



# Camden Lock Village

Statement of Community Involvement  
prepared by London Communications  
Agency

London Communications Agency

# Contents

1.	Introduction .....	3
2.	Executive Summary .....	4
3.	Consultation strategy .....	7
4.	Meetings with the Hawley Wharf Working Group .....	9
5.	Meetings with other community groups.....	20
6.	Development Management Forum – 30 May 2012.....	24
7.	Development Control Committee briefings - 8 May and 2 July 2012 .....	24
8.	Meetings with statutory consultees .....	25
9.	Post-submission engagement.....	27
10.	Conclusion.....	28
APPENDICES .....		29
Appendix 1: Letter from the Applicant to Local Community Groups .....		29
Appendix 2: Letter from Regent’s Canal Conservation Area Advisory Committee .....		30
Appendix 3: Development Management Forum – 30 May 2012 – Publicity.....		34
Appendix 4: Development Management Forum – 30 May 2012 – Minutes .....		38
Appendix 5: Briefings to Development Control Committee - 8 May 2012 and 2 July 2012..		48

## **1. Introduction**

This Statement of Community Involvement has been prepared by London Communications Agency with Gerald Eve and forms part of the suite of planning documents, submitted in September 2012, that support a revised application brought forward by Stanley Sidings Limited (The Applicant). The application addresses the reasons for refusal of the previous application for the redevelopment of Camden Lock Village (Hawley Wharf).

The SCI sets out the programme of community engagement which has taken place since April 2012 and shows how this has influenced the revised proposals for Camden Lock Village.

The SCI is in accordance with the London Borough of Camden's Statement of Community Involvement guidance (July 2011) on undertaking pre-submission public consultation on planning applications.

The SCI also reflects the principles for consultation in the Localism Act - the Applicant has consulted local communities before submitting the planning application, having had regard to advice from Camden. The Applicant has considered the responses received and explained how they have been taken into account.

## 2. Executive Summary

- Following the London Borough of Camden's decision not to grant planning permission for Camden Lock Village at a meeting of the Development Control Committee on 15 March, London Communications Agency (LCA) was retained by Stanley Sidings Ltd (the Applicant) to advise on a new community engagement programme for the revised scheme.  
(section 3)
- LCA, along with planning consultants Gerald Eve, reviewed both the decision of the Development Control committee and the previous consultation programme, and then developed a consultation strategy for the revised scheme which was approved by the Applicant in April 2012.  
(section 3)
- The strategy approved was focussed on trying to gain as much consensus as possible with the Hawley Wharf Working Group (HWWG) on a revised scheme prepared by new architects Allford Hall Monaghan Morris (AHMM) that responded to the three key reasons for refusal before consulting with local community groups and statutory organisations. LCA also met with local ward councillors Pat Callaghan and Chris Naylor, co-chairs of the HWWG very early in the process (27 April 2012) to discuss the broad approach to this strategy.  
(section 3)
- The wider consultation strategy was to then offer meetings for local groups with the Applicant and the architect on the broad principle of "any time, any place, anywhere". It became apparent through this process that there were a number of local groups who had different, and more positive, views on the proposals to those of the HWWG. (section 3)
- The Applicant committed to presenting, listening and responding through a workshop and meeting-led approach was structured around a series of models and a PowerPoint presentation by the architects, AHMM, which was updated almost daily through the new design process, and discussed at each meeting. (section 3)
- Between May and the end of August 2012, no fewer than nine meetings were held with the HWWG in various formats. These are detailed in the following sections in date order and on each occasions were one of three types of meeting, namely:
  - With the HWWG
  - With representatives of the HWWG
  - With the HWWG and Camden officers
- As a result of this focussed and collaborative engagement with the HWWG, the Applicant has refined the proposals with the HWWG's comments having had a significant influence over the scheme's design. The Applicant has reached an agreement with the HWWG over many elements and also believes that this has led to an improvement in the proposals.  
(section 4 and tables 1 and 2)
- Separate to HWWG, a total of 20 groups were written to in June 2012 offering a meeting. The Applicant subsequently held a total of eight meetings between June and August with local groups/residents where the new proposals were presented and discussed. These meetings were very positive with strong support for the principles

of the new development and the desire to see the Hawley Wharf site regenerated (section 5)

- In addition there was a Development Management Forum held on 30 May 2012, arranged by the London Borough of Camden. This was publicised in advance by both Camden and the Applicant with personal letters to all those who had previously attended Camden Lock Village exhibitions and events. The Forum was attended by more than 100 local people who viewed a presentation from the newly appointed architects and were able to ask questions of the Applicant and the consultant team. (section 6)
- Consultation with the London Borough of Camden, apart from regular dialogue with officers, was organised through two presentations to members of the Development Control Committee. The first was on 8 May 2012 and the second on 2 July 2012. (section 7)
- The Applicant also consulted the following statutory consultees.
  - Greater London Authority
  - Design Council/ CABE
  - English Heritage
  - The Canals & Rivers Trust (formerly British Waterways)
  - Metropolitan Police
  - High Speed 2/Network Rail(section 8)
- The Applicant is committed to continuing its engagement with local communities following the application submission and will be undertaking the following over the next few months;
  - Producing a newsletter outlining the new scheme, to be distributed to homes and offices across the local area in early September
  - Holding an exhibition in late September providing final details of the scheme, to support and enhance the borough's statutory consultation process
  - Promoting the information on the website [www.camdenlockvillage.com](http://www.camdenlockvillage.com) and through the local media
  - Encouraging attendees at the exhibition or visitors to the website to pass comments direct to the case officer to inform the officers' report for the committee meeting at which the revised application will be considered.(section 9)
- The Applicant will continue to consult with the local community should the scheme be granted consent. This will include the formation of a community liaison group, which will include representatives from all local groups, to act as a forum for discussion of any issues pertaining to the development.
- The detail set out in this SCI summarises nearly five months of community engagement on the Camden Lock Village proposals since the refusal on the previous scheme (which itself was subject to nearly two years of consultation) and clearly demonstrates the significant effort made by the Applicant, and its advisers, to consult widely, deeply and effectively. This has greatly assisted with the development of the new proposals and the Applicant believes that it has reached a consensus with the HWWG on the principles and key elements of the scheme.

- Furthermore, the Applicant has engaged with a number of other local community groups, many of which were set up after the refusal of the previous proposals in March 2012 and support the principle of regenerating a site which they see as currently poor quality, underutilised or unsafe. Representatives of these groups were very positive about the new proposals and said that they would like to see the development of the Hawley Wharf site brought forward.

### 3. Consultation strategy

The consultation strategy for the revised proposals for Hawley Wharf was prepared by LCA, along with planning consultants Gerald Eve, and considered both the decision of the Development Control Committee on 15 March 2012 and the previous consultation programme. The strategy for the revised scheme was then approved by the Applicant in April 2012.

This strategy built on the previous three years of engagement with the local community on the original proposals. Throughout this time, the Applicant had made a number of changes and improvements in response to feedback from local residents, businesses and other stakeholders. These included a reduction in the height and mass of the buildings, the introduction of additional public open spaces and a new design approach.

In preparing a revised application, the Applicant remained committed to delivering a scheme that would meet the needs and aspirations of people living and working in the area, whilst being commercially viable and responding to the three key reasons for the refusal of the previous scheme;

- The design and detail of the Area A market building
- The impact of the height, form, bulk and massing of the buildings in Area C
- The size of the open spaces

The core focus for the early stages of consultation on the new scheme was on seeking to gain as much consensus as possible with the Hawley Wharf Working Group (HWWG) which was originally set up by the London Borough of Camden to help facilitate engagement between the Applicant and local people. The HWWG states that it includes representatives from many of the local resident and amenity groups in the area.

This focus on the HWWG also reflected the feedback from the London Borough of Camden during and after the 15 March 2012 committee meeting where the importance of engaging with the HWWG, listening to and responding to their concerns and achieving local support was made clear. The strategy was also discussed with local ward councillors Pat Callaghan and Chris Naylor, co-chairs of the HWWG, on 27 April 2012.

This meeting-led approach was structured around a series of models and PowerPoint presentations by the architects, AHMM, which were updated throughout the new design process, and discussed at each meeting.

Alongside this engagement with the HWWG, the wider consultation strategy was to offer meetings for other local groups with the Applicant and scheme architects AHMM on the broad principle of “anytime, anyplace, anywhere” as well as liaising with the London Borough of Camden to ensure that members of the Development Control Committee could review the proposals as they were being developed. The Applicant also assisted Camden in facilitating a Development Management Forum to give an opportunity for local residents to see the emerging plans and ask any questions of the Applicant, consultant team and planning officers throughout the process.

Given this meeting-led approach the new proposals were purposefully not promoted widely through the local media apart from publicising the Development Management Forum on 30 May. This was to minimise debate and speculation through the media and ensure that all engagement between the Applicant and local groups was conducted directly through meetings and written correspondence. This was reflected in the HWWG who also chose not to publicise their views on the new proposals in the local media.

Finally, the Applicant committed to engaging with all the key statutory organisations who have retained an interest in the proposals on heritage or/and design matters.



#### **4. Meetings with the Hawley Wharf Working Group**

The HWWG was specifically set up in 2009 to facilitate engagement between the Applicant and local residents on the proposals for the Camden Lock Village site. The Applicant engaged regularly with the HWWG throughout 2009, 2010 and 2011 on the previous proposals for the site however the group objected to the application. A local resident representative of HWWG and HWWG co-chairs and local ward members Cllr Chris Naylor and Cllr Pat Callaghan spoke against the proposals at the London Borough of Camden's Development Control Committee meeting on 15 March 2012 where the proposals were refused.

As set out in section three, as part of the new proposals for the site, the Applicant committed to meeting the HWWG regularly to inform them of the development of the new scheme, listen to their views and where possible incorporate their feedback into the proposals.

Between May and the end of August, 2012, the Applicant met with the HWWG on nine occasions in various formats. These were key to informing and refining the new proposals and hearing the views of members of the HWWG. The group also used the meetings to raise current local issues and potential concerns for the team to consider as the proposals were developed.

These meetings are set out below under each format of meeting, namely:

- With the HWWG sub-group (five)
- With the full HWWG (two)
- With the HWWG and Camden officers (two)

##### Meetings/workshops with the HWWG Sub-Group

The HWWG sub-group had been formed so that there could be regular engagement and dialogue between the Applicant and the HWWG. These often took the form of workshops where the architects (AHMM) presented the latest iteration of the scheme and sought feedback from HWWG members.

These meetings/workshops with the sub-group were held on the following dates.

- 14 May 2012
- 14 June 2012
- 20 June 2012
- 27 June 2012
- 1 August 2012

Generally in attendance at these meetings were:

- Heather Blockey, HWWG
- Peter Clapp, HWWG
- Peter Darley, HWWG
- Will Fullford, HWWG
- Paul Whitley, HWWG
- Mark Alper, Stanley Sidings Ltd (Applicant)
- Arin O'Aivazian, Stanley Sidings Ltd (Applicant)
- Yair Ginor, Chelsfield (Applicant)
- Will Lee, AHMM (Architects)
- Matthew Murphy, AHMM (Architects)

- Lisa Webb, Gerald Eve (Planning consultants)
- Natalie Davies, Gerald Eve (Planning consultants)

### Presentations to the full HWWG

The Applicant also met and presented to the full HWWG on 17 May and 5 July 2012. The 17 May meeting was chaired by Councillor Chris Naylor and the 5 July meeting was chaired by Councillor Pat Callaghan. Both meetings were attended by around 20 local residents on each occasion.

At the 17 May 2012 meeting the new architects (AHMM) were introduced to the group and lead architect Simon Allford gave a presentation that reviewed the previous refused scheme and the HWWG alternative scheme. He then presented some emerging ideas for a new development proposal comparing these with the previous scheme and the HWWG scheme. As this was a first presentation from AHMM there was only a very limited discussion on the proposals but it was noted that the Applicant would continue to engage with the HWWG in advance of the application submission.

The second session on 5 July 2012 included an updated presentation from Simon Allford who explained that the ideas presented at the last session had now been developed into emerging proposals. He reiterated that AHMM had looked closely at the reasons for refusal before noting the key elements of the new proposals such as an increase in the Local Space of 50%, the opening up of the arches and the widening of the viaduct routes. He also explained that AHMM were looking at options for the archway, noted the night time closures on certain routes and presented visuals explaining the design concept for buildings C1, C2, W and D. He also noted that AHMM were looking at materials for Building A and how a timber frame might be appropriate given the style of nearby buildings and the canal heritage.

### Meetings with HWWG Sub-Group and London Borough of Camden officers

Two meetings took place between the Applicant, the HWWG and representatives from the London Borough of Camden on the 12 and 18 July 2012.

In attendance at these meetings were:

- Heather Blockey, HWWG
- Peter Darley, HWWG
- Will Fullford, HWWG
- Peter Clapp, HWWG
- Paul Whitley, HWWG
  
- Mark Alper, Stanley Sidings Ltd (Applicant)
- Arin O'Aivazian, Stanley Sidings Ltd (Applicant)
- Yair Ginor, Chelsfield (Applicant)
- Will Lee, AHMM (Architects)
- Matthew Murphy, AHMM (Architects)
- Lisa Webb, Gerald Eve (Planning consultants)
- Natalie Davies, Gerald Eve (Planning consultants)
  
- Edward Jarvis, London Borough of Camden
- Conor McDonagh, London Borough of Camden
- Richard Wilson, London Borough of Camden

These meetings gave the applicant and the HWWG the chance to discuss the proposals in the presence of representatives from the London Borough of Camden. Key points covered included:

- General Masterplan
- Canal buildings
- Building C1
- Building C2
- Building W
- Arches space
- Canal space
- Local space and open space
- School
- Site management
- Access

### Conclusion

The Applicant committed to a genuine dialogue with the HWWG from the start of the engagement process in April 2012 with regular meetings and opportunities for HWWG members to review and comment on the new proposals whilst they were being developed.

A positive and collaborative working relationship was formed as a result and the Applicant has been very grateful for the group's time and commitment over the past five months. The output of this engagement has had a significant influence over the scheme's design and has led to a better project all around.

A significant number of changes were made to the scheme as a result of the meetings with the HWWG.

It is the Applicant's understanding that, overall, the HWWG has indicated that the new proposals address all their major points and issues and there are only some details remaining that require further presentation and discussion. The key design changes which have been agreed by the HWWG can be summarised as follows:

- Increase in the width of routes adjacent to the viaduct
- Increase in open space across the site
- Changes to the architecture of the market buildings to reflect the industrial heritage of the area
- Introduction of Class B office/workshops within the market retail building
- Separation of the market buildings from the tow path through a solid base at canal level
- Removal of the direct ramp and stair link from Chalk Farm Bridge onto the canal towpath
- Increase in the Arches space to enable 5 of the existing viaduct arches to be viewed and celebrated

- Introduction of a range of land uses surrounding the local space in Area C to activate the space
- Introduction of covered local retail in building C2 and a connection through to the mews along the northern viaduct at the back increase of local open space by 50%
- Reduction in the height and bulk of buildings C1 and C2
- The connection via the skewed arch between Area A and Area C.

To help track all the key elements of the new proposals and issues of interest, both the Applicant and the HWWG prepared aide-memoires that were shared and discussed between the two parties both at the regular meetings and on email.

The Applicant produced a schedule of design changes from the previous application and kept a track of the current status of these in regards to whether they had been agreed on with the HWWG. The latest version of this document is shown below as Table 1 and clearly demonstrates that a lot of the principle changes have been agreed with the HWWG.

The HWWG produced a 'State of Play' document in August 2012 (shown on page 14 as Table 2) to inform the Applicant the position of the group on aspects of the new proposals. Whilst this document does not show all the elements of the new scheme where an agreement had been reached between the Applicant and the HWWG, it has been helpful for the Applicant in showing matters that still need to be resolved or addressed or where discussion is continuing. These are shown in the right hand column and detail specific issues which – if resolved – will satisfy the concern of the group described in more general terms in the left and centre columns.

The Applicant will continue to engage with the HWWG throughout the post-submission period and beyond to discuss those areas where the group still has concerns. The Applicant feels that all of these can be addressed in the development of the detailed designs for the scheme and the comprehensive management strategy for the site. Where the Applicant is unable to reach a complete agreement or compromise with the group, they will ensure that their reasoning is clear and understandable.

**Table 1: Schedule of Design Changes – August 2012**

The below table was produced by the Applicant and updated regularly over July and August to track the key design changes compared with the previous scheme and show the status of agreement on the changes with the HWWG.

<b>Location</b>	<b>Design Change</b>	<b>Status of agreement with HWWG</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Canal buildings	separation from the tow path through a solid base at canal level	Agreed	
Canal buildings	2nd floor changed use from market retail to workshops	Agreed	
Canal buildings	changed architecture to respond to canal heritage	Agreed	
Canal buildings	upper floors – use of open screens	Agreed	
Canal buildings	use of timber screens	Agreed in principle subject to detailed design	
Canal buildings	architecture changed to separate the 2 blocks	Agreed in principle subject to detailed design	
Canal buildings	industrial style exposed bridges and circulation	Agreed in principle subject to detailed design	
Canal buildings	removal of direct ramp and stair link from Chalk Farm Bridge to	Agreed	

<b>Location</b>	<b>Design Change</b>	<b>Status of agreement with HWWG</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	canal		
Building C1	height reduced by 1 floor	Agreed	
Building C1	depth reduced	Agreed	
Building C1	architecture changed to respond to vertical rhythm of terrace	Agreed	
Building C1	local retail on ground floor	Agreed	
Building C2	base mass reduced by 1 floor	Agreed	
Building C2	height of western mass reduced by 2 floors	Agreed	
Building C2	residential blocks re-orientated	Agreed	
Building C2	new architectural approach	Agreed	
Building W	height as seen from Jeffrey St	Not in agreement by some of the HWWG	Following discussion with Camden Council, the proposed heights will remain the same as those shown to date
Building D	height and bulk of building D	Agreed in principle subject to further design	HWWG requested further information on elevations and bay studies

<b>Location</b>	<b>Design Change</b>	<b>Status of agreement with HWWG</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Masterplan	increase in width of routes along the viaduct	Agreed	
Masterplan	night time routes	Agreed	Met Police has requested further information once the application is submitted
Arches space	increased in size by 100% by decreasing the building lines in Area A and D to reveal 5 arches	Agreed	
Arches space	introduce active uses on the northern arches space	Agreed	
Canal space	<p>reconfiguration to focus inwards:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· physical boundary introduced between the space and the towpath, to filter connectivity and views between levels;</li> <li>· narrow frontage to canal;</li> <li>· emphasis on route to rear</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed in principle</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	HWWG to formally confirm views on the detail of the boundary treatment.
Local space	increased in size by 50%	Agreed	
Ground floor site C	<p>flexibility of space to accommodate:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· up to 50 borough market type stalls</li> <li>· playspace</li> <li>· operation of</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed that this would form part of the S106 agreement and a liaison group would be party to the operation of the market</p>	Agreed to introduce active uses around the public spaces, to include local retail as an option in C2, to introduce a gallery (that could revert back to A1 or B1) and to open up a connection

<b>Location</b>	<b>Design Change</b>	<b>Status of agreement with HWWG</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	weekdays/weekend produce market		between the local space and the mews along the Northern viaduct through the local retail in C2
Skewed arch	design within skewed arch to manage movement between market and local space	Agreed in principle. Details to be agreed in discussion post planning	
School	plans developed with school in response to brief	Agreed	
Hawley Road	retention of villas	Not in agreement by some of the HWWG	AHMM has provided explanation and rationale and the current proposal for Area B remains
General	public toilets open to 1 hour after operation	Agreed	S106 package to include sum for pop up toilets near Stables Market
Management	strategy for litter	Details required	Management strategy to be provided in S106
Noise	acoustic design to restaurants in canal buildings to meet noise conditions	Agreed	This will be conditioned and details will be provided prior to implementation



<b>Location</b>	<b>Design Change</b>	<b>Status of agreement with HWWG</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Open space strategy for residents and dog walkers		Outstanding	The scheme provides more open space than the previous scheme. Further, each unit has their own private amenity space

**Table 2: State of Play document – As at 8 August 2012**

The table below was produced by HWWG in August to help show the Applicant the position of the group on the key elements of the new proposals. The issues listed in right hand column detail specific issues which – if resolved – will satisfy the concern of the group described in more general terms in the left and centre columns

*‘Significant and welcome changes to the refused scheme have been made, reflecting a much more genuine engagement between HWWG and the developer. The emerging proposals have the potential to meet all HWWG major objectives. However, there are detailed design matters still to be resolved or addressed on which discussion is continuing or on which HWWG awaits further information from the developer. These are summarised below. The terms of an acceptable S106 agreement are still to be agreed. (Note: Items in italics represent issues outside the reasons for refusal)’*

	<b>What works for HWWG</b>	<b>What remains of concern</b>	<b>What is yet to be addressed</b>
<b>Overall scheme</b>	More generous open spaces	Lack of open space for residents will impact neighbouring open spaces incl. Canal, CCC, Clarence Way and Camden Gardens	Dog ownership and issues for S106. See also below.
	Improved E-W routes and reduction in N-S routes	Name "Camden Lock Village" confuses and does not respect heritage and grounds for refusal	Work with community to find names linked to local history, eg Fleet River, Hawley Wharf
	Better filtering between Market and Mixed Use areas through skewed arch		More details of filter in skewed arch (to be secured by planning condition)
<b>Site A - Market</b>	Moving main E-W routes from along canal to along viaduct, and creating internal E-W route	Tranquillity of canal towpath as affected by quantity of visitors and litter produced	Constraints on fast food (A5) outlets at ground level. Litter management strategy
	Plan limits space between buildings and extends space on east end to expose arches		

	Changes to canal façade from giant arches to respect industrial heritage	Noise impact of restaurants on upper level	Planning conditions that address noise and other impacts and contain them within acceptable limits
<b>Site C - Mixed use</b>	Community Space and surrounding areas to provide food-based warehouse storage/production/retail	Mix of uses within and surrounding Community Space to create vital, useful and viable retail space - this is now agreed.	Further detail to be provided, if necessary after submission. Height of opening in C2 to view northern arches to be addressed in detailed design stage as part of a planning condition.
	Increased size of Community Space; links with Castlehaven Road and northern viaduct; widening of E-W route; workshops on south side of building C2	Quality, shape and interconnectivity of open spaces and circular "Retail Route" around building C2. Blank façade created by bricked up arches along southern viaduct	More detail required of ground floor elevations of building C2 to harmonise with Retail Route. Details of animation of arches.
	Mass of building C2		Details of elevations of building C2
	Height, shape, mass and design of building C1 facing Castlehaven Road		
<b>Site D</b>	Widening of east-west route; mix of uses; general approach to massing	<i>Height of building</i>	Elevational Treatment
<b>Site B - School and Residential</b>	<i>Developer's justification for removing Hawley Road villas</i>	<i>Façade of buildings along Hawley Road</i>	
		<i>Access to nursery school and impact of school on road safety</i>	<i>Details of mitigation measures</i>

## 5. Meetings with other community groups

The Applicant sent letters or emails to the following groups during June and July, requesting a meeting with them to present the emerging new proposals for the site. The letter can be seen in Appendix 1.

- Action Camden
- Better Arts Group
- Camden Civic Society
- Camden Education Support Group
- Camden Town Speaks Residents' Association
- Camden Town Unlimited
- Camden Village Support Group
- Harmood, Clarence and Hartland Residents' Association
- Hawley New Era
- Hawley Road and Castlehaven Support Group
- Hawley Wharf Action Group
- Hawley Wharf Regeneration Support Group
- Jeffrey Street Conservation Area Advisory Committee
- Local Residents for Change Group
- Neighbourhood Development Group
- Parents Against Crime
- Regent's Canal Conservation Area Advisory Committee
- Safer Street Community Association
- Scar Studios
- Tiptree Barling and Havering Tenants' and Residents' Association

As a result of these letters and emails, the following meetings were arranged.

### Regent's Canal Conservation Area Advisory Committee (RCCAAC)

The Applicant met with the RCCAAC on 26 June. Attendees were:

- Mark Alper, Stanley Sidings Ltd (Applicant)
- Arin O'Aivazian, Stanley Sidings Ltd (Applicant)
- Natalie Davies, Gerald Eve (Planning consultant)
- Will Lee, AHMM (Architects)
- Peter Darley, RCACAAC
- Anthony Richardson, RCACAAC
- Del Brenner, RCACAAC

A number of key issues were discussed, including:

- Improvements to water front elevation on Site A
- Views of the viaduct arches in the open space fronting the towpath
- Public space on Site C
- Numbers 1-11 Chalk Farm Road
- Possible widening of pavements on Chalk Farm Road
- Towpath separation
- Height of Site A building
- Numbers 2-17 Hawley Road
- Design of Site B

A letter from the RCCAAC setting out the committee's position on the new proposals is shown in Appendix 2.

### Camden Town Unlimited

The Applicant met with representatives of Camden Town Unlimited on 17 July 2012.

- Mark Alper, Stanley Sidings Ltd (Applicant)
- Will Lee, AHMM (Architects)
- Simon Pitkeathley, Chief Executive, Camden Town Unlimited
- Members of the Environment Steering Group of Camden Town Unlimited

A number of key points were discussed, focussing mainly on confirming and clarifying the likely Section 106 conditions on SME and incubation space and whether this was in line with the previous proposals. CTU also expressed an interest in the employment space and the type of market on site A.

CTU are discussing the proposals further internally and confirmed they would be sending a letter to the Applicant in due course setting out their position and any comments on the proposals.

### Meetings with other local community groups - 20 July, 30 July, 13 August, 14 August

The Applicant met with representatives from a number of other local groups over four dates in July and August. The Applicant was informed at these meetings that many of these groups were set up in response to the decision by the London Borough of Camden to refuse the previous proposals and that they supported the principle of regenerating site which they viewed as poor quality, underutilised or unsafe. They indicated that the HWWG did not speak for all of the local communities around the site and wanted to make their views known to the Applicant and Camden.

In total 35 people attended these meetings with representatives of the following groups attending;

- Better Arts Group
- Camden Education Support Group
- Camden Village Support Group
- Hawley New Era
- Hawley Road and Castlehaven Support Group
- Hawley Wharf Regeneration Support Group
- Locals for Change
- Parents Against Crime
- Safer Street Community Association

Those present were shown a short presentation and were talked through the scheme with the architect's model as a visual aid. Overall there was broad support for the new proposals particularly concerning the following elements;

- Regenerating a site which many see as poor quality, under-utilised or dangerous
- Reduction in the height and massing of the proposals
- Strong support for the inclusion of a new school onsite.
- The new designs, particularly the market building and timber framing
- Increase in public open space and the general openness and accessibility of the site
- The proposed art-house cinema

A number of key points were also discussed, including:

- Night time routes and how these will prevent crime and anti-social behaviour on the site during hours of darkness
- Construction programme and phasing should the proposals gain consent
- Produce market
- Potential retailers on site

#### Meeting with Mik and Diane Scarlett – 23 August 2012

The Applicant met with Camden accessibility campaigner Mik Scarlett to present the new proposals and focus on the accessibility and inclusivity elements of the proposals.

Mik Scarlett was engaged on the previous proposals and is an adviser to the GLA on accessibility and inclusivity issues as well as taking a keen interest in new developments in Camden. Diane Scarlett has lived in Camden all her life and knows the stables and local markets well.

Will Lee from AHMM outlined the key elements of the new proposals, showing how it had responded to the three reasons for the refusal in March 2012 whilst highlighting the new designs.

Overall Mik and Diane Scarlett noted their support for the new proposals stating that there was equally good access compared with the previous scheme but that the Applicant had also responded to the reasons for refusal. Other comments included;

- Support for having a café and open space by the canal, away from the traffic of Chalk Farm Road
- Recognition of the buffer between the local and market spaces as necessary for ensuring local residents could enjoy the development
- Understanding of the rationale behind the skewed arch but the need to make this legible enough for people with visual impairment.

Mik Scarlett also suggested that the Applicant and architects present to Young People For Inclusion (YPFI), a campaign and advocacy group for young disabled people based in Camden. The Applicant agreed to facilitate this in late September as part of the exhibition on the proposals.

#### Ongoing Engagement with Hawley Infants School

In addition to the meetings set out above, the Applicant has continued to engage with the headteacher and governors at Hawley Infants School as part of the proposals for relocating the school to the Camden Lock Village site and establishing it as a new nursery and primary school.

The school's architect has developed a comprehensive brief, which AHMM responded to. This resulted in redesigning the outline proposals, to allow for the school's brief and aspiration to be met. Further engagement with the school will follow if consent is granted and detailed proposals prepared.

#### Conclusion

The Applicant has committed to meeting local community and amenity groups over the past five months. The Applicant has been very pleased with the responses from all of these groups, in particular the broad message that this scheme is a significant improvement from the previous proposal.

The Applicant will continue to engage with all of these groups and wider local communities following the submission of the application (see section nine). Furthermore, the Applicant has committed to form a community liaison group, which will include representatives from all local groups, to help guide the future of the development and act as a forum to discuss any issues regarding the construction or operation of the site.

## **6. Development Management Forum – 30 May 2012**

A Development Management Forum was arranged by the London Borough of Camden to help facilitate engagement and discussion on the new emerging proposals between the Applicant and local communities. This was publicised in advance by Camden who sent out invitation letters to people across the local area.

Over 100 local people attended the meeting alongside local ward councillors and members of the Development Control Committee.

The Applicant issued a press release to the Camden New Journal in advance of the Forum which noted that new proposals were being prepared and that new architects had been appointed. This news was subsequently covered in the Camden New Journal on 25 May.

The Applicant also sent out letters to all local residents who had attended previous Camden Lock Village exhibition and events publicising the Forum and noting that the Applicant was now planning to submit a new application for the site in the near future.

The minutes from the meeting alongside the press release and coverage from the Camden New Journal are shown in Appendices 3 and 4.

## **7. Development Control Committee briefings - 8 May and 2 July 2012**

As part of the pre-application engagement programme, two briefings were arranged for the Applicant to present to members of Camden's Development Control Committee and local ward councillors in advance of the application submission.

This helped the Applicant to further understand the committee's reasons for refusal and show that the new proposals were addressing these as well as responding to previous concerns from councillors and local communities. This also gave members of the committee an opportunity to familiarise themselves with the design progress, and ask specific questions which were then discussed in further detail. Summary notes of these meetings are shown in Appendix 5.



## 8. Meetings with statutory consultees

### GLA

The applicant met with representatives of the Greater London Authority on 12 June 2012 to discuss the emerging proposals.

In attendance were:

- Justin Carr, GLA
- Sam Wells, GLA
- Alex Reitman, GLA
- Conor McDonagh, London Borough of Camden
- Ed Jarvis, London Borough of Camden
- Yair Ginor, Chelsfield (Applicant)
- Mark Alper, Stanley Sidings (Applicant)
- Arin O'Aivazian, Stanley Sidings (Applicant)
- Simon Alford, AHMM (Architects)
- Will Lee, AHMM (Architects)
- Matthew Murphy, AHMM (Architects)
- Lisa Webb, Gerald Eve (Planning Consultants)

At the meeting, officers from the London Borough of Camden welcomed the emerging ideas for the scheme. A number of key issues were discussed, included:

- Re-organisation of the proposed mass of building C2
- Layering of height from Castlehaven Gardens
- Increase in public open space
- Separation of the Market building from surrounding buildings
- Separation of the towpath
- Proposed new façade for the market building
- Movement away from the ramped market design
- Affordable housing and affordable rent

The proposals were supported in principle by the GLA who recognised the benefits of the revised scheme and that this was a significant improvement compared with the refused proposals.

The key issues arising from this meeting are shown in Appendix 6.

### English Heritage

The applicant met with representatives from English Heritage on 15 June 2012.

In attendance were:

- Richard Parish, English Heritage
- Nadina Revsman, Heritage Architecture
- Ed Jarvis, London Borough of Camden
- Conor McDonagh, London Borough of Camden
- Yair Ginor, Chelsfield (Applicant)
- Will Lee, AHMM (Architects)
- Matthew Murphy, AHMM (Architects)
- Lisa Webb, Gerald Eve (Planning Consultants)

English Heritage confirmed that they wanted to see the site developed and a number of key points were discussed during the meeting. These included:

- Design of the Chalk Farm Road buildings
- Setting of the 1 Hawley Road building

- Wider public benefits of the scheme versus the loss of the villas on Hawley Road
- Public open spaces
- General planning benefits

English Heritage supported the principle of regenerating the site and the layout of the Masterplan. The reinstatement of 7-8 Chalk Farm Road and the removal of the ground floor shopfront extensions to allow additional space for pedestrian movement were welcomed. The English Heritage officer was aware that the proposals involved the demolition of the existing villas on Hawley Road but acknowledged that the scheme seeks a balance between protecting historic assets and delivering a high quality sustainable mixed use development which includes a new school on this part of the site. Further detail regarding the historic environment is contained within the Environmental Statement and the Heritage Assessment.

The key issues arising from this meeting are shown in Appendix 7.

### Design Council CABE

The applicant met with representatives of Design Council CABE on 11 June 2012.

In attendance were:

- Faye Tomlinson, Design Council CABE
- Conor McDonagh, London Borough of Camden
- Peter Stewart, Peter Stewart Consultancy
- Yair Ginor, Chelsfield (Applicant)
- Mark Alper, Stanley Sidings (Applicant)
- Arin O'Aivazian, Stanley Sidings (Applicant)
- Simon Alford, AHMM (Architects)
- Will Lee, AHMM (Architects)
- Matthew Murphy, AHMM (Architects)
- Lisa Webb, Gerald Eve (Planning Consultants)

The case officer confirmed that the changes to the scheme were an improvement and that many of the previous comments had been addressed.

The key issues arising from this meeting are shown in Appendix 8.

### Other consultees

In addition to the meetings set out above there has been ongoing consultation with representatives of Network Rail (as partial landowners) and High Speed 2, which has resulted in changes being made to the design. Given the location of the site, engagement will continue if the Camden Lock Village proposals are granted consent and the HS2 plans move forward. They are supportive of the proposed scheme.

The Applicant also met with the Metropolitan Police secure by design officer for Camden Adam Lindsay. This included a briefing on the proposed night time routes for the site. A formal response from the Metropolitan Police is expected in due course.

Finally the Applicant has consulted with the Canals and Rivers Trust as partial landowners of the site. They have been kept fully briefed of the development proposals during the design development process and are supportive of the proposed scheme.

## **9. Post-submission engagement**

The Applicant is committed to continuing its engagement with local communities following the application submission and will be undertaking the following over the next few months;

### Newsletter

The Applicant will issue a newsletter to local residents and businesses in the area around the site in September following submission of the application. This will outline the new scheme and will include images of the new development, emphasising changes that have been made since the previous submission and setting out the benefits the proposals will deliver.

### Public exhibition

A post-submission public exhibition is planned for late September to showcase the final designs and provide the local communities with an additional opportunity to provide their views. This will supplement and enhance the London Borough of Camden's statutory consultation process.

### Website

The scheme's website, [www.camdenlockvillage.com](http://www.camdenlockvillage.com), will be developed with detailed information including images of the development, key benefits and an explanation of any changes that have been made following feedback from local communities.

### Meetings with the HWWG and other community groups

The Applicant will continue to be open and accessible to requests to meet with the HWWG and other community groups post-submission. This will ensure that these groups are kept informed about the scheme.

### Encourage the community to provide their views

The applicant will encourage members of the local communities to provide their comments and views on the proposals directly to the London Borough of Camden to inform the officers' report for the committee meeting at which the revised application will be considered. The exhibition, website and newsletter will all provide an opportunity for this.

## 10. Conclusion

The detail set out in this SCI summarises nearly five months of consultation and clearly demonstrates the significant effort made by the Applicant, and its advisers, to consult widely, deeply and effectively. The consultation focussed on trying to gain as much consensus as possible, especially with the HWWG, in particular in relation to the Applicant's response to the three key reasons for refusal in March 2012. This is shown in the table below.

<b>Reasons for refusal of previous proposals</b>	<b>The New Proposals</b>
The design and detail of the Area A market building	The market building in Area A has been redesigned to respect the character and appearance of the Regents Canal and neighbouring areas
The impact of the height, form, bulk and massing of the buildings in Area C	The buildings at the centre of the site have been fundamentally re-thought and reduced in height and massing to mitigate the impact on the setting of the local area
The size of the open spaces	The size and nature of the spaces and routes have been reconfigured and increased, to improve the amenity of future and existing residents in the area

The Applicant is pleased that both the HWWG and many of the other local community groups support the principles of the new development proposals for the Camden Lock Village site and in particular that there has been significant support for the increase in the amount of public open space, the reduction in the heights and massing of buildings across the site and the designs for the buildings in addition to the provision of a new primary school and nursery for Camden

The feedback provided by these groups throughout the consultation period has been highly valued by the Applicant and has contributed significantly to the final submitted scheme. The Applicant is very grateful for all the time and effort that these groups have put into engaging on the revised proposals.

As the detailed plans for the site are developed throughout the coming months, the Applicant will continue to engage with these groups to ensure that the scheme continues to meet the needs and aspirations of people living and working in the area.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: Letter from the Applicant to Local Community Groups

The letter below was sent out to all the local community and amenity groups listed on page 13 in late June and July.

Dear (Name)

#### Meeting regarding new development proposals for Hawley Wharf site

As you may be aware, we have appointed architects Allford Hall Monaghan Morris (AHMM) to prepare new plans for the regeneration of the Hawley Wharf site. AHMM were responsible for the design of the school and affordable housing provision in the original scheme.

Since Camden's Development Control Committee turned down the previous application in March 2012, we have been carefully considering the reasons given for refusal as well as feedback received from local communities.

We want to build on the previous two years of consultation we have carried out with local residents, businesses and other local, regional and national organisations so that we can prepare a new scheme that responds to previous concerns whilst meeting our aspiration of regenerating the site.

Throughout the early summer we will be sharing our plans with local communities through a series of meetings and public discussion sessions. Following this, it is our intention to submit a revised planning application to the London Borough of Camden.

We would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to discuss our emerging proposals and hear your views.

If you would like to arrange a meeting, or for further information please phone 0800 881 5327 or email [clv@londoncommunications.co.uk](mailto:clv@londoncommunications.co.uk).

Yours sincerely,



Mark Alper

Managing Director

Stanley Sidings Limited

## Appendix 2: Letter from Regent's Canal Conservation Area Advisory Committee RCCAAC

The letter below was received by the Applicant in July following the meeting with  
RCCAAC members on 26 June

**THE REGENT'S CANAL CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**31 OVAL ROAD, CAMDEN TOWN, LONDON NW1 7EA**

Chairman: Anthony Richardson

Please reply to: Anthony Richardson email: anthonyrichardson@arparchitects.co.uk Tel: 020 7485 0991

3111/02

076 July 2012

Mark Alper  
Stanley Sidings Ltd  
Unit 7, James Cameron House  
12 Castlehaven Road  
Camden Town  
London NW1 8QW

Dear Mark

### **Hawley Wharf and Adjacent Sites**

Many thanks to you and your team for taking the time to listen to the Conservation Area  
Advisory Committee's concerns and explaining your scheme at the present design stage.

1. We think the new idea emerging for the water front elevation on Site A is a huge improvement on the refused design.
2. We support the revealing of a view of five of the viaduct arches in the new open space fronting the towpath.
3. We look forward to seeing the enlarged redesigned public space on Site C.
4. Pavements in Chalk Farm Road

These should not be widened at the expense of rebuilding Nos 1-11 Chalk Farm Road in response to increased visitor numbers. The growth of your business makes this unrealistic in the long run. There is road space which could be taken.

- a) We wish to see the complete restoration of Nos 1-11 Chalk Farm Road including the shop frontages, between the bridge and the railway viaduct.
- b) We wish to see reinstatement of the canal bridge ramp with granite sets and the reinstatement of the abutment walls to the bridge.
- c) If Network Rail's operational needs preclude rebuilding against the viaduct and bridge pylons then we wish to see the minimum opening at this point – less than 5.00m width.

1 of 3

RCCAAC ADVISES THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN ON CONSERVATION MATTERS IN THE AREA OF THE REGENT'S CANAL  
Peter Darley, Anthony Richardson, Del Brenner, Brian Lake, Leslie Sklair, Ian Shacklock, Malcolm T Tucker

**THE REGENT'S CANAL CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**31 OVAL ROAD, CAMDEN TOWN, LONDON NW1 7EA**

Chairman: Anthony Richardson

Please reply to: Anthony Richardson email: anthonyrichardson@arparchitects.co.uk Tel: 020 7485 0991

5. Towpath

We wish to see a separation of the towpath from Sties A and D.

- a) This should take the form of a brick wall preferably of yellow London Stock brick at a height of 1:000 minimum on the sites A and D side, with 3 openings of not more than 1.5m width at Chalk Farm Road bridge (at the bottom of the ramp) at the central space and at Kentish Town Road end.
- b) Any enlarged opening or the absorption of the path by Sites A or D is a breach of Camden Council's Open Space Policy and contrary to the Acts controlling the canal.
- c) We wish to see consultation and agreement of finishes and any alterations agreed with British Waterways or a Condition of Consent.

6. Height of Site A Building

The height of these building should be lower than the height of Nos 1-11 Chalk Farm Road buildings and the Chalk Farm Road railway bridge pylons. Our attached photograph shows the way these are a conservation feature of the conservation area.

In addition, we consider that appropriate canal side buildings should not be dominated by roof top planting and elaborate decorative roof lines. This will spoil the great idea your are developing for this elevation.

7. We touched on matters outside our Committee's remit but of general concern particularly Hawley Road.

- a) A large number of local people have expressed a wish to retain Nos 3-17 Hawley Road houses. This local wish has only recently become clear.
- b) There are sound economic grounds for reviewing the design of Site B at this point – particularly referring to Nos 9-17. The number of units of conversion in these house exceed that in your proposed Block X.
- c) There would need to be a replanning of family and wheelchair units between refurbished houses and Block W. We consider that equivalent housing standards can be achieved. The sale value and cost of converted properties will make this change very desirable.
- d) We would be grateful if an exercise to develop this option could be undertaken now.

2 of 3

**RCCAAC ADVISES THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN ON CONSERVATION MATTERS IN THE AREA OF THE REGENT'S CANAL**  
Peter Darley, Anthony Richardson, Del Brenner, Brian Lake, Leslie Sklair, Ian Shacklock, Malcolm T Tucker



**THE REGENT'S CANAL CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**31 OVAL ROAD, CAMDEN TOWN, LONDON NW1 7EA**

Chairman: Anthony Richardson

Please reply to: Anthony Richardson email: anthonyrichardson@arparchitects.co.uk Tel: 020 7485 0991

---

Thank you for your time and trouble in consulting our committee.

Yours sincerely



Anthony Richardson

Chairman, The Regent's Canal Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Encl: Photograph/Attachment

cc: RCCAAC Members (by email)

3 of 3

---

**RCCAAC ADVISES THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN ON CONSERVATION MATTERS IN THE AREA OF THE REGENT'S CANAL**  
Peter Darley, Anthony Richardson, Del Brenner, Brian Lake, Leslie Sklair, Ian Shacklock, Malcolm T Tucker





### **Appendix 3: Development Management Forum – 30 May 2012 – Publicity**

#### Press Release

The Applicant sent out the below press release on 22 May in advance of the Development Management Forum. This publicised the meeting and noted that new proposals for the Camden Lock Village site were being prepared.

#### **NEW DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR HAWLEY WHARF SITE**

- AHMM appointed as new architects
- Engagement with local communities on emerging plans to take place over the next few months

The developers behind plans to regenerate the Hawley Wharf site in Camden have today confirmed their intention to submit a revised planning application to the London Borough of Camden later this year.

Stanley Sidings and Chelsfield have appointed award winning architects Allford Hall Monaghan Morris (AHMM) to begin developing new proposals and will be inviting members of the public to have their say and help shape them. The emerging proposals will be presented at the Camden Development Management Forum on 30 May and then discussed with local communities at a series of public discussion sessions throughout the spring and early summer. AHMM were responsible for the design of the school and affordable housing provision in the original scheme.

#### **Mark Alper, Stanley Sidings Ltd Managing Director said;**

“We have been carefully considering the views of Camden Council, the Hawley Wharf Working Group and local communities since the decision from the Development Control Committee on 15 March.

“We still firmly believe that we can deliver much needed regeneration to this site whilst maintaining the distinct character of the area and have therefore now asked AHMM to prepare new plans. We will be engaging with local people on these as they develop over the next few months.

“These designs will meet local aspirations and deliver many benefits for Camden including a school, housing, new jobs and quality markets.”

#### **Simon Allford, Director at AHMM said;**

“We are excited about preparing new designs for this well known and much loved site in collaboration with local residents, the council and other key stakeholders.

“At AHMM we believe in making places, as well as buildings, that work over time and have lasting qualities intrinsic to their architecture.

Notes for editors:

### Camden Development Management Forum:

The first opportunity for the community to view the emerging proposals will be at the Camden Development Management Forum on Wednesday 30 May. The forum will be chaired by the council and will be held at the Arlington Conference Centre, 220 Arlington Road, London, NW1 7HE. Doors will open at 6.15pm for a 6.30pm start. The meeting will finish at 8.30pm.

For more information contact:

Jennifer Dowdeswell

London Communications Agency

[jd@londoncommunications.co.uk](mailto:jd@londoncommunications.co.uk)

020 7612 8480, 07521 019 015

## Press coverage

The Camden Lock Village reported on the new proposals and upcoming Development Management Forum in their 25 May edition.



### Letter to attendees at previous CLV events

The Applicant sent letters or emails to all previous attendees of Camden Lock Village exhibitions and events on 22 May informing them of the forthcoming Development Management Forum.

Dear (Name),

#### **New development proposals for Hawley Wharf site**

Having previously expressed an interest in the original proposals for the Hawley Wharf site, we are writing to let you know that we now intend to submit a revised planning application to the London Borough of Camden later this year.

We have appointed award winning architects Allford Hall Monaghan Morris (AHMM), who were responsible for the design of the school and affordable housing provision in the original scheme, to begin developing new proposals and we will be inviting members of the public to have their say and help shape them.

We have also been carefully considering the views of Camden Council, the Hawley Wharf Working Group and local communities on the previous proposals. These will help inform the new plans but the focus will remain on delivering much needed regeneration to this site whilst maintaining the distinct character of the area.

The emerging proposals will be presented at the Camden Development Management Forum on 30 May and then discussed with local communities at a series of public discussion sessions throughout the early summer. The forum will be chaired by the council and will be held at the Arlington Conference Centre, 220 Arlington Road, London, NW1 7HE, from 6.15pm. Your attendance at this event and your ongoing support would be appreciated.

If you have any questions, or for more information, please email [clv@londoncommunications.co.uk](mailto:clv@londoncommunications.co.uk) or telephone 0800 881 5327.

Yours sincerely,



Mark Alper

Managing Director

Stanley Sidings Limited

#### **Appendix 4: Development Management Forum – 30 May 2012 – Minutes**

Below are the minutes of the Development Management prepared by the London Borough of Camden. The Forum was held at the Arlington Conference Centre from 6:15pm to 8:30pm.

Proposal: Revised proposals for redevelopment of the site to create a mixed use development comprising eight new buildings ranging between three and nine storeys in height to accommodate a new one form entry school and nursery, employment, housing, market retail, local retail, cinema, farmers market together with areas of public open space. The demolition of all buildings across the site including single storey shopfront extensions at 1-6 Chalk Farm Road (excluding 1 Hawley Road and remaining structures at 1-6 Chalk Farm Road).

Present: Jonny Mansour	Stables Market
Herman Trebelnig	CaTUDIS
Dominic Cullinan	SCABAL
Tony Miller	Stables Market
Ann Clapp	
Peter Darley	Camden Railway Heritage Trust
Sol Scarfe	
Heather Blockley	
Fr Gavin Cooper	St Michaels Church
N Mullins	
Anne Fontaine	Hawley Infants School
S Peterson	Leatherbound
Grant	
P Jones	HWWG
K Ndiwe	Funkytown London
Peter Clapp	HWWG
Peter Hodgman	
Paul Whitley	
Peter Lyons	Green Party
C Ricketts	



M Rutter	
Roger Mason	
Mik Scarlet	
Del Brenner	Regents Network Regents Canal CAAC
Eleanor Botwright	Castlehaven Community Centre
Fr Graeme Rowland	Holy Trinity Church Holy Trinity and St Silas School
Neil Guppy	
David Murphy	`
Tim Stockton	
Tom Nicol	
Vicki Lea	
T Angress	Scar Studios
Adam Beamish	Cunnane Town Planning
Diane Wallace	
Jane Brett-Jones	Chair of Governors Hawley Road Infants School
Will Fulford	UML
Steve Wilmot	Zensai
Jackie Herald	Governor Hawley Infants School
Henry Hall	CFH
Ritesh Hargovan	Stables Market
Corena	
Marc Hayward	
Simon Pittkeathley	Camden Town Unlimited
Arin O'Anazian	Anise Ltd
Pat Thomas	HCHRA

R Brennan	
Lee Bennett	WOF/Purple Turtle
Sonja Wilson	
Kerry Waleman	
Lee Hindle	
P Jones	
K Gemmell	
John Milly	UML
Jerome Hall	
James de Lusignan	UML
Benjamin	TBH TRA
Jessica King	
Nadina Reusmann	Heritage Architecture
Stephen Levrant	Heritage Architecture
Eva O'Dwyer	

### Councillors

Cllr Milena Nuti Chair Development Control Committee

Cllr Chris Naylor Camden Town with Primrose Hill Ward

Cllr Lazzaro Pietragnoli Camden Town with Primrose Hill Ward

Cllr Matt Sanders Haverstock Ward

Cllr Jill Fraser Haverstock Ward



### Developer

Simon Allford AHMM

Will Lee AHMM

Matt Murphy AHMM

Yair Ginor Chelsfield

Mark Alper Stanley Sidings Limited

Natalie Davies Gerald Eve

Lisa Webb Gerald Eve

### Camden Council officers

Frances Wheat (FW) Development Management Service Manage

Conor McDonagh (CMD) Planning officer

Leela Muthoora Note taker

Ian Gemmell Note taker

Sara Whelan Advice and Consultation team manager

David Peres da Costa Planning officer

Katrina Christoforou Planning Officer

Edward Jarvis Planning Officer

Dawn Allott Community Liaison officer

### Introduction

Frances Wheat (FW) welcomed attendees and gave a brief explanation of the purpose of the Development Management Forum.

A Development Management Forum is a pre-application public meeting at which developers present their proposals for complex or major developments before a formal application is made. It gives the local community the opportunity to express their views and ask questions, allowing issues to be raised at an early stage.

FW explained that the Development Management Forum is not a decision making forum and that council officers were not here to give their views. The forum does not replace the formal consultation process on applications.

FW asked members of the press and councillors to identify themselves.

FW introduced representatives present at the meeting, set out the agenda and format for the meeting.

## Summary of the site

Conor McDongh (CMD) gave an overview of the site explaining the planning policies and key considerations which would have to be taken into account if a planning application is submitted.

He showed a slide showing the location of the site explaining it was located within the Regents Canal Conservation Area and the Camden Town Centre. There is one listed building within the site at 1 Hawley Road.

The relevant planning policies are set out in the

- Council's Local Development Framework,
- the London Plan and
- the National Planning Policy Framework.

CMD explained there had been a previous planning application for a mixed use scheme which was refused in spring 2012

The proposal was for

- 180 new flats (note – the final proposals are for 169 homes)
- One form entry primary school (outline)
- Employment, market, cinema, pub/restaurant and retail uses
- 3 areas of public open space

The substantive reasons for refusal were

1. Building A facade: detail design would harm Regents Canal CA
2. Buildings C1 & C2: Height and massing overbearing and would harm Regents Canal CA and local views
3. Insufficient open space harm amenity of future and existing residents

CMD explained that the main planning considerations are:

- Design and heritage conservation
- Open space and landscaping
- Housing mix and quality
- Affordable housing
- Protection of neighbouring amenity
- New community and leisure uses
- New employment, retail and market uses
- Transport and parking standards
- Sustainability and energy

The application will be referable to the Mayor of London.

## Developer presentation

Simon Allford of AHMM (SA)

AHMM were asked to look at the project in response to the refusal of planning permission. They have considered the reasons for refusal and the views expressed at the committee meeting.

They aim to build on the benefits of the Hawley Wharf Working Group (HWWG) scheme.

They are presenting preliminary ideas which are not yet fully considered proposals.

The proposed uses remain broadly the same but there is now a difference in scale and massing.

Elements that are retained from the previous design are:

Site A – 3 floors comprising market, restaurant, bars and open terraces

Site B – engagement onto the canal

Site C1 & C2 - open space

Site D – family housing and new school

## Emerging proposals

- Mass is condensed in to the centre of the site at site B and C2 and reduces down to street level.
- The height of block C1 has been reduced by 1 storey
- The amount of open space has increased across the site
- There is a new design for building A which is now split into two and is set further back from the canal
- Block C2 has been realigned and the height lowered
- A workspace has been added above the market within building A
- The industrial heritage of the site will be considered in the choice of materials

Questions

FW suggested the following topics for discussion and questions

- Design bulk and massing
- Open space and pedestrian routes
- Affordable housing
- Traffic and transport
- Public order – crime and disorder

## 1 Design bulk and massing

Q 1.1 Mik Scarlet

The original design was fully inclusive –has this been sacrificed in the new design?

A 1.1 SA

All the principles of access are to be maintained and improvements have been made to public open space

Q 1.2 Cllr Matt Sanders handed out questionnaires on behalf of the Hawley Wharf Working group and encouraged all to attend the meeting on 9th June.

Q 1.3 Heather

Concerned that the public space in the market will not be for local people. Although the height of the blocks have been reduced, it is still blocky and would have preferred an open courtyard design. The market appears to be more like a shopping mall than an open air market.

Q 1.4

Buildings A and C are out of scale

A 1.3 and 1.4 SA – we cannot dictate who will use the public open space. The height of the buildings has been reduced by 1 and 2 storeys, the footprint has been reduced and reoriented.

Q 1.5 Referred to the design of Portobello Green as a good example. The current trend is to make shopping centres bland. Camden Town has global importance in terms of tourism and a more exciting design is needed.

Q 1.6 Del Brenner Regents Canal CAAC

Regents Canal is the major open space in the area and it's important that surrounding buildings are sympathetic. The buildings are too high, higher than properties in Chalk Farm Road, the land level drops but the height of the buildings stay the same.

Q 1.7 Jackie Herald Governor Hawley Infant School

What mapping has been done for shadowing? And what are you proposing for soft landscaping between buildings?

Answer

SA – the design is a 21st century market building with the lowest floor below the level of Chalk Farm Road.

It is recognised that the canal needs sensitive enclosure. The towpath is at lower ground and ground floor level. There are 4 floors of building and a set back top floor which is less visible from the towpath.

The shadow patterns have improved and more work will be carried out when the massing is fixed. Greenery is an important issue and there is a balance to be made between hard and soft landscaping. The school will have its own play area.

## 2 Open space and pedestrian routes

Q 2.1 Eleanor Botwright, Castlehaven Community Centre

Concerned about anti social behaviour and the routes between the viaduct and buildings becoming no go areas.

#### Q 2.2 Cllr Matt Sanders

Why would the triangular space be attractive to residents? It feels like the same scheme but has shrunk a little.

#### Q2.3 Del Brenner

Doesn't think the design will enhance the serenity of the canal.

#### Answer

The owners are in discussion with the Police about safety and site management will be extensive. There will be shops and workshops within the viaduct. And some routes may be closed at night.

The triangular space is 50% larger and will feel different as it benefits from lowered buildings on all sides. There will be more sunlight. The introduction of landscaping will help create an attractive space.

The canal sometimes feels calm and sometimes frenetic. Recognises that there needs to be a threshold and distinction between the buildings and the towpath and is open to discussion about what form that should take.

#### Q 2.4 Cllr Nuti Chair Development Control Committee

The value of the school play space is said to contribute to the green feel, but the use as a farmer market could reduce the openness of that space. The local open space should be flexible, and include children's play area.

Q2.5 Shopping centres have their own security. What will the security arrangements be for the market?

#### Q2.6 Cllr Jill Fraser

The narrow dark alley way was part of the reason for refusal. Has this been addressed?

#### Answer

SA – it could be possible to have a market, and open space when the market is not in use. How to do this would need to be worked out. The detailed brief for the school is being worked up and it may be possible to use it out of school hours. The school play area will also give visual amenity.

Mark Alper (MA) – there has been reduced policing as a result of increased security at the current market in the previous 12 months.

SA the management strategy includes lighting and possibly closing down routes at night. The design strategy employs visual overlooking of routes. The routes are now wider.

### 3 Land use

#### Q 3.1 Peter Lyons (who was Green candidate Camden Town with Primrose Hill ward)

How do you justify the Council's commitment to affordable housing and employment, when the school is included in the scheme?

Answer

FW – The Council is committed to affordable housing and is seeking the maximum amount. Schools are also a high priority. The inclusion of the school within the site reduces the scheme physically and financially. There is a balance to strike. Policies within LDF and London Plan allow for this.

MA – further affordable housing could be provided elsewhere off site. The scheme is designed to provide local employment using incubator spaces, art and design and jewellery apprenticeships.

Q3.2 Simon Pitkeithly Camden Town Unlimited

Is anything happening with the Sam Smith's site?

Q 3.3 Pat Thomas

Camden Town is a special licensing area where no new bars are allowed?

Answer

CMD – It is the Council's view that the planning permission has lapsed at the Sam Smiths site.

MA – no bars, clubs or night clubs are proposed.

FW – hours of operation would be controlled through conditions attached to the planning permission

Q3.4 Del Brenner

How do you justify 3 floors of market it is excessive. Sam Smiths site should be considered with this scheme.

Answer

MA – the market is key driver for the viable development of the site, the market floorspace been reduced in site A with a floor of workshops added..

CMD – the planning permission for the Sam Smiths site has expired. Any future application on that site would be considered on its own merit.

#### 4 Traffic and transport

Q 4.1 Peter Lyons

The viability of the scheme suggests an extra 10,000 visitors per week. There are problems with Camden Town tube station. How do you propose to get people to and from the site?

Q4.2 Penny Jones

How will the site be serviced? How will it impact on residents and the school?

## Answer

Arup – the number of trips have been calculated with the Council and TfL. Overall implications for extra trips could be accommodated by existing network. Mitigation measures would be secured and trips will be encouraged through better wayfinding and routes to Chalk Farm station, Camden Road station and buses.

All servicing will be within the site. There would be a Servicing Management Plan secured in the s106. No loading in local streets is proposed. There is a dedicated loading bay on site which is located away from the residential units and the school. The service traffic will leave in forward gear.

FW thanked all for attending and closed the meeting at 8:30

## **Appendix 5: Briefings to Development Control Committee - 8 May 2012 and 2 July 2012**

### 8 May 2012

A first presentation to the Development Control Committee was held on 8 May and attended by committee members, Camden planning and design officers as well as the following representatives of the Applicant and the consultant team;

- Mark Alper, Stanley Sidings Ltd (Applicant)
- Yair Ginor, Chelsfield (Applicant)
- Philip Turner, AHMM (Architect)
- Will Lee, AHMM (Architect)
- Matthew Murphy, AHMM (Architect)
- Hugh Bullock, Gerald Eve (Planning consultant)
- Natalie Davies, Gerald Eve (Planning consultant)
- Robert Gordon Clark (Community engagement consultants)
- Chris Madel (Community engagement consultants)

The presentation was introduced by Mark Alper who noted that the Applicant had been considering the views expressed at the 15 March 2012 committee meeting and had been looking at how key concerns and issues raised could be addressed.

He introduced the team from AHMM noting that they had been appointed to look at the entire Masterplan. He did though note that many aspects of the scheme were discussed over a number of years and debated and accepted on the night, notably the school. The focus for AHMM was therefore on the principle three reasons for refusal in March namely:

- The proposed Area A market building by virtue of its design and detail, would harm the character and appearance of the Regents' Canal Conservation Area;
- The cumulative impact of the height, form, bulk and massing of the C1 and C2 buildings in Area C would result in an overbearing form of development and harm the setting of the Regents Canal Conservation Area and views in the immediate and local area;
- The proposed development, by reason of insufficient open space, would be detrimental to residential amenity of future residents and existing residents in the area.

Mark Alper also noted that the Applicant had been in contact with the HWWG and was looking to set up meetings every three weeks to discuss the emerging scheme. He also noted that the Applicant would be seeking to engage with other groups across the local area.

Philip Turner of AHMM then introduced and talked through three boards showing and comparing the refused scheme, the alternative scheme developed by the HWWG and the emerging ideas for a new scheme.

As part of this he highlighted several central elements of the new emerging proposals including;

- A reduction in the height of the C1 building
- A significant increase in the amount of public open space across the site
- A move away from the arches design concept and introduction of two buildings on site A rather than a single market building



Philip Turner also introduced some emerging ideas noting that this would build on the work from the both the previous scheme and the HWWG alternative scheme. He explained that AHMM were focussing strongly on the public space and increasing this across the site as well as looking at the industrial heritage of the site, reducing height and exploring more separation for Building A.

Members raised observations and points on the following;

- The width of the canal towpath with potential anti-social behaviour still remaining a concern
- Similarly the Committee wanted increased reassurances over the safety of night time routes
- The emerging treatments for the canalside and Castlehaven buildings were welcomed
- The challenge of finding an appropriate design for the market building to replace the arches was raised. AHMM noted that they were looking at potential timber or brick screens
- The area sizes for retail, offices and light industrial which will broadly remain the same
- Consultation with the HWWG with members welcoming the fresh and open approach
- Position of the art-house cinema which will remain under Building C

Following the briefing it was agreed that another session should be held with members once the proposals had been worked up in more detail and after consultation with the public.

## 2 July 2012

The second presentation took place following further development of the proposed new scheme as well as engagement with local communities. Members of the committee, Camden planning and design officers as well as the following representatives of the Applicant and the consultant team attended;

- Mark Alper, Stanley Sidings Ltd (Applicant)
- Yair Ginor, Chelsfield (Applicant)
- Simon Allford, AHMM (Architect)
- Will Lee, AHMM (Architect)
- Matthew Murphy, AHMM (Architect)
- Lisa Webb, Gerald Eve (Planning consultant)
- Natalie Davies, Gerald Eve (Planning consultant)
- Robert Gordon Clark (Community engagement consultants)
- Chris Madel (Community engagement consultants)

Mark Alper made a short introduction noting that good progress had been made on the proposals and that the Applicant had listened and responded to feedback from members at the last briefing. He also noted that since the 8 May 2012 meeting, the Applicant had focussed on engaging with the HWWG other key community groups and statutory bodies. They had held a number of meetings as well as presenting the emerging scheme at the Development Management Forum on 30 May which had been attended by nearly 100 people (see section six).

He reiterated that the changes from the previous scheme were substantial and that whilst not everyone could be satisfied on every point, the new designs had gone a long way to resolving all the issues. He then noted that the Applicant would continue to engage regularly with local communities over the summer with more meetings planned in

advance of the planning application which he said would be submitted towards the end of the summer.

Simon Allford from AHMM then reiterated the three reasons for refusal of the previous scheme (see notes on 8 May meeting) before presenting the key elements of the new scheme including;

- Masterplan - a new Masterplan had been prepared looking at the entire site
- Massing/height - It was noted that the massing and height had been reduced with a two storey reduction on Building C2 and overall the heights were now proposed at nine, seven and five storeys
- Local space - with building depths reduced, local space has been increased by 50% with space for market stalls
- Arches space - space had been increased by 100%
- Canal space – space reconfigured with people now passing through the buildings rather than the towpath. The market building had also been pulled back from the boundary
- Viaduct routes - widened by 50%
- Route assessment - both day and night time routes had been explored and assessed
- Building A - architecture was being explored with the potential for using timber, metal or glass
- Area B - amendments to the proposals for the school with floor plans shown

Members made a number of observations throughout the meeting including;

- Width of the tow path - There was an enquiry as to the width of the towpath. This was noted as 4.5m
- Servicing and deliveries to the market/retail - A question was raised about about deliveries. It was noted that there would be a central delivery area.
- Area A screening and options for materials. Timber, metal and brick screen were all discussed with members generally welcoming the timber frames. It was agreed that more information and elevations showing the detail of the retail buildings would be provided by the Applicant.
- Permeability through the skewed arch - Members agreed that this arch needed to remain open but they recognised concerns raised by the HWWG about separation between local residents and visitors. They liked the public art suggestion but did not like the kiosk idea as they felt that this would attract to people into the arch. Members felt that the public art could, in some way celebrate the viaduct.
- Produce Market and local retail - Members expressed a preference for local retailing facilities rather than an internal produce market. It was agreed that further work needed to be undertaken to understand:
  - The need and function of the market
  - The viability of the market - i.e. types of goods sold
  - Critical mass
  - Review of London Farmer's Markets
- The playspace in Area C