



33. JF said that the tenants of Vicar's Road will be leaving next January.

34. JM advised that all options must be reviewed and compared. JY confirmed that financial analysis will be carried out. RM, LBC confirmed that there was no set format for the comparison/viability assessments. JM confirmed that timing and certainty are the main issues. Information JM would like to see:

- Commentary on status of Burmarsh workshops
- Information on when the refurbishment could be completed
- A comparison of Burmarsh workshops with the existing Vicar's Road units
- Brief notes on the other options, noting the difficulties of delivering them
- Confirm that there are no other sites suitable in Camden.

It was agreed that a site visit for JM and GF would be arranged to Burmarsh Workshops to address points 1 and 3 above.



meeting notes



Attendees:

- Jonathan Markwell - Senior Planning Officer, LBC
- Alex Hutson - Trees and Landscape Officer, LBC
- Michelle Horn - Access Officer/Lifetime Homes, LBC
- Zoe Trower - Senior Transport Officer, LBC
- Edward Jarvis - Principal Urban Designer, LBC
- Ann Baker - Waste and Recycling Officer, LBC
- Rachael Matthiae - EC Harris
- Julia Farr - Senior Development Management, Housing and Adult Social Care, LBC
- Caroline Hull - Karakusevic Carson Architects
- Stefan Mannewitz - Karakusevic Carson Architects
- Rachel Godfrey - Quod
- Poppy Carmody-Morgan - Quod

Project: Q30150 Bacton Low Rise Regeneration

Meeting Title: Design Workshop 2 **Location:** London Borough of Camden **Date & Time:** 29 August 2012, 9.00

Action

1. Purpose of meeting was to discuss:
 - Revised plans and layout of development
 - Block C
 - Landscape strategy and treatment of eastern entrance to DHO site
 - Tree Strategy
 - Location and design of wheelchair- accessible units. Already adapted/ readily-adaptable units
 - Design of employment units
 - Location and design of cycle parking
 - Elevational treatment and use of materials
 - Waste storage (to include basement development issues)
 - Other design development since Design Workshop 1 and/or since issue of advance information pack on 15 August
 - Ecological design
 - Outline energy strategy

meeting notes

Revised plans and layout of development

2. SM started the discussion by presenting revised layouts/plans of the wheelchair-accessible units and describing space standards and core stair arrangements. CH confirmed that there are now wheelchair-accessible units in blocks D, E, F, A, C. It was noted by MH that these units must ideally be located on different floors.
3. SM told the group that GLA and Camden wheelchair housing design guides had been paid attention to and described the adaptable living areas and wheelchair specifications.
4. RG confirmed with MH that the level of detail submitted before would be acceptable for the Design and Access Statement. MH also agreed that the 2 and 3 bed mix is appropriate as it matches Camden's housing need. MG provided further guidance with regard to Lifetime Homes. Staircases in the maisonettes must be easy going. Access to terraces should be level, and the size of entry level WCs must be carefully considered. SM confirmed that there will be a Lifetime Homes assessment in the application.

Waste Management

5. AB told the group that a site visit is being organised by Mark Hunt to see similar waste storage units in Tower Hamlets. AB will find out when this site visit is organised for. It is possible that the Council could share facilities with Tower Hamlets or Lambeth. CH hopes that Mark's findings will help in understanding the general viability of this option so that it can inform the waste strategy. AB
6. CH explained to the group that if an underground storage solution is adopted it will free up space at ground floor level which could be used for habitable rooms.
7. Further information regarding waste management from the Council is needed. AB confirmed that this information will be provided in September but was not able to give a specific date. SM alerted the group that if storage space can be freed up for habitable rooms it would require a fundamental redesign of the ground floor level of the development. RG raised the issue of time constraints. There is a final design meeting which is important for finalising application drawings scheduled for the 11th September. AB noted this time constraint. AB
8. AB also discussed the design of underground bins. She suggested an example from Belgium and using Eurobins as this would fit in better with existing council facilities. It would cause the council less concern as they could be more easily serviced. The Eurobins could be wheeled around parked obstructions. CH said that they would consider this and discuss with Paul his previous reservations about this type of bin. CH
9. AB requested SM to send over further details concerning the system of sharing existing refuse lorries from other boroughs. AB expressed concerns over cost and maintenance issues.



meeting notes

10. JM wanted to discuss the separation of commercial and domestic waste. AB confirmed that there is no link and that they should be dealt with separately because commercial waste has to be paid for. CH suggested the solution of having one bin storage unit purely for commercial waste which could be charged for. AB agreed that this was suitable.

Design and Landscaping

11. SM and CH started the discussion by presenting working progress elevation drawings. Block A on the DHO site remains unchanged. Block C has been redesigned. The footprint and layout have become more 'L' shaped. The massing of the block was discussed. 7 or 8 storey options were discussed. Integration with the rest of the scheme and existing buildings is very important. EJ noted that there is potential for roof terraces. SM is testing different elevational planes and possible brick work options at present. EJ found the plinth interesting as it worked as a device mediating the scale of the building. He said it is important to get the building to feel comfortable in itself and in its surroundings.

12. There are four components at present that need to work. SM and EJ agreed that the fragmentation of the elevation and pop-out elements would be considered further in a separate informal design break-out meeting. EJ suggested looking at the example at Swiss Cottage, the Alexander Road Estate. Another good example EJ proposed was at St. George's Circus by Maccreanor Lavington. SM agreed to test out these ideas on our development. EJ also told the architects to consider twisting the shortest block slightly so that it follows the building line/form of the road.

13. EJ also would like to see the architects' model views so we can start to understand the views from the church as well.

SM

14. SM has considered roof terraces and roof slopes. Balconies create softer corners and break volume. EJ suggested that the architects should go and visit the Levitt Bernstein Scheme.

SM/CH

15. AH brought up the issues of construction impact on trees. It must be noted that if buildings require scaffolding, another 2m of space around the tree will be required. AH also noted that residents will not want trees growing into their balconies. ZT brought to attention that a licence may be needed if balconies overhang footpaths.

16. It was agreed that EJ would visit the architects next Monday (3rd September 2012) to discuss further the design proposals.

EJ/SM/CH

17. Town house proposals were discussed. SM explained that the concept was to move away from the standard block design and create a strong and visually interesting facade. EJ expressed concern over the integration of maisonette units with the houses, the order of their different designs and the proposed concrete plinth splitting the town houses. JF would prefer to see brickwork in this space or large windows. This topic will also be further reviewed next Monday.

EJ/SM/CH



meeting notes

18. When considering the maisonettes the issues of the staircase, access to upper levels, lighting issues and double height windows were discussed. SM felt that sense of ownership would be very important in this development. Safety and a clear divide between public and private space is essential. This is informed by tenant views. EJ felt that the entrance space to maisonettes should be left open.

19. Further block D elevations are to be shown on Monday. SM said that a mansard roof would not be fitting. Communal roof gardens will not be provided for the social houses because JF noted that this has proved too difficult to manage on other schemes. AH was concerned that the scheme has a lack of biodiverse roofs. There is an 80% policy expectation from the Council. RG suggested that 80% of flat roofs can be green roofs but that the architecture of the scheme cannot be dictated by this requirement. CH questioned whether this could be offset by permeable landscaping elsewhere. AH said that this was a possibility and that rain gardens should be considered. This could be further discussed.

20. CH told the group that the courtyards would contain softer landscaping to accommodate falls in levels. There is a natural topography which has been incorporated into the design. The DHO has similar characteristics to the courtyards but will feel denser. SM said that this was done to take into account tenant views. AH proposed that a meeting with the landscape architects would be useful. SM/CH said that there was limited time to arrange this, but that in any case, AH's comments would be taken into account.

SM/CH

21. EJ asked whether there would be a public art contribution. JM said that this is a possibility. EJ suggested that if there was a contribution for this, that it could be directed to commissioning a bespoke entrance feature for the DHO site.

JM

22. AH suggested that the community should get involved with planting. This should be incorporated into the landscaping strategy. It would help the residents to take ownership of the scheme. JF noted that the ground maintenance of the landscaping must be considered. SM said that it would be helpful if some landscaping details could be conditioned e.g. gate design.

23. AH raised concerns over proposals to move large trees to other parts of the site. SM confirmed that he has done research into this. He has found companies which can do this successfully. Obviously every tree has different circumstances, and water levels, ground conditions and the impact on trees that won't be moved must be considered. RG said that arboricultural survey results, constraints plans, impact reports and method statements will be submitted to the Council.

RG

24. ZT raised the issue of footpaths. She suggested that parking to the south of the BLR site at Wellesley Road will have to go back on-street. Parking is a complicated issue, potential variations to the Council's policy position, and information on how the existing on and off-street spaces are used, will need to be balanced in the approach taken across the site. This will be discussed further at the Transport meeting to be held 30/08/12. RG suggested that with regards to policy departures, it would be useful if ZT could advise us about other schemes in the borough that she has worked on and how these could be used to inform our approach.

ZT



meeting notes

25. ZT also informed the group that it is important that the new east-west pedestrian route does not look like a secondary road. It will need good landscaping to ensure that people do not drive down it. This can be further discussed at the transport meeting.
26. AH suggested that the project team should look at raingardens rather than normal planters in this location as raingardens double up as sustainable drainage. SM/CH
27. AH also advised the use of bird bricks in the buildings (especially in the internal courtyard area). These will cater for birds such as sparrows and swifts. The bird bricks cannot be south facing. AH will provide the project team with links to information about bird bricks. RG said that the ecological and landscape strategy can be further discussed at the final pre-application meeting. AH
28. RG told the group that the Phase 1 habitat survey had shown that there was low potential for protected species at the Bacton site. The extended bat survey found one bat near Lismore Circus. There were no bats found inside any buildings. AH does not require sight of the bat survey before it is submitted.

Design of Employment Units

29. JM advised the project team to consider who will be using these units carefully. It may be that we have to consider wider entrances to the units in case car access is needed. Flexibility in the units design will be key. It was agreed that advice would be sought from Raj on what tenants of such units require. JF/Raj

Cycle Storage

30. CH noted that the cycle storage strategy will inform the landscaping strategy but she confirmed that the correct numbers of cycle parking spaces as required by policy have been provided. ZT told the group that the accessibility of stands is as important as the number. She advised the project team to use CPG 7 for guidance on design and TfL guidance for the numbers required. ZT will circulate to the team details on possible designs for bicycle storage. ZT

Energy

31. RG said that the scheme is being designed to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. Information from the energy consultants on the draft energy strategy will be sent to JM in advance of the final pre-application meeting. RG
32. It is hoped to utilise the heat from the Royal Free hospital's gas turbine CHP system for heating and hot water provision. RG noted that as this is 68-69% efficient we may need onsite renewables to bring the development up to the Code for Sustainable Homes target. It is this which will determine the provision of on-site renewable. RG will ensure the draft energy strategy is submitted to JM who will provide comments. RG/JM

Meeting ended 12.30.



meeting notes



Attendees:

- Jonathan Markwell (JM) - Senior Planning Officer, LBC
- Zoe Trower (ZT) - Senior Transport Officer, LBC
- Laura Harney (LH) - Transport Consultants, Peter Brett Associates
- Peter DeSouza (PD) - Transport Consultants, Peter Brett Associates
- Rachael Matthiae (RM) - EC Harris
- Julia Farr (JF) - Senior Development Management, Housing and Adult Social Care, LBC
- Caroline Hull (CH) - Karakusevic Carson Architects
- Stefan Mannewitz (SM) - Karakusevic Carson Architects
- Rachel Godrey (RG) - Quod
- Poppy Carmody-Morgan (PCM) - Quod

Project: Q30150 Bacton Low Rise Regeneration

Meeting Title: Transport Break-Out Meeting **Location:** London Borough of Camden **Date & Time:** 30 August 2012, 9.00

Action

1. Meeting to discuss:
 - Baseline conditions
 - Proposed Development
 - LPA comments on draft Transport Statement scoping
 - Other issues such as land ownership and EIA screening.

Baseline Conditions

2. LH has undertaken the PTAL assessment and can confirm that the whole site is PTAL Level 3. ZT agreed that this was the case.
3. On site there are currently garages used by Bacton Low Rise residents and non-residents as well as parking in the courtyard. There are 50 garages and 12 parking spaces let to and being used by Bacton residents. JF said that there was no legal obligation to re-provide these garages/parking spaces. ZT questioned the use of the garages and suggested LH find out if they are used for vehicles or for other uses such as storage. LH

meeting notes

Proposed development/parking strategy

4. LH outlined the proposed plans and parking strategy. Currently there is one parking space per disabled unit as is required by London Plan and Camden policy. There is 10% provision for wheelchair accessible units, and therefore there are 29 associated parking spaces. Some are for social units; some are for market (located on Haverstock Road and at the Northern end of Wellesley Road).
5. There are two options for vehicular circulation around the site:
 - Option 1: Maintain the current use of Haverstock and Wellesley roads. Use off-street right angled parking, located to avoid the existing trees. Residents will use the space between the trees to manoeuvre in and out of parking spaces. The road would be 3.3m wide. The space between trees can be used for informal passing points. Refuse vehicles would turn in the space between BLR and Bacton High Rise at the end of the road.
 - Option 2: One way circulation system. Would make use of off-street echelon parking. This would still protect the existing trees. This solution would avoid conflict between vehicles along the road. It would improve the ease of servicing the site. It would also be easier for refuse lorries to manoeuvre.

In both options, the DHO site could have 2 off-street parking bays. Car club bays could also be provided in off-street parking spaces.

6. ZT concern is that there would be an overprovision of designated disabled parking. It would be acceptable to have 0.5 spaces/disabled unit. Therefore there can be 15 spaces as opposed to 30. ZT accepted RG's reasoning that disabled parking spaces could just be provided for the adapted wheelchair units, with any future occupant of readily-adaptable units being able to apply to Camden for a disabled bay in the usual way. Therefore it was agreed that the provision of between 10-15 off-street disabled parking bays would be acceptable to the council. ZT noted that other schemes that had provided disabled parking at lower than policy levels had been accepted than Camden's development management committee.
7. RG asked ZT about how many spaces should be designated for Car Club. ZT responded by saying Car Club is a private run enterprise and therefore the provision of spaces should be agreed with any potential future operator. LH should make contact with Camden Council's Car Club Advisor to find out how many spaces would be recommended for a Car Club. ZT would expect it is in the region of 1 of 2 spaces. LH
8. RG asked ZT whether electric charging points will be needed. ZT replied that electric charging points would not be needed at our site.
9. ZT was interested in how many garages there are currently on site in total. JF said that there were 90. It was asked whether the Council was happy for the existing 90 garage spaces being translated into 50 garages to be provided at Weedington Road.



ZT said that if current garages at Bacton are not all being utilised, the number re-provided at Weedington Road may be reduced. JM requested more information to be provided about the existing provision at Weedington Road. JF told the group that a large number of spaces at Weedington Road were currently vacant and that the council had leased further spaces to a private landlord that could be recalled due to a clause in the lease. ZT also felt it was important to know more about the existing provision at Weedington Road in order to find the correct balance, and ensure that parking was not being displaced onto the streets.

LH

10. RG asked ZT to confirm which option for vehicular circulation (as outlined above) she preferred. ZT told the project group that she preferred option 1 as Haverstock Road is a pedestrian route and this option would provide a more clearly defined pedestrian/cycle route. ZT outlined her concerns with the one way approach.
11. RG asked ZT to confirm if she was happy with a shared surface for this route. ZT confirmed that this would be acceptable. SM expressed concerns that cars must not be able to park too close to the buildings as this would detract from the positive frontage that the scheme is trying to create. PD explained that having cars closer to the buildings would create more room for emergency service access. ZT confirmed that this would be important because the road is a defined route for ambulances. SM agreed to work together to overcome this problem.
12. RG said that while the quantum of employment floorspace was below the threshold for parking spaces for commercial units, comments by JM in previous meetings would indicate that providing one parking space per employment unit may be desired as it would make the units more attractive to potential tenants. ZT said that the Council would like the development to be as car free as possible but understand that this needs to be balanced with viability and making the commercial units as attractive as possible. ZT will respond to the project team with her thoughts about how many commercial car parking spaces are required at a later date.
13. JM would like the team to provide further information on tenants which are likely to move in to the proposed commercial units. The project team can then use this as a basis for building up a justification of providing or not providing commercial car parking spaces.
14. JM would like to see more clearly where the trees are located in relation to car parking spaces, then he will talk to Alex Hutson and seek his views on the acceptability of this.

ZT

JF

LH/SM/CH

Permeability/accessibility

15. RG said that the new east-west route will need to be a pedestrianised route where informal parking will not be available. This in turn will inform the landscaping strategy. ZT agreed that it is important to make it clear it is pedestrianised and that the only access will be to refuse lorries/emergency vehicles and potentially removal lorries. The Council would much prefer trees and bollards rather than gates and railings to define this space.



LPA comments on draft Transport Statement scoping

16. RG said that while the EIA Screening Report states that a Transport Assessment will be provided, it is intended that a Transport Statement will be submitted, and this approach was confirmed at the pre-application meeting. ZT confirmed that the traffic modelling elements that would normally be seen in a transport assessment are not required. It was agreed that the document will be called a Transport Assessment, but it will be explained in the introduction that the traffic modelling elements had been scoped out of the report by Camden. ZT said that it would be helpful to see current data being used for trip generation. LH will provide this.
17. RG asked ZT if she was happy with the parking survey area. ZT confirmed she was happy with the Lambeth method and the distance used from the site (200m) and the times that the survey was carried out (morning, afternoon, early evening and late night).
18. ZT confirmed that the proposals for the framework travel plan and pedestrian audit were acceptable. It will be important to enhance Haverstock Road for pedestrians.
19. For the Construction Management Plan, ZT advised the project team to use CPG 6-Amenity's checklist. Also the team should make use of the service management and waste service management check lists. It will be important to understand the phasing and how residents will be affected.

LH

Other Issues

20. RG wanted to check the ownership of the land. ZT confirmed that Haverstock Road is housing land rather than highway land. She noted that there was not any street cleaning on the housing land. ZT is waiting to confirm this with JF's team. JF is clarifying with the legal team the ownership of land around Wellesley Road. The red line may need to be extended, and JF will advise on this.
21. RG asked if there would be spare budget that could be spent on this scheme in the Council's Highway Improvement Funds. ZT did not think there would be. Funding has already been allocated to different schemes. The Shadow S106 will need to incorporate funds for any changes to the highway which would need to be made. Vicar's Road will need changes, for example, the relocation of cross overs. ZT said that there may need to be cooperation on management arrangements between the highways and housing departments.
22. ZT said that the parking space on the DHO site that requires negotiation with Network Rail may need to be removed. ZT said that the other off-street parking space on the DHO site was also unlikely to be acceptable. However, there could be potential for on-street disabled bays where the crossovers are currently located.
23. PD asked if a safety audit is required. ZT confirmed that it wasn't required.
24. Project team need to speak with Mark Hunt and Ann Baker to determine current waste management arrangements.

JF/Legal team

LH

meeting notes



25. LH requested accident data from the Council. ZT said that she would provide it to LH. ZT

Meeting ended 11.30.



meeting notes

Attendees:

- Frances Wheat (FW) - Head of Development Management, LBC
- Jonathan Markwell (JM) - Senior Planning Officer, LBC
- Carolyn Whittaker (CW) - Housing and Affordable Housing, LBC
- Richard Mileham (RM, LBC) - Senior Town Planner, LBC
- Rachael Matthiae (RM) - EC Harris
- Julia Farr (JF) - Senior Development Management, Housing and Adult Social Care, LBC
- 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 Regeneration

Meeting Title: Housing Break Out Meeting **Location:** London Borough of Camden **Date & Time:** 31 August 2012, 9.30

Action

1. Purpose of meeting was to discuss:
 - An update since the issue of the advance information pack on 21 August
 - The quantum of proposed housing and density
 - The proposed typologies of properties
 - The Decanting Strategy (including leaseholders)
 - The proposed mix of housing – tenures
 - Tenure distribution within scheme and individual phases
 - The proposed mix of housing – size of units
 - Residential design and space standards
 - Provision of amenity space
 - Lifetime homes and wheelchair accessible housing



meeting notes

Update since the issue of the advance information pack on 21 August.

2. SM and CH presented changes since the issue of the advanced information pack on 21/08/12. They have carefully considered how to accommodate the unit mix that has arisen out of the housing needs of existing tenants. The unit mix is currently the same as in the information pack, although this is still being refined. Phasing has been highlighted as a key issue. In terms of wheelchair accessible units there is a provision of 10% in each block. In the social housing these are dedicated for wheelchair users. In the market housing the units will have the ability to be easily adapted to wheelchair accessible units.

Tenure distribution within scheme and individual phases

3. 1st Phase- the DHO site- Blocks A, B1, C and B2
 2nd Phase- BLR South- Blocks D and E
 3rd Phase- BLR North- Block F.
4. The DHO site will be used to rehouse as many of the existing Bacton residents as possible, starting with those who live around the southern courtyards of Bacton Low Rise. Block A contains apartments, Block B is maisonettes and townhouses, Block C comprises 2 bed houses. Market housing is shown on the information pack as green. Leaseholders will also have an opportunity to be decanted within the scheme.

Quantum of proposed housing, density and tenure

5. FW said it was important that appropriate accommodation was provided to re-house tenants on-site. JF said that this was the intention of the adopted local lettings policy, and that that accommodation would be 'sized to fit' if tenants' current accommodation is overcrowded. If current accommodation is underused, the families will be offered a size of unit to fit their need plus one bedroom. JF confirmed to FW that the mix of units is shifting upwards, so that more larger units are being provided than currently exist. SM added that there is currently a good match between housing need (from decanting) and housing provision at present and the scheme has some flexibility to respond to family changes in the future.
6. JM expressed concern that fewer 3 bedroom units are proposed than in the existing mix. PK responded that the development is far in excess in terms of floorspace (m²) for social rent and that more larger (4 bed+ units) are being provided. JM asked for figures showing the total floorspace of existing units and also the proposed units so a comparison can be made.
7. RG asked the Council about the overall proportion of larger social housing units proposed within the scheme. Currently the project team is proposing 43% larger units (3 bed+) compared with the policy target of 40%. RM, LBC confirmed that 43% social housing should be acceptable. Camden Planning Guidance advises that the

SM/CH



target may go down to 30% if the project team can show a large proportion of 4 to 5 bed units.

8. CW wanted to discuss the quantum of floorspace vs. number of units. RG confirmed that the council's planning policies protect the quantum of floorspace rather than the number of social housing units. FW said that it was important to remember that Bacton must not be considered in isolation. There are other developments in Camden which are providing smaller units. Bacton must think about what it is bringing to the borough as a whole. Bacton can provide a strong role in providing family housing for the borough.
9. JM brought up the topic of intermediate housing. RM, LBC noted that all of the intermediate housing proposed is 3 bedrooms and questioned whether this was affordable. CW added that prospective purchasers are likely to find it difficult to raise a deposit for such units. Intermediate rented schemes were discussed. JF noted that intermediate renting would have a negative effect on the financial model. PK suggested that there could be flexibility at the planning stage on the tenure of units in later phases. FW said that flexibility depends on viability and how this interacts with decanting the existing tenants. A variation after planning permission has been granted could be considered. FW suggested that the balance between large intermediate units and smaller social rented units could be considered to ensure that there was a range of unit sizes across tenures within the scheme.
10. RG said that just over 40% of market units were proposed as 2 bedroom properties. JM said that he was more comfortable with the proposals for market housing, including the mix of large and small units. The project team is taking advice from Savills as to what the demand is for market units - this is key for the viability of the whole development going forward. PK said that if there are too many market sale 3 bedroom units the viability of the whole scheme would be compromised. He said that it should be noted that the size of the smaller units proposed are much bigger than you would normally see in other developments. 1 bed flats have usually been provided at around 42-43 m². The units that are proposed are up to 60m². RG said there has been an escalation of standards, which is reflected in this scheme, which will make the development better and more marketable.
11. CW asked how many wheelchair units there are in the social affordable units and how many are there in the private units. CH answered that there are 10% provided in each tenure. PK asked if there was any flexibility in this provision, i.e. is there a need for 29 units in the scheme? CW proposed that there could be 29 overall but 20 in the social units and 9 in the market units. RM, LBC said that 10% overall provision is expected but there is flexibility in the tenure of the units. CW suggested that the project team talk to Neil Steadman (occupational therapist) about what he would like to see and what the evidence shows is needed. JM reinforced the policy requirement of 10% overall provision and said that evidence from the occupational therapist could be used for a variation in the proportion provided in each tenure. JF/SM/CH
12. FW also asked the project team to consider the mix of units and child densities. PK confirmed that the child densities had been calculated in accordance with GLA guidance.



Proposed typologies of properties

13. SM described the 4 and 5 bedroom social rented town houses and their internal layout. FW thought that proposals for these units were excellent as long as the scheme can afford to use the floorspace in this way. There was a discussion about the provision of additional amenity space within the 4 and 5 bedroom units to compensate for the proximity of the railway line, and whether this space would be used to provide an extra bedroom in future. FW suggested using a narrative to explain the sizing and use of space within the units and how this provides flexibility in their future use. RG summarised the overall housing tenure composition. Of total gross housing floorspace, 48% is affordable and 52% is market sale. PK noted that the net floorspace is more likely to be 50%/50%. RM, LBC indicated his support for this position. RG noted that the scheme was still evolving and would go through a further design iteration when the financial viability model is updated. FW asked about the mix of units within the net additional residential floorspace on site and said that while account will be taken of the fact that this is an estate regeneration scheme, it will be important to provide a full analysis of the existing and proposed residential floorspace and justification for any departures from policy, including on viability grounds. SM/CH
14. The 3 and 4 bedroom maisonettes were discussed next. JM said he was comfortable with the design standards in these and said that they were well thought out. A meeting or discussion with the occupational therapist to check the layout of wheelchair accessible units is advisable. JF/SM/CH
15. JM suggested that drawings which show levels of daylighting and sunlighting in the Design and Access Statement will be useful. Also visual material showing how the scheme will look from surrounding areas, and in the context of existing buildings will be important. This is especially the case for how the corner of Block E will look from surrounding streets. SM/CH

Decanting Strategy

16. PK said that the scheme had been designed to provide a close fit for the first phase of decanting tenants. There is more flexibility over the second phase of decanting as some residents may have moved away from the scheme, and other families may have revised housing needs. A limited amount of double decanting may have to take place. JF told the group that there are 12 existing leaseholders on the estate. 6 are Bacton residents, 6 are non Bacton residents (i.e. they are landlords). The Bacton residents will be offered the value of their property plus 10% and those that are non-resident will be offered the value of their property plus 7.5%. Where possible, leaseholders will be accommodated within the redeveloped scheme. The first phase will only include 1 or 2 resident leaseholders.

Amenity Space

17. RG said that amenity space for younger children will be provided onsite. Provision for older children may be made via a financial contribution, and it is noted that Hampstead Heath is a short walk away. The scheme incorporates a significant

meeting notes



amount of private and communal amenity space. SM said that balconies will be well designed and sized, where possible, to accommodate all of the residents of the associated unit. JM encouraged that this detail is demonstrated in the Design and Access Statement to make it as easy as possible for planners to understand the project team's reasoning. Amenity space will be further discussed at the Shadow S106 meeting on 19/09/12.

Other

18. CW noted that further discussions with Neil Steadman the Occupational Therapist will provide information on what other disabilities the project team will need to consider. JF/SM/CH
19. JM noted that the overarching mechanism in determining the housing mix is viability. The Shadow S106 meeting will require a lot of analysis. In order for the council to consider an initial shadow section 106 offer, the final housing mix should be sent to JM in advance of the meeting if possible. JM will be asking an independent assessor to review the information. This is likely to be BPS. RG
20. RM may be able to show a summary of EC Harris's financial model but it will not be in its final form. From this, an understanding of the format of the residual appraisal, the income from each type of house, build costs and the bottom line can be gained. RM will check whether BPS (Mike Jennings) have used the EC Harris model before. RM
21. JM would like viability information to be sent through as soon as possible (05/09/12 has been agreed) and the project team must understand that the LPA will not be able to give a final view on financial obligations at the shadow S106 meeting.

Meeting ended at 11.25.



meeting notes



Attendees:

- Frances Wheat (FW) - Head of Development Management, LBC
- Jonathan Markwell (JM) - Senior Planning Officer, LBC
- Carolyn Whittaker (CW) - Housing and Affordable Housing, LBC
- Michael Hrycak (MH) - Senior Community Safety Officer, LBC
- Melissa Dillon (MD) - Head of Housing Regeneration, LBC
- Genny Fernandes (GF) - Business Opportunities Manager (Economic Development section), LBC
- Rachael Matthiae (RM) - EC Harris
- Julia Farr (JF) - Senior Development Management, Housing and Adult Social Care, LBC
- Stefan Mannewitz (SM) - Karakusevic Carson Architects
- Sarah Price (SP) - Quod
- Poppy Carmody-Morgan (PCM) - Quod
- Sarah Robbins - Bacton Low Rise TRA
- Julie Jackson - Bacton Low Rise TRA
- Simone Lewis - Bacton Low Rise TRA

Project: Q30150 Bacton Low Rise Regeneration

Meeting Title:	Location:	Date & Time:
Final Pre-application Meeting	London Borough of Camden	28 September 2012, 9.30am

Action

1. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss any significant outstanding issues, following the break-out meetings, and to identify any major issues before the project team starts to finalise the application documentation.

a) Community Safety

2. SP and SM outlined the project’s approach to community safety and, in particular, the approach to gating. It is felt by the project team that the most appropriate urban design solution in this case is to provide a clear separation of public and semi-private space by providing gating at the eastern entrance of the DHO site. This will help to ensure that those with access to the internal courtyard are residents of the scheme and should help to create a sense of community spirit. Users of the playspace will feel safer in the knowledge that other users are also residents, and will also feel more incentivised to take care of the space.

meeting notes

3. SP explained that gating of the shared space on the DHO site was only part of a wider approach to community safety and that the scheme had been designed with safety in mind. It was noted that the constrained nature of the site meant that natural surveillance from all sides could be difficult.
4. MH highlighted that there is never one solution to community safety and we are not able to predict future issues. There is the possibility that gating will increase territorial pressures and could exacerbate crime/anti-social problems. For example, the design feature could become flawed if one resident allows in the people the majority of tenants are trying to keep out.
5. FW would like to ensure the best design possible and advised the project team to justify their proposals where they do not meet policy guidance. MD noted that management issues will also need to be discussed.
6. It is therefore important to consider all measures i.e. CCTV, natural and passive surveillance, wardens. It was agreed that a meeting would be set up between the architects and the Crime Prevention Officer. SM

b) Design

7. It was confirmed that Edward Jarvis (the design officer) met with the KCA on 27/09/12. Elevations, depth of recesses, balconies, and pitched roofs were discussed. EJ was satisfied with the general approach to design. A further meeting with EJ to discuss colours, entrance doors, window frames is to be organised. SM to send any further design information to JM, once available. SM
8. FW highlighted that the quality of the building is very important. The planning application should be detailed to ensure that design quality stays with the development to the procurement/tender stage of the process.

c) Housing Mix

9. MD informed the group that this development is very important to Cabinet. It will set a benchmark for other developments.
10. JM requires the existing floorspace figures before he can comment on the proposed housing mix. FW would like to see floorspace figures split by number of bedrooms. SP to forward to JM. SM, SP
11. CW said that she was concerned about the number of 3 and 4 bed intermediate housing units proposed, given that Camden has no experience of any intermediate housing products over 2 bed. It will be important to see the uplift in intermediate floorspace as well. SP to amend schedule and re-circulate. SP



meeting notes

12. MD noted that there is a shared ownership waiting list and that there may be a market for these larger intermediate units. There will need to be further conversations within the Council to confirm this is the case. MD

13. Service charges of affordable units will also need to be discussed in due course, following planning.

14. JM was concerned that there will be a decrease in the number of proposed social rent 3 bed units. This may be of concern to Cabinet members therefore the housing needs survey which informed this unit mix decision must be made clear reference to in the planning application.

d) Height/Bulk/Massing

15. JM confirmed that he was largely satisfied with the height/bulk/massing of the development but reinforced that details are very important, especially on the corners of courtyards. SP confirmed that this detail will be shown in the Design and Access Statement.

16. FW noted the importance of outlook and daylight within blocks and for surrounding properties. RM to check whether reports regarding these issues have been received. RM

e) Employment

17. JM - Policy regarding employment is clear (i.e. direct floorspace re-provision on site) but it is understood that there needs to be some flexibility.

18. Project team are awaiting further information regarding Burmarsh Workshops (what improvements can be made/viability). When the information becomes available they are to pass on the information to JM. SP to co-ordinate. SP

19. Initial information indicates that it is possible to improve Burmarsh workshops by meeting some elements of category 2 but it will be difficult to get Burmarsh workshops fully to Category 2 specifications. This is due to site constraints and the high costs involved.

20. JM would like to see information showing the demand for these units and to see evidence of Vicars Road tenant consultation. JF confirmed that so far 4 Vicars Road tenants have supported a move to Burmarsh workshops or Queens Crescent. 4 tenants have agreed to take up site visits to these new locations. There has only been one tenant who has not responded to the consultation yet. Property Services are managing this at present.

21. SP asked if a monetary contribution rather than specific employment space would be acceptable. JM recommended that a site specific solution needs to be identified. The council is already being flexible and the existing employment space found at Vicars



meeting notes

Road is rare. Whatever choice is made there will need to be clear justification in the application. GF is to assist the project team with alternatives they could consider. GF

f) Waste

22. Mark Hunt and Tower Hamlets have organised a meeting for 19 October 2012 to demonstrate how a neighbouring council have used a new approach.

23. KCA require more information from Ann Baker to confirm that the waste strategy is appropriate in terms of volumes etc. KCA to send email to her asking for the information they require. Please also copy in JM. SM

24. It was confirmed that the application scheme would allow for both the traditional and new approach to waste collection.

g) Energy

25. Investigations are on-going into the cost and feasibility of using Cross-Laminated Timber (CLT). Two approaches will be outlined in the energy strategy. One for the use of CLT, one for traditional construction methods. It was proposed that there could be a condition to submit a detailed energy strategy at a later date. JM approved of this approach in principle.

26. The council were happy to take into consideration the carbon savings provided by using CLT in the overall energy strategy. In the application it will be important to make clear that this construction method is "future-proofing". It does not rely on clever management for it to succeed. The project team should provide examples of where it has worked before.

27. Council were satisfied with the CHP strategy.

h) Development Forum and Member Engagement

28. FW confirmed that the application will not be presented at another development forum. FW is sending over a PowerPoint presentation to Development Control Committee Members and giving them an opportunity to comment on it. FW

29. A drop in session and exhibition of drawings is being held 2 October to give members of the community an opportunity to see how their comments have been taken into account. MD to send flier to FW for distribution to DC Committee members. MD

30. FW would like the email addresses of people who attended events such as this to be sent through to JM. They can then be added to the consultation list and be notified when an application has been submitted. JF

i) Other Matters

31. The PPA is currently in draft form and with Legal Services. JM will send to SP. JM

meeting notes



32. The council has been in contact with BPS to obtain a quote for independently assessing the financial feasibility.
33. Stuart Minty to be copied in to all further correspondence as JM goes on paternity leave.

Meeting ended 11.30

3. BACTON LOW RISE

Background

3.1 The renewal of the Bacton Low Rise estate is an important early project within the Community Investment Programme and a resident led project based on the need for a radical option to address the poor condition, design faults and problems of energy inefficiency on the estate. The estate consists of 8 blocks of (mainly) 2 and 3 bedroom maisonettes accessed from a deck set above garages lining the street frontage and is vulnerable to crime and anti-social behaviour.

Investment Need

3.2 The blocks have flat roofs and homes on the upper level have large patios, both of which are prone to leak in wet weather. The properties at the ends of the blocks are particularly susceptible to damp and mould growth on the ceilings and walls and are the most expensive to heat. The scope of necessary repair work is significantly wider than most 'Better Homes' projects with unit costs per property in the region of £40-50,000 or approximately £5,000,000 overall.

3.3 The key issues on the estate are issues of poor energy efficiency, failing heating, water penetration, damp and condensation, and poor thermal and envelope performance requiring significant investment. Persistent anti-social behaviour is adversely affecting residents' quality of life. Residents expressed view is that another round of repair/refurbishment works would not resolve issues that they feel relate to the fundamental design and construction of the estate.

3.4 The Community Investment Programme report agreed by Cabinet in July 2011 included the opportunity to redevelop the Gospel Oak Housing Office (DHO) and the housing depot to the rear together with the adjacent HRA Vicars Road workshops and benefit from resources raised from the disposal of the site in Lawn Road to fund new affordable housing for the existing residents of Bacton Low Rise as a first phase of regeneration in Gospel Oak.

3.5 In December 2011 Cabinet members agreed a budget provision of £950,000 to develop the scheme and a local lettings policy in consultation with residents and that a further report would be brought to Cabinet to agree indicative design and tenure mix, funding arrangements, the submission of a detailed planning application and the contract award strategy.

Resident Consultation

3.6 The lead consultants EC Harris (project managers), KCA architects and Quod planning advisers have been in post since May. A series of consultation events have taken place during the latter half of May, June and July. Firstly with the Bacton Low Rise residents to ensure their satisfaction and support for the proposals and then a fun day, open house evenings for the wider community to see the plans, models and proposed materials.

3.7 The on-going design work has been presented 4 times to local residents over the past 3 months and all design work and material options were presented in

June 2012. Over 250 people attended a Fun Day (organised by the Tenants & Residents Association) for Bacton Low Rise residents, local residents from the wider area and businesses in the Gospel Oak Area.

3.8 A Development Management Forum organised by Camden planners was held on 23rd July for the wider community and stake holders to hear what is being proposed and to comment on the planning matters.

3.9 Comments gathered at these events have been very positive particularly by the Bacton Low Rise residents. Whilst many local residents have also shown enthusiasm for the project, a number of local residents have expressed concern about density, heights of buildings and matters associated with an increased population. These concerns will be addressed in the development of the detailed design and planning process.

Description of the development sites

3.10 Gospel Oak has been identified as an area of opportunity with a need for investment. The current project is the first phase of physical development and seen as one strand of future regeneration throughout the area.

3.11 The DHO site incorporates the Gospel Oak District Housing Office (DHO) and housing depot, 16 commercial workshops and 4 mature plane trees. The mainline railway to St Pancras runs along the northern edge and the vicarage and a small block of Housing Association flats, a Grade II Listed church hall and small privately owned Victorian house adjoin the site on the south west corner. On the opposite corner across Vicars Road is St Martins C of E Church that has a Grade I Listing and two Victorian villas.

3.12 Bacton Low Rise contains 99 family sized homes 87 of which are occupied by tenants and 12 by leaseholders. At the northern edge of the site is the 22 storey Bacton high rise block comprising 120 one bedroom and studio flats that will be upgraded to meet Better Homes standards. Wellesley Road lies to the south and Haverstock Road to the west of the estate.

Scheme outputs

3.13 The urban design and architectural approach responds to the key qualities the site currently possesses. Clearly evident on visiting are the townscape opportunities that the existing trees and listed church offer. The mature trees are a real asset and these are being retained where possible.

3.14 The urban design strategy reintroduces a street pattern into the area, connecting to the network of streets in the wider area such as Vicar's Road, Wellesley Road and Haverstock Road. The homes and buildings create clear street edges with street-based housing throughout the site that is reminiscent of the typical North London urban fabric.

3.15 The February 2011 housing needs survey carried out on the estate produced an exceptionally high response rate of 63% overcrowding was reported by 21% of respondents but a higher number (26%) were under occupying their homes. Subject to cabinet approval and planning permission the Local Lettings policy for the redevelopment project will re-house tenants who wish to move to new

homes according to their assessed bedroom need and in line with policy on under-occupation.

Existing and projected new homes and bed spaces

- 3.16 The estate currently provides 87 rented homes or 222 bed spaces with the remaining 12 homes on the estate occupied by leaseholders. At the current stage of design development it is expected that the three phases of the project will provide approximately 283 new homes increasing the number of rented bed spaces to 509 or 115 homes and additional 8 low cost home ownership units.
- 3.17 Funding for the redevelopment of the new homes, s.106 community benefits and new employment space will be provided by 160 smaller market sale units. The provisional new homes breakdown is set out in Tables 1 & 2 below:

Table 1. Provisional new homes breakdown by tenure

Bacton New Build	Social rented units	Low Cost Home Ownership units	Sale Units	Total
Phase 1	45	0	32	77
Phase 2	61	0	68	129
Phase 3	9	8	60	77
Totals	115	8	160	283

Table 2. Provisional New Homes Tenure mix: by bed and floor space

Bacton New Build	Affordable bed spaces	Sale bed spaces	Affordable bed spaces %	Sale bedspaces %	Affordable floor space %	Sale floor space %
Phase 1	192	89	68%	32%	67%	33%
Phase 2	243	262	48%	52%	46%	54%
Phase 3	74	228	25%	75%	22%	78%
Totals	509	579	47%	53%	45%	55%

Project Phasing and Re-housing of current residents

- 3.18 The proposed scheme seeks to replace the existing 99 homes in three phases of redevelopment. Phase 1 on the District Housing Office /Vicars Road site, providing 77 new homes in a mixture of houses, maisonettes and flats designed to rehouse 45 households from the Bacton Low Rise estate whose current homes are in the phase 2 area. Phase 1 would also include a block of apartments for sale to provide funding for the project as set out in paragraph 3.17.
- 3.19 Phase 2 of the project would be located on the south side of Bacton Low Rise estate consisting of a mews style development opposite St Martin's church and a courtyard block behind. This phase would provide new homes for the remaining 42 Bacton Low Rise households, 19 additional new council homes for rent, and 68 homes for sale to provide funding for the project. As has been the practice at Chester Balmore and Holly Lodge, leaseholders on the estate would have the opportunity to purchase new market sale or shared ownership homes

through a ring fenced marketing period before properties were placed on the open market.

- 3.20 The final phase 3 would be developed on a cleared site between phase 2 and the adjoining Bacton Tower and would include 250 square metres of employment space and 77 homes for mixed tenure. Wider strategic options are in development across Gospel Oak which could impact on the final mix of housing and employment space for this phase of development and some flexibility may be necessary to adapt to future regeneration needs in Gospel Oak.

The redevelopment will effectively extend Vicars Road between the phase 2 and 3 sites with St Martin's Church as a focus for sight lines from the existing streetscape and the new development with a village style clustering of homes with front doors on the street and trees lining the pavements. Each phase of new homes will have an enclosed landscaped court yard for residents which will support a variety of activities.

- 3.21 Subject to member approval, new homes will be built to high design standards and meet Lifetime Homes standard and with 10% designed to full wheelchair criteria and will all meet the London Mayor's requirements for space, outdoor amenity space, thermal performance, sustainability and renewable energy.

Local lettings

- 3.22 A Housing Needs Survey was undertaken with residents on the estate in 2011 indicated that 70% of Bacton Low Rise residents wished to remain in Gospel Oak. The proposed mix of housing on phases 1 and 2 of the project reflect the needs of the existing residents wishing to move into the new homes.

- 3.23 A local lettings policy has been drafted to ameliorate the concerns of the BLR tenants and members have supported the following principles:

- Existing Bacton Low rise tenants would have first priority for initial letting on new homes developed as part of the Bacton regeneration project via a direct let;
- Existing households will also have the option to move away and bid for properties elsewhere in the borough if they wish to do so, and will receive an award of additional points to enable bidding through the Choice Based Lettings system and be entitled to bid for a home of the size they require;
- Households currently under-occupying their accommodation will be entitled to bid for properties that would provide their bedroom need plus one bedroom;
- In accordance with the Council's Full Allocations Scheme where existing households are overcrowded they will be offered accommodation to suit their needs;
- Where households have adult children living at home and the tenant(s) wish to split their household, parents and adult children may be housed separately. The adult children may be entitled to regeneration points and to bid for properties through the Choice Based lettings scheme and to receive more than one offer/application subject to Exceptions Panel approval;

- As set out in the Estate Regeneration policy approved by Executive on 1st April 2009 the Council would buy back existing leasehold properties on the Bacton Low Rise estate at market value plus 10% where leaseholders are resident on the estate and where leaseholders are not resident on the estate at an additional 7.5%. Leaseholders' legal fees, removal and other associated costs would also be met by the Council. Existing leaseholders on the estate would also have the opportunity to buy new shared ownership or market sale homes in the Bacton re-development if they wished to do so.

Re-instatement of street pattern and public realm improvements

- 3.24** As part of the wider regeneration of Gospel Oak the scheme proposed for Bacton Low Rise re-instates part of the traditional street pattern and pedestrian and vehicle routes that were an important component of the urban fabric prior to the construction of the estate. The detailed design and planning application process will incorporate connection of the public realm and highways to achieve improvements in the public realm.

Employment Space & relocation of existing commercial tenants

- 3.25** The 16 workshops in Vicars Road occupy a total floor area of 731 m² and a variety of businesses ranging from joiners to freelance photographers to a sushi food supplier. Proposals for the relocation of existing businesses are set out below and will be informed by pre-application discussions with the Council's planning and economic development services and the study on local employment commissioned by the Gospel Oak Regeneration Team.

Renovation of Disused Commercial Space

- 3.26** The Council is able to offer local alternative business premises to the Vicars Road commercial tenants at Burmarsh Workshops in nearby Marsden Street, and in Queens Crescent. The commercial tenants will be invited to open days to see the alternative spaces available and will have the opportunity to negotiate repairs or rent free periods.
- 3.27** The Burmarsh Workshops have been out of commission since 2008 through disrepair and the link to the Bacton Low Rise project provides an opportunity to bring them back into beneficial use and preserve local businesses. A schedule of condition has been prepared and when restored the workshops will provide a total of 957 m² of employment space, 226 m² more than the total commercial floor space at Vicars Road.

New Employment Space – Bacton Phase 3 Project

- 3.28** An option under consideration is to provide a further 250 m² of employment floor space in the phase 3 of the Bacton project on the ground floor of the block facing the health centre and Gospel Oak nursery in Haverstock Road. The use class and occupation will reflect the findings of the local employment study and be compatible within the residential setting. Wider strategic options for other

parts of Gospel Oak could impact on the final use of phase 3 and some flexibility may be necessary to adapt to possible changing circumstances.

- 3.29** The local economic study will map local businesses and understand their needs and opportunities and how the local retail offer can be improved. The study will also look at the services for, and the needs of, the unemployed residents of Gospel Oak. This work is due to conclude in September, with wider discussion and recommendations in October 2012. As set out in paragraph 3.25 the local employment study will help to determine the final employment use content of the project and an allowance has been made in the project budget for the delivery of appropriate employment floor space.

Phase 1 – Engineering Studies

- 3.30** Phase 1 of the project will be bordered by the National Rail railway cutting and tests are being carried out to assess potential acoustic and vibration from the cutting and to incorporate any necessary mitigation into the design through orientation, increased thickness of external walls, triple glazing and acoustic screens.
- 3.31** Air quality testing for the areas adjacent to the rail tracks is being conducted and mechanical ventilation for homes in the Phase 1 development facing the railway is also being investigated as part of the design solution.
- 3.32** This approach will be refined once the acoustic results have been evaluated and discussions with Building Control/Environmental Health take place during scheme development.

DHO Closure

- 3.33** The Gospel Oak District Housing Office, the housing depot at the rear of the DHO and the Vicars Road commercial units should all be vacated during Q3 2012/13 and a demolition contract to clear the site will take place in early 2013.

Procurement Options appraisal

- 3.34** Three options, summarised below, have been tested against anticipated timescales of delivery routes, peak capital exposure, development risk on construction and sales and output requirements in terms of affordable housing and capital surplus.

Table 3. Procurement Options Appraisal

	Pros	Cons
Option 1 Council led development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The Council retains control of development ■ The Council retains total capital receipt from sales ■ No funding or JV set up time lag therefore no impact on proposed project timeline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The Council has to provide a funding facility of to cover forecast peak debt for Phase 1. ■ Phase 1 deficit to be carried forward through phase 2 development. ■ Council carries the development risk around construction and private sales.
Option 2 Joint venture i. Developer ii. Contractor iii. Investor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Provision of Equity and Debt Finance for development ■ Opportunity to share and mitigate the construction risk ■ Opportunity to share and mitigate the private sales risk ■ Benefit from specialist knowledge around development and private residential sales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Loss of control ■ Requirement to give away a significant amount of potential profit ■ Timescales to establish JV arrangement
Option 3 Disposal of private sale units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Provides a capital receipt at an early stage to enable funding of social housing element ■ Mitigates the risk associated with private sales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Loss of developer's profit on private sale element ■ Potential loss of control around construction timescales and quality

3.35 The Council-led development route is the recommended option through a develop and construct form of contract but with additional activity to test disposal options for private residential elements to offer potential reductions to the Council's exposure to private sales risk and cumulative capital outlay.

3.36 This option incorporates the design qualities and priorities that have been developed in close consultation with residents. High quality design will provide the best possible homes for tenants and residents of the new development and make a very positive contribution to the local streetscape and environment in Gospel Oak, providing a bench mark for later phase of the new development and other projects in the area.

Financial viability

3.37 The outline scheme reported to Cabinet in December 2011 provided 62% private 38% affordable housing floor space with a total estimated development cost of £63.729m and on completion of sales a capital surplus of £3m.

3.38 The current cost plan for project designs, currently at RIBA design stage B+ has a revised estimated development cost of £66.19m and a capital surplus of £1.85m on completion of sales. This allows for an increase in new Council homes, an increase in the number of large family units and an allowance for replacement of employment floor-space. Tables 4 & 5 below set out the key assumptions.

Table 4 Cash Flow and Cost by Project Phase

	Phase 1 £'000	Phase 2 £'000	Phase 3 £'000	Total £'000
Acquisition	2,000	2,000	500	4,500
Works Costs	12,955	23,595	14,215	50,765
On-Costs (exc interest)	2,505	4,287	4,133	10,925
Total Capital Expenditure	17,460	29,882	18,848	66,190
Grant Income	-	-	-	-
Sales receipts	11,380	29,624	27,036	68,040
Total Income	11,380	29,624	27,036	68,040
Net capital Expenditure	6,080	258	- 8,188	- 1,850

Table 5 Cash flow over Project Time line

	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000	2015/16 £'000	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000	Total £'000
Total Capital Expenditure	852	9,161	15,544	22,469	10,805	7,358	0	66,190
Total capital Income	0	0	6,828	4,552	29,624	13,518	13,518	68,040
Net Capital Expenditure	852	9,161	8,716	17,917	-18,819	-6,160	-13,518	- 1,850

3.39 The scheme is based on the current stage of design and applies a stage B cost plan using comparable London schemes to benchmark rates. The construction cost estimates will be refined as the scheme progresses to final detailed design. There are allowances made for the cost of replacement employment floor space and contributions to community infrastructure and public realm improvements which will be refined as the project progresses through the planning process. Construction costs have been adjusted to apply indexation across the delivery periods with a 5% construction contingency and sales values are based on the lower end forecast provided by Savills of £475 per square foot.

3.40 It should be noted that the effect of short term interest on the cash flow through the development period of 1% during phase 1 rising to 2% on later phases is approximately £1.3m reducing the estimated net surplus to the council to £550k.

EIA summary

3.41 An Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) was carried out in conjunction with the decision to proceed with a preferred redevelopment option. This has been reviewed and updated to reflect the projects current design stage and is attached at appendix D. The EIA identified the requirement for a local lettings policy which has been prepared as set out in paragraphs 3.32-3.24. The EIA indicates that no groups have been or will be disproportionately disadvantaged

by the implementation of this project, during the construction process measures will be put in place to minimise disturbance to local residents during the construction period.

Risk Mitigation

- 3.42** The initial instruction for the lead consultant team and subsequent design development has been produced in recognition of the need to minimise the demand on the Council's resources and to ensure that the project is financially viable. The project limits peak capital exposure through the inclusion of housing for market in each phase of development and the options set out below with separation of private accommodation by area and block. There are options to dispose of a single sale block in Phase 1, producing projected capital receipts of £3.6 million and a further market sale block in Phase 2 projected to produce a capital receipt of £10 million.
- 3.43** Further work is being undertaken to test options to reduce peak capital debt and to ensure that the Council's exposure to the residential sales market is properly weighted against the objective of optimising capital receipts across a representative selection of CIP projects. The development of this approach will enable the council to actively manage sales risk exposure across the phased delivery of the development period.
- 3.44** Timely closure of the District Housing Office is essential to keep to the anticipated programme of commencing work on the first phase of Bacton new build in spring 2013.

Recommendation

- 3.45** The Council-led development route is the recommended option through a develop and construct form of contract. There would also be additional activity to test disposal options for market sale units to offer potential reductions to the Council's exposure to private sales risk and cumulative capital outlay.
- 3.46** It is recommended that, should Cabinet approve the regeneration strategy contained within this report, a number of decisions required in the delivery of this project be delegated to officers in line with the scheme of delegation approved by Cabinet in the 18th July 2012 Community Investment Programme report. The specific delegations for the Bacton Low Rise project are those relating to:
- a) Acquisition and disposal of property;
 - b) Obtaining vacant possession of commercial and other non-residential property;
 - c) Agreeing contract award strategies and contract awards;
 - d) The making of compulsory purchase orders;
 - e) The issuing of demolition notices;
 - f) The appropriation of Council held land under the relevant statutory powers to enable implementation of the scheme.

Decisions sought: That the Cabinet:

1. Agrees the regeneration strategy for the Bacton Low rise estate as set out in this report and that the project be implemented in accordance with the specific delegations approved as part of the July 2012 CIP Cabinet report, which are set out in Appendix E to this report.
2. Delegates to the Director of Finance the option to undertake prudential borrowing to support the capital funding requirements of the scheme if required.



meeting notes



Attendees:

- Adam Lindsay – Crime Prevention Design Advisor, Holborn Police Station (AL)
- Stefan Mannewitz – Karakusevic Carson Architects (SM)
- Caroline Hull – Karakusevic Carson Architects (CH)
- Rachel Godfrey – Quod (RG)

Project: Q30150 Bacton Low Rise Estate Regeneration

Meeting Title: Crime Prevention and Secured by Design Meeting
Location: KCA Offices
Date & Time: 3 October 2012, 14:00

Action

1. SM and CH presented the proposed scheme for the Bacton Low Rise (BLR) site and the District Housing Office (DHO) site.
2. AL commented on the proposals and it was agreed that the following amendments would be made to the proposed scheme by SM and CH:
 - AL said that a gating solution to the eastern access to the DHO site was preferential to a cul-de-sac solution, but either option could be made workable. If gating is to be used, the gate should be a minimum of 2.5m high.
 - The siting and height of the gate will be applied for in the full planning application, however, it is likely that the detailed design of the gate will be secured by condition. It was agreed that design principles incorporating the following points would be incorporated into the Crime Impact Assessment part of the Design and Access Statement to guide the eventual design:
 - The gate should be design to avoid the potential for people to climb over it.
 - The design should prevent people from gaining a foot-hold on the fence.
 - The lock should be integrated into the design to avoid this feature being a foot-hold.
 - Further guidance is set out on the Secured by Design website and should be considered.
 - The DHO site should have one access point, and therefore the proposed western access should be closed. The other potential access points around the DHO site should be secured. Solutions for each instance around the DHO site were agreed in principle and marked on a plan. The crime and anti-social behaviour problems

meeting notes

found on older housing estates are exacerbated by multiple entrance/exit points to sites and this should be avoided on new housing developments.

- The ‘dead space’ in the north-west and north-east corners of the DHO site is to be amended to create usable space for adjacent residential units.
- The entrance to the westernmost property in Block B should be amended to preserve line of sight to the eastern entrance of the DHO site.
- The two terraced houses to Vicar’s Road are to have 1800mm railings above the low wall, and the railings are to be flush with the wall to prevent a foot-hold being created.
- The access to the railway on the DHO site needs to be revised to ensure it is not an informal escape route for intruders to exit the development.
- The bin store and plant room layout on the DHO site needs to be revised to ensure it meets with Secured by Design standards in terms of access by residents and servicing personnel and in terms of self-closing doors.
- The Block C private residential entrances to Vicar’s Road need to be amended to remove the potential for persons to conceal themselves and preserve line of site down Vicar’s Road.
- The double height recesses on the BLR site are to be designed to a maximum of 600mm depth. A solution that meets both Secured by Design standards (minimising recesses) and Lifetime Homes standards (providing covered entrances) is to have a 600mm recesses and a canopy projecting from the building face. There may be alternatives to achieving this standard i.e. by providing the recess at such a width that the potential for concealment are negligible. Any such proposed alternatives can be sent to AL who will consider them and provide a response.
- The unit on the BLR site facing St Martin’s Church with the open patio is to be revised to provide this space as a winter garden/glazed internal space. Such spaces function as recesses, disrupt line of site along the street and therefore should be avoided. Units on the BLR site with similar spaces should be amended accordingly. Such units were marked on a plan.
- Consideration should be given to reducing the size of some of the bike stores on the BLR site (i.e. by splitting them in half so one side is accessed from the street, and the other from the internal courtyard) to reduce the number of people that have access to each store.
- It was agreed that the number of residential units per core, and the number of residential units per core, per floor is acceptable.



meeting notes

- The design of the post-boxes needs to be amended. If they are to be provided externally, then slide boxes should be used (or a similar solution), or they should be provided inside the building.
 - A variety of Secured by Design Section 2 'target-hardening' physical security measures, applying to the BLR and DHO sites, were discussed and agreed. In each case, the proposed solution is as recommended in the Secured by Design guidance.
 - In particular, it was agreed that a ring of specialist security doors should be provided around all communal or residential entrances on the perimeter blocks on the BLR site. It was agreed that fire safety standards and access to the building by fire services personnel should also be provided.
 - With regards to CCTV, there is no formal requirement for its use. The team should consider whether, on the basis of monitoring arrangements, management and maintenance, whether a system was likely to be effective, and therefore whether it is therefore needed.
 - Proposals for external lighting to the British Standard were discussed and agreed.
 - The design of the public open space was discussed. The benches should be of a easy install/easy remove design. They should be functional, yet designed so as to discourage long stays (i.e. to prevent the area being used by street drinkers). Trees can be part of the design; however, care should be taken so that they do not compromise visibility along the street.
3. It was agreed that if there were any queries about the proposed adoption of crime prevention/Secured by Design measures, SM and CH should send them to AL who would review and comment on an appropriate solution.
 4. AL said that he would be providing comments on the planning application as part of the formal consultation process.



meeting notes