount of homes provided would be 283 including market residential units. This would mean that approximately 50% of the proposed floorspace would be affordable housing. It would not equate to 50% of the units as a lot of the new social rented units are large family housing 4+ bedrooms, so therefore have a large floorspace.

The definition of affordable housing is as social rent which is Camden's current policy. The proposals will be for Class C3 residential accommodation; there will be no studios or student accommodation proposed.

**Q) Has the Housing department consulted the community to see what they would want in the business space in terms of shops etc?**

**A)** No, not yet but this will come at a later stage. This element of the proposals are only in the early stages of consideration and development. The space has only been identified for business uses at present. Who occupies it will be decided at a later stage.

**Q) A question was asked about whether the estate would be gated and further comments were made about the existing Bacton Low Rise accommodation which does not have any insulation and did not improve when the estate was refurbished. The buildings are high maintenance and suffer from anti social behaviour, damp, environmental issues and are generally run down.**

**A)** In Phase 1 of the proposals the mews properties (adjacent to the railway line) would be gated at the entrances to the shared courtyard space. Access to the properties fronting onto Vicar's Road and Wellesley Road would be direct from the street.

The new units would be fully insulated and thermally efficient; they would have a centralised boiler and would nearly be zero carbon which would be a very green development. This scheme is hoping to be similar to a scheme in Hackney which the architects have worked on. Last winter 10 residents in the new buildings in Hackney did not need to put on the heating at all due to the measures incorporated into this scheme.

**Q) The way people work today we are dependent on technology for example solar panels and web access, would this be provided in the scheme? Also solar panels can give people an income as well as electricity.**

**A)** Yes the modern requirements such as internet access will be included in the new homes. It is not clear at this stage whether solar panels will be used as they are not always the best way to be green and save on carbon. They still cost a lot and other ways can be cheaper and more reliable such to achieve the require sustainability and energy standards.

#### **Design, height, bulk and massing**

**Q) Will there be any gardens?**

**A)** There will be a combination of courtyard gardens, front gardens and large roof terraces accessed from individual properties across the development. For example, in the mews properties proposed as part of phase 1 there will be 3 metres deep private rear gardens, a small south facing front garden to each of the units and a shared garden space as well as generous roof terraces. The streets would be come a more lively place for residents as they would have front doors to streets, rather than using the elevated walkways.

**Q) Object to the height of the market housing block at part 7 storeys on the junction of Vicar's Road and Grafton Road. The tenants from Barrington Court would be looking directly onto the proposed 7 storey building. The only reason the proposal is this height is to get more money. The proposal should be redesigned with input from the community.**

**Q) The Vicar's Road Residents Association had argued strongly about the height of the Gospel Oak 7 and 8 development. This was eventually taken down to 4-5 storeys and generally successful. There are very few in the community who want to see a 7 storey building, we have seen 7 storey blocks in Abbey Road which are monstrous.**

**Q) Comment made that the existing houses are in such poor state of repair that the development needs to happen and if that means 7 storey buildings then so be it.**

**A)** The scale and height of existing buildings in the wider area can accommodate for a 5-7 storey building, the junction is considered to be an appropriate point for a 7 storey building. The height has been taken from pointers in the area as well as making the scheme viable. However the architect understands the local community concerns. It was recognised that tenants had previously stated that they would prefer to live in a low building. In response the 7 storey building is to be reserved for market housing, and designed sensitively with reference to neighbouring buildings.

**Q) In relation to phase 1, concern was raised about gating and social cohesion and would the gates allow access for vehicles?**

**A)** The only area to be gated would be the shared amenity space for the mews properties and this is considered necessary to make the amenity space work. The roads would still allow access for vehicles including emergency vehicles. The gates would be see-through gates allowing security but not encouraging anti social behaviour.

**Q) What will the views of St Martin's Church be like from Grafton Road?**

**A)** The Grafton Road is a long viewing corridor and it will still be possible to see the tower of St Martin's. This element of the proposals is being carefully considered.

#### **Residential Amenity**

**Q) When will the daylight and sunlight modelling be done? Concern over impact on residents within Barrington Court.**

**A)** It will be completed when the design is completed so the impacts can be understood. The technical study for daylight and sunlight will be undertaken to take account of all possibly affected windows. The architect would be happy to go to

individual properties which may be impacted especially in Barrington Court and on Vicar's Road to complete a precise daylight and sunlight reading from their window. Although it is hard for any proposals to have no impact on daylight and sunlight when building in central London, a detailed study will be submitted with the planning application. This will seek to demonstrate that in areas where there is a reduction, this reduction is within appropriate limits.

The privacy of surrounding residents will also be considered as part of the design

### **Public open space and routes**

#### **Q) What is happening to the existing trees? And will the existing and proposed trees survive next to new buildings?**

**A)** It is proposed that 1 of the 4 trees along the north-west side of Vicar's Road will be moved to the proposed shared garden which is in close proximity to its existing position. This is to make way for new housing as it cannot be designed to go around the tree. Also two trees within the proposed Northern Courtyard are to be relocated within the garden space, so mature trees would be present in the completed development. The trees will be lifted out by a large crane and moved, using specialised techniques to ensure they would survive this move. The benefits that the new housing and layout of the buildings would bring to the area are considered to outweigh the harm of moving the trees. The new scheme would include planting approximately 50 trees.

Two other trees in the existing phase 3 area will be moved to a phase 2 location (likely to the east-west pedestrian link). A trained tree specialist will complete a detailed survey of all the existing and proposed trees including measuring how close the new buildings would be to the trees; this will ensure they can survive. In addition an Urban Designer in the Planning Department is a trained tree specialist.

#### **Q) What will happen to the open space in Lismore Circus?**

**A)** This will remain the same; no changes are proposed to Lismore Circus

#### **Q) What are the timescales of the proposal?**

**A)** Planning application due to be submitted October 2012, hope to start on site in Spring 2013. The first phase would be complete by 2014, the second phase by 2016 and final phase by 2017.

#### **Q) What would happen to the existing Community Hall?**

**A)** This will remain in place.

#### **Q) A common problem in the area and in Camden generally is that there is not enough for young kids to do which leads to anti social behaviour.**

**A)** The Councils Housing department is working with the 'Real Deal Community Partnership' which will help tackle anti social behaviour in the area.

### **Transport**

#### **Q) Where are people going to park their cars? You won't be able to sell houses or flats without parking.**

**A)** There will be no new parking permits issued apart from disabled residents and there will not be any parking spaces provided for new residents. Those with existing parking permits will continue to have access to them, with parking integrated into the new landscaping of Haverstock Road and underused garages on Weedington Road being utilised to provide off-site provision. Car clubs will be used in the area which can be hired per hour and there will be electric charging points in the scheme to encourage the use of electric vehicles. There are many developments in London which are car free and people are happy to live in these properties.

#### **Q) Will the traffic going up Grafton Road get worse?**

**A)** No as there will be no new cars allowed as part of the development. A transport consultant has been commissioned who will report on all the potential traffic impacts. The existing road layout will be maintained as existing; no new roads are proposed as part of the scheme.

#### **Q) The buses are packed in the area by the time they have started their route and gone through four stops they are full so that no more people are allowed to board the bus. Will this be looked into?**

**A)** A transport expert will look at the travelling patterns of new and existing residents and it may be that a financial contribution towards Transport For London who run the buses may be necessary. However, this will be discussed further once the planning application has been submitted.

### **General**

#### **Q) How do you stop properties becoming buy to let?**

**A)** The planning department cannot enforce who buys the properties and whether they are then rented in the future. However Cllr Fulbrook (Cabinet Member for Housing) is aware of the concerns and is looking into this further from a legal perspective.

#### **Q) Could the sewage in the wider area be looked into as there are existing problems?**

**A)** An infrastructure plan has been taken into account as part of the design and will be submitted as part of the application

#### **Q) Concern regarding heavy construction vehicles going past St Martin's Church (impacting on the foundations of the building) and whether construction will be coordinated with other large developments such as construction works of an Elderly Person's Home at Wellesley Road.**

**A)** A Construction Management Plan would be submitted as part of any planning application. This will advise how dust, noise and hours of construction will be dealt with. This Construction Management Plan would also deal with the routes to and from the construction site. It will also programme in how the works at Wellesley Road will impact upon the construction at the proposed site. Consideration has already been given to minimising noise impacts through design, by perhaps using timber frame structures rather than concrete to avoid excessive noise from drilling. A noise report will also be submitted as part of the application.

**Q) Will the construction allow for local apprenticeships and employment?**

**A)** Yes it will be a requirement that the proposal includes apprenticeships for young people in Camden. This is a standard requirement for proposals of this nature in Camden.

**Q) The buildings you will be knocking down have only been around for 30 years. How long will the new buildings last for?**

**A)** We are expecting that the new buildings will last for 200 years.

Ed Watson thanked all for attending and closed the meeting at 20:30



# meeting notes

**Attendees:**

Jonathan Markwell (JM)	Senior Planning Officer, LBC
Edward Jarvis (EJ)	Principal Urban Designer, LBC
Julia Farr (JF)	Senior Development Manager, Housing and Adult Social Care, LBC
Rachael Matthiae (RM)	EC Harris
Paul Karakusevic (PK)	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Caroline Hull (CH)	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Stefan Mannewitz (SM)	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Rachel Godfrey (RG)	Quod
Poppy Carmody-Morgan (PCM)	Quod

**Project:** Q30150 Bacton Low Rise Estate Regeneration

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>
Design Workshop 1	London Borough of Camden	31 July 2012, 12:00

**Apologies:**

Ann Baker

**ACTION**

1. Purpose of meeting was to discuss:
  - The response to the Council’s Initial Pre-application Meeting Report on design issues;
  - The response to the public’s comments at the Development Management Forum (DMF);
  - Design Development; and
  - Waste Management solutions.
2. PK noted that the response from the Development Management Forum was broadly positive. There was a debate over how many storeys the buildings should be surrounding Vicar’s Road and Grafton Road.



meeting notes

- a) **Design Development**
  - i) **Southern Block on the Bacton Low Rise (BLR) Site**
    3. (See Item 1, figure 1 on page 7) – Agreement amongst team that this is a key part of the site with many issues. PK confirmed that there would be no B1 use at this location; any B1 will be located within the northern block on Haverstock Road. Here there will be a mix of residential units. Architects have changed the drawing slightly since last meeting to create more links to maintain street views. Model being created by the architects at the moment will show this well.
    4. EJ showed concern over the treatment of the space located at item 1, figure 1. PK explained that the other green spaces worked as garden squares whereas this space will have harder landscaping and a character similar to a mews. EJ asked if the residential units here would be using the land at item 1, map 1 as private external space. PK answered that there would be a subtle line demarcating private and semi-private space, instead of actual patio gardens or defined back gardens. The space would have a more continental feel.
    5. RG said that it was positive that agreement had been reached on the function of the space. EJ added that the precise detailing of landscape treatments and the interface with the street would need to be considered in a further design workshop.
      - ii) **Eastern Approach to District Housing Office (DHO) Site**
    6. At (item 2, figure 1)- PK suggested that this space would provide an entrance to the DHO part of the development, and would include an attractive treatment, such as a low wall or attractively-designed gate to subtly differentiate the public from semi-private space. EJ noted that this space is symmetrically laid out but he raised concerns that it did not have a clear function. SM said that it has a clear sense of enclosure, created by surrounding buildings on three sides and the mature trees on the fourth side. He said that it could become a garden area for residents. JF noted that this space is not large enough for another dwelling and that the trees take up a large proportion of this space. PK said that the landscape treatment of this space would be considered further.
    7. At item 3, figure 1- EJ said that there was a risk of this space turning into dead space as it was just an area/route to nowhere. EJ suggested that there could be single storey unit here linking the two buildings. This would be better acoustically.
    8. There was a discussion about whether this part of the site should be gated or be more permeable. PK noted that the GLA were leaning towards gates being a positive feature. Local residents were greatly in support of gates as they want it to



be safe development. The GLA liked the idea of having public frontage but with subtle controls further inside the development- thought this would be sensible urban design. PK confirmed they would do more work on this. i.e compare gates across the whole entrance or just controls across the 'pinch point' bottle neck.

9. EJ noted said that he thought that gates across the centre of the space here would seem too aggressive and over the top and suggested that to have a gate at the natural bottleneck may be more appropriate. He said the team will therefore need to find a way to make this large area useful. He added that this was not to say that the Council consider that gates are definitely appropriate.
10. EJ wanted to find out if there was a real risk to safety/security and the perception of safety without gates. JF confirmed that there is a very real crime risk. An example came from Queens Crescent where there is a large young person population and there are instances of gang warfare, drug issues, guns, knives, excessive drinking and sleeping outside. There is a similar problem at the Church garden, opposite the site, where street drinking and sleeping outside occur. The security measures at the Bacton Low Rise Estate put in place 10 years ago (an idea that was supported by the police) do not work, and the entry point phones are constantly broken. JF advises that this area should not be an open space and that access to it must be controlled. The gates should not be at the bottle neck pinch point but across the whole entrance, and this can include columns and planting to create character.
11. PK agreed that the risk was real and noted that without gates, changes to the dwellings may be made by residents, for example, grills on ground floor windows/doors.
12. RG noted the importance of the perception of safety for future residents. RM saw the blank elevation at the rear of the French School as a problem, as this reduces the natural surveillance of the space. There would also be blind spots there and so gates would be a good idea.
13. EJ would not ideally like to see a gate across the whole of the frontage and further work should be done to explore what this space can be used for and how it is landscaped. He suggested that as the area is overlooked and if it could be well designed there would not be the need for gates. PK agreed this should be discussed in a further design break-out meeting, with the aim of presenting the solution in the next design workshop.



#### **b) Building Heights**

14. JM noted that at the corner of Vicar's Road the height of buildings should be carefully considered. PK confirmed that at this location the proposal at the moment is 5 storeys with a 2 storey pop up. This acts as an interesting counter-point to the church and surrounding buildings. There was no GLA comment on the proposed height of these buildings. PK confirmed that they will be working on the detailed design on the building over the next 2-3 weeks. EJ made clear that he was not totally against a taller building (i.e. 8 storeys in a more slender form) if the design was right. A well designed taller building would be preferred over a shorter building with a less interesting form. EJ advised the architects to keep an open mind.

#### **c) Roof and Design Materials**

15. PK said that the detailed design of this aspect of the scheme has yet to be progressed, as the team concentrates on fixing the structural elements of the proposals.
16. EJ advised that he is favour of the use of parapets, including sloping parapets, as this would help create interesting roof forms and can create enclosure to roof gardens. PK agreed and said that this would be considered.
17. EJ asked about the use of timber. SM advised that the use of many woods, such as larch, would not last more than 15 years and had therefore been ruled out. The use of copper was discussed. The team agreed that it would need to be well detailed if used. EJ asked whether the use of tiles had been considered and pointed out the benefits of using such materials to create character. EJ made clear the roofs are going to be seen and therefore should be made a feature, and he welcomes bold ideas.
18. JF said that the residents would not like to see too many different materials being used. She would suggest that brick and slate would be appropriate.
19. Dormer windows were discussed and PK said that there were a number of options as to whether they are made part of the roof or the building in terms of their treatment.
20. It was agreed that these details will be further discussed in design workshop 2.

#### **d) Basements**

21. PK expressed his wish to see part of the basement of the southern block on the BLR site to be utilised as space for plant/servicing rooms in order to save space on the active frontages. The existing basements would need to be excavated a further ~0.75m. JM was asked if a formal Basement Impact Assessment (BIA)





would be needed for this. JM answered that a BIA would be needed and that this process could be time consuming and expensive. RM and PK confirmed that intrusive investigations were being carried out anyway and that the scope of these investigations would be widened to take account of the BIA requirements. JM advised the team to instruct the company carrying out the boreholes to ensure they've read through CPG 4 and the Arup report (links to this report can be found in the Initial Pre-application Meeting Report (21/06/12)). JM confirmed that information would be submitted at the planning stage therefore it is very important to get the timing correct. RG confirmed the procedure with JM as being:

- a) Project team conducts screening at stage 1.
- b) If stage 2 -4 are needed then the project team will also carry these out.
- c) At stage 5 the Council will assess the work that has been undertaken.

**e) Trees**

- 22. On Vicar's Road at the southern entrance to the site, three of the trees will be retained in-situ. One will be moved from its position into the garden square.
- 23. PK asked what format information should be submitted to Alex Hutson. JM said that he has yet to speak with Alex but that a statement and supporting plans would be needed setting out a clear rationale for the proposals.

**f) Noise**

- 24. RM reported that noise modelling will start shortly along the railway and roads surrounding the site.

**g) Waste and Recycling**

- 25. In order to create a better streetscape and to stop ground floor space being taken up, the architects propose locating waste storage underground.
- 26. A further meeting with Ann Baker will be needed. But JM had spoken to her and relayed her thoughts on the draft proposals that had been sent through:
  - i) Practicality in introducing them- i.e. can Council contractors utilise the sunken waste storage facility, and the fact that specialist vehicles would be needed.
- 27. JM/EJ preferred the idea of raising eurobins from the basement on a platform so special collection vehicles would not be needed. PK noted that a possible problem is that this solution contains the most moving parts within the design. If the hydraulics failed it would create a large problem.



- 28. JM noted that other Boroughs such as Tower Hamlets already have suitable vehicles and there is the possibility they could lease their vehicle to Camden. PK thought this was a good idea and said it would help with management and up-front costs. JF said that more work was needed and that it would be worthwhile working out how the extra floorspace (gained from not having waste stored on the ground floor) could fund a new collection lorry or the Borough's lorry renting costs.

ii) It may interfere with other underground infrastructure

- 29. PK said that this would be considered, as would the route of the River Fleet which flows under part of the site.

iii) Storage Capacity Levels – collection frequency may decrease in the future.

- 30. JM noted that Ann thought the architects proposed storage capacity levels appear to be acceptable. However, the proposals are based on the principle that there will be an increase in the frequency of collections, whereas in reality there is likely to be a decrease.
- 31. PK asked EJ if he would be happy if the bin receptacles were in the public realm. EJ had no objection. JM says there is definitely scope here to explore further. CH will contact Ann Baker 01/08/12 setting out specific questions for her to answer.

CH

**h) Air Quality**

- 32. JM has received comments from the air quality officer. They have said that it is likely an air quality assessment is going to be needed as a separate report rather than being part of a Energy and Sustainability report.
- 33. Information will be included in JM's meeting report or in a separate email.

**i) Land Contamination**

- 34. JM has received comments from the land contamination officer. A preliminary report may be needed as part of the application. RM said that a Phase 1 desktop study had been completed and Phase 2 works were planned, so this information could be submitted as part of the application.
- 35. Information will be included in JM's meeting report or in a separate email.

**j) Other**

- 36. JM asked how emergency service vehicles would access the development. PK said that they would access from Vicar's Road and Wellesley Road. He confirmed to JM

that vehicles would not gain access from land between the units and the railway line.

- 37. PPA – JM asked the current position of this. RG confirmed that it is presently with Jed Young. There are issues with response times and additional meetings which are being considered. Once RG receives this back from Jed Young it will be passed to JM.
- 38. JM asked if an independent assessor will be present at the housing breakout meeting as it may help with viability issues. RG said that it would be useful to confirm the key principles of the approach to viability at the initial meeting between officers and the project team, and that the independent assessor could be engaged following this. RM asked if Camden have a specific assessor in mind, and JM replied yes, they usually use one from BPS Surveyors.
- 39. EIA –RG confirmed to JM that the Environmental Impact Assessment screening report will be with him this week.

RG



Figure 1



# meeting notes

**Attendees:**

Jonathan Markwell (JM)	Senior Planning Officer, LBC
Richard Mileham (RM, LBC)	Senior Planner, Strategic Planning and Information Team, LBC
Jessica Leech (JL)	Gospel Oak Regeneration Programme Manager (Placesaping section), LBC
Genny Fernandes (GF)	Business Opportunities Manager (Economic Development section), LBC
Jed Young (JY)	Regeneration Team Leader, LBC
Julia Farr (JF)	Senior Development Manager, Housing and Adult Social Care, LBC
Rachael Matthiae (RM)	Senior Project Manager, EC Harris
Stefan Mannewitz (SM)	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Caroline Hull (CH)	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Rachel Godfrey (RG)	Quod
Poppy Carmody-Morgan (PCM)	Quod

**Project:** Q30150 Bacton Low Rise Estate Regeneration

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>
Employment Break-out Meeting	London Borough of Camden	16/08/12, 13:00

**ACTION**

1. Purpose of meeting was to:
  - Discuss the nature of existing employment units
  - Discuss proposed relocation of existing tenants.
  - Present the proposed on-site replacement employment floorspace, including location and design
  - LPA feedback on proposed on-site replacement employment floorspace
  - Present the proposed off-site replacement employment floorspace, including timing of delivery.
  - LPA feedback on proposed off-site replacement employment floorspace.
  - Discuss next steps and further information requirements.



# meeting notes

2. JF started the discussion by explaining what Raj Matharu, from Camden Property Services, has been working on. JF noted that the Burmarsh Workshop units are approximately twice the size of the units at Vicar's Road and that an initial estimate had found that approximately £600,000 would need to be spent on the workshops to bring them up to a lettable standard. JF said that the nature of businesses attracted to the refurbished units would be important in the site's success.
3. JF said that letters were sent to the tenants of the existing Vicar's Road employment units on 10th August and that formal notice was served on the 13th August. The letters offered the tenants support in finding alternative accommodation. There are 14 or 15 tenants at this site in total. In the last three days, Raj has had 4 tenants respond to him who are interested in finding out more about what alternative accommodation is available. JY noted that one tenant may have moved to Islington recently. JF confirmed that one tenant had moved to Islington, and therefore it is not clear at present whether there are 14 or 15 tenants.
4. It was agreed that a schedule of the Vicar's Road units would be created showing the number of people employed in the units, whether they were resident in the borough, and what their proposed relocation plans are. GF was interested in finding out the employment levels and tenant's proposed relocation. She asked if Raj could let her know these.
5. JF suggested that the proposed relocation options for the current Vicar's Road tenants would be either Burmarsh Workshops or Queens Crescent, although other opportunities in the borough would be available.
6. JL asked if Raj will interview each occupier and JF confirmed he would. JY said the system for handling business relocations has now changed, the letter sent to tenants offers one-to-one support. JY also noted the Highgate Laundrette example; tenants will still have to pay commercial market rent prices for the units that they occupy, although rent free periods etc. can be used to facilitate the relocation. He asked if other support would be available to the tenants. GF confirmed that she would let Raj know of other support available from the Council and from elsewhere.
7. JM told the attendees that it was quality and quantum of floorspace that will be important in assessing whether the project proposals meet Camden planning policy. A comparison between the existing units and the proposed will be essential. A table showing existing features and proposed features would be useful for officers. The project team should refer to the relevant Camden Planning Guidance document and the Business Premises Report of March 2011.

JF to clarify

Raj

GF

RG to coordinate





8. GF asked whether the existing employment units are ground floor or on the first floor. JF and RM confirmed that they are not two storey units and are either ground floor or first floor.
9. JM noted that natural light is particularly important. As this is a feature of the existing units, it should be replicated, if possible, in the proposed units.
10. JY mentioned other features which can be considered when comparing existing and proposed units. For example, toilet facilities are found in all existing units. Ceiling heights can also be compared.
11. JM asked what is currently being proposed in terms of on-site provision of replacement employment space. SM told attendees that three employment units were proposed in Phase 3 of the scheme, on the facade facing Haverstock Road. Proposed ceiling heights are 3.8m. CH explained the locational benefits of the proposed employment unit i.e. they are located on a key local route between Lismore Circus and Malden Road, they are near to the crèche and health centre, parking spaces would be provided near-by, and Haverstock Road is set to become an attractive pedestrian route with mature trees in the street. SM said that the design principles were to provide the same space requirements as existing units, level access from the outside to each unit, and raised ceiling heights. WCs would be provided for each unit, and the units would present an attractive facade to the street scene. There is the possibility of sub-dividing one of the units to provide another unit. SM envisages the spaces being used by small businesses, and those in creative industries. JM suggested that these design features be discussed further at next Design Workshop. He said the layout was very important. Incorporating business in a residential building may be inevitable but the Business Premises Study would prefer them to be separate.
12. RG said that the Business Premises Report preferred horizontal over vertical separation of uses, however, this solution would not be easy to accommodate successfully with the urban forms that are being proposed on this site.
13. JY asked about the idea of not having B1 at the site location and highlighted the strict management that would need to be in place which in turn could limit the employment uses. JY suggested having no employment on site and instead intensifying the Burmarsh Workshop site.
14. JM and GF advised that the scheme would be expected to provide some replacement employment floorspace on site as set out in Camden planning policy. RM, LBC said that providing employment units on-site is the Council's starting point. Creative businesses such as the Artists who currently occupy the Vicar's Road workshops would be the desired type of occupier but if the units



- are not attractive to this type of occupier, then off-site employment units might be better. JM described it as a balancing act. JM said that on-site units have to be viable. JM asked if there was scope to pre-let the space to potential tenants.
15. JF answered that tenants she had contact with were looking for more space than 250sqm. JY thought there was definite scope to do some advance work on potential tenants for the units and suggested that Savills could do some market research on this. Raj could also scope potential tenants. GF advised that creative industries should be targeted. GF agreed to circulate information she has on different creative industries.
 

Raj  
GF
  16. RG confirmed with JM that the team should move forward with the proposal of providing some employment floorspace onsite plus some off-site provision. JM in principle agreed but noted that the design objectives must be addressed in both types of provision. GF has a list of features that the council look for in employment uses and will circulate to all attendees.
 

GF
  17. JM said flexible units will be most beneficial.
  18. JL asked if the re-provision of employment floorspace has to be **new** provision. i.e. does Burmarsh Workshops count as re-provision? JY said that they have been unoccupied for a long time. JF said that most units had been unoccupied for 4.5 years. JL asked if Raj could find out exactly how long it has been empty. JF noted that all the units used to be occupied, and that it was a very popular option for small businesses, however, the deterioration in the condition of the units had resulted in all but three of the 16 units being vacant.
 

Raj
  19. JM said that Burmarsh Workshops would not be new provision but their refurbishment could contribute to meeting the policy requirements, particularly if the units could be upgraded, for example, from category 3 to category 2. RG said that it was interesting to note that Raj's email said the units were not currently in a lettable condition, because of the poor condition of their built fabric and water ingress. Upgrading these units to a standard where they could be re-occupied by businesses, particularly if this involved an upgrade of their category, would represent a material improvement in the condition of the units.
  20. GF advised that the proposal would be considered as a holistic package. This year's Roger Tym report refers to the current poor state of the Burmarsh Workshops. GF confirmed that this year's Roger Tym report has not been published so RM, LBC agreed to circulate the factual information within the report on the workshops to attendees.
 

RM,  
LBC



21. RG noted that the Business Premises Study stated that a shell and core specification were not found to be most attractive to tenants and in some cases discourage occupation of the units. RG suggested that, subject to viability considerations, the specification could possibly go further than just shell and core, whilst retaining the essential flexibility of the units. JM agreed that this would make it easier for tenants to move in and would add to features the Council will look for. JM advised further on the layout- there is scope to divide up the units further in the proposals. Units below 100sqm is preferable. The Vicar's Road units are half the size of the teams proposals therefore there is scope to divide the corner unit into two. The other two units would remain approximately 70sqm and 90sqm each.
22. SM highlighted the corner unit as a key design feature and therefore it must be attractive. Units are very flexible in term of subdivision.
23. JY noted that an important consideration was the timing of delivery. It was agreed that the off-site Burmarsh Workshop option could be delivered first; the on-site provision would probably not come forward for another five years and that there were a number of points of uncertainty regarding the delivery of the two other off-site provision options – Ashington Garages and Mansfield Road.

#### Ashington Garages

24. JY said that this site was in the capital receipts target for small sites. Positively, the garages at this location are under licence therefore ownership issues are not a barrier to delivery. However, the proposals are still at an early feasibility stage, and there is a need to consult residents nearby. Network Rail would need to be consulted due to the proximity of the railway line. The scheme would also need to progress through the Cabinet approvals process.
25. JM noted that the timing of delivery of any off-site replacement employment floorspace was very important. If this option were to be progressed, the uncertainties surrounding delivery would need to be resolved, and a timetable for when it would come forward would be essential.

#### Mansfield

26. JM made sure that the project team were aware that there is an application to list the whole of the terrace. It was agreed that the Mansfield Road option presented similar issues over certainly and timing.
27. RG proposed that the project team adopt the working position that the scheme would provide on-site replacement floorspace as discussed, plus the refurbishment of the Burmarsh Workshops. She noted that there is approximately 750sqm of employment floorspace currently on-site; that

JM



- approximately 250sqm of replacement on-site floorspace is proposed; and that approximately 1,300sqm of floorspace at Burmarsh Workshops requires improving. There are significant uncertainties surrounding Ashington and Mansfield, including certainty of delivery, timing and viability, and even if it were to be provided, it would be of the same type as proposed on the BLR site – employment units on the ground floor of a residential development. The Burmarsh Workshop option involves a significant amount of floorspace, which is can be materially improved, and more closely fits the desired light industrial typology, than any of the other options. JM said that he was supportive of this approach but would have to confirm this with colleagues in the planning department.
28. JM raised concern that Burmarsh Workshop appeared to be semi-basement space and queried the level of natural light. JF said that if the frosted glass was removed and clear glass put in that natural light levels would be greatly improved. JM said that natural light will be another feature to be compared when assessing employment provision as it will affect future marketability and interest in the units. He suggested that the current Vicar's Road tenants' views on what they would expect to see, and what would be interested in be taken into account.
29. Referring to JM's earlier point on potential for advanced letting of units, RG noted that prospective tenants can be shown the Burmarsh Workshops location and units now whereas the other proposals would exist only on plan for several years. She said the Business Premises Study report is useful in showing that current demand for such units is high. It shows that this is a very tight market which points towards the team being able to find occupiers for them quickly.
30. JM asked how local people will benefit from offsite employment opportunities in the future. JL is currently creating a report which will help answer this. The report will look at mapping local businesses in Gospel Oak, what ought to be there/improved, what businesses say about barriers to growth, who they're employing and issues such young person unemployment. Burmarsh, if chosen, must be used as an opportunity to regenerate local area. JL to provide information to the team.
31. JF asked the group if the rental cost of units could be limited. JY highlighted that Camden does have some very high rents, but that the council was obliged to charge a market rent for units. JL said that a decision could be made at committee to charge less than market rates, if the development shows it meets strategic targets.
32. GF said that there is huge demand for start-up businesses; smaller spaces lend themselves to start-ups.

JL