



Camden

Building Schools for the Future

Adelaide Road

Planning Application

– Statement of Community Involvement

**BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE:
CAMDEN**

BAM CONSTRUCTION LTD

ADELAIDE ROAD

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

MAY 2010

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	The importance of Consultation	2
3.	Pre- IPD Outline Planning Application	3
4.	BSF Consultations - IPD1 and IPD2	5
5.	Response to the consultation	8

TA Ref: BAML2001

LPA Ref:

Office Address: 25 Savile Row
London
W1S 2ES

Telephone 020 7851 4010

Date of Issue: May 2010

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report is prepared on behalf of BAM Construction Ltd and Camden Education Authority to support of a full planning application for the re-development of the existing school buildings at Swiss Cottage School, 80 Avenue Road, NW8. The current schools on the site are the Swiss Cottage Specialist SEN School and Frank Barnes School for Deaf Children.
- 1.2 The application follows outline planning permission granted on 5 November 2008 by the London Borough of Camden for the proposed redevelopment of the site for a new UCL sponsored 1150 pupil Academy and associated facilities including floodlighting, replacement 230 pupil special educational needs school with associated facilities and 3,400 sq m of residential accommodation. The consent also included the relocation of the existing Frank Barnes School off site.
- 1.3 This site is one the two 'Sample School' sites in the London Borough of Camden, for the borough's Building School's for the Future (BSF) programme. The other site is South Camden Community School, in Somers Town, Kings Cross.
- 1.4 This application seeks the following:

“Construction of a new academy school (Class D1) and replacement special educational needs school (Class D1), with associated access arrangements, landscaping, floodlighting and parking works”.
- 1.5 This reports outlines the consultation process that has been carried out in advance of the application being submitted to the Council, which has informed the design.

2. The importance of Consultation

- 2.1 One of the central purposes of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is to improve community involvement in the planning process.
- 2.2 The Government made it clear in the guidance accompanying the new legislation that developers should be encouraged to undertake public consultation, particularly on major developments. Planning Policy Statement (PPS)1: 'Creating Sustainable Communities', finalised in February 2005, and 'Community Involvement in Planning: the Government's Objectives' place heavy emphasis on the importance of consulting with local communities early in the planning process.

"We would encourage developers to undertake pre-application discussions and early community consultation on significant applications..."

(Community Involvement in Planning: The Government's Objectives', paragraph 3.18)

3. Pre- IPD Outline Planning Application

3.1 A series of consultations and workshops with various stakeholders took place at the very early stages of the design process. This was essential in creating a thorough, clear effective brief for the bidders to respond to during the IPD1 and IPD2 stages of the BSF process.

3.2 These early consultations were undertaken by:

- Navigant Consulting and Seymour Harris as part of the Strategy for Change and Outline Business Case elements of the BSF Programme.
- The School's own strategic BSF working group.
- The Sorrell Foundation and Seymour Harris Architecture.
- Navigant/SHA consultation programme: Three consultations attended by the Technical Advisor (TA) BSF team comprised of Navigant Consulting and Seymour Harris Architectural personnel provided the opportunity for site analysis, feasibility options, and a chance for feedback which could all be fed into the schools vision and brief.
- SCCS BSF working Group: Comprising of key teaching and support staff and governor representation they co-ordinated a series of consultations and workshops.
- A Public meeting held on 4 September 2007 at UCL regarding the Academy
- Public meetings were held on 24 September 2007 and 1 October 2007 at Swiss Cottage school to discuss the proposal. These events were advertised in the local press, with an invitation door dropped to 5000 local residents living around the site. The summary of the consultations were published in an Executive Report to Camden's Executive on 21 November 2007 (CSF/2007/12).
- Meetings with parents of children at Swiss Cottage special school 14 December 2007, 28 Feb 2008, 26 March 2008
- On 19 March 2008 a public meeting was held concerning the expansion of Swiss Cottage special school and closure of Jack Taylor special school. Advertised in local press, and by door drop. Invitations sent to residents of Alexandra and Ainsworth estate. Article in tenant newsletter.

The summary of the consultations were published in an Executive Report to Camden's Executive on 23 April 2008 (CSF/2008/05)

- Throughout the summer/autumn 2008 the student brief was developed for Swiss Cottage special school. This included the 'Learning through landscapes consultation' which took place on 24 April 2009. Attached at appendix 1 are some of the boards produced by the students.

3.3 The findings of the early consultation process resulted in the control scheme (with outline planning permission) and the feedback enabled the development and formulation of the various briefs outlined below:

- The Schedule of Accommodation as provided in the Outline Business Case.
- The academy and SEN vision, education and Design Brief.
- Facilities and services output specification Part B1/1 sustainability brief.
- The facilities and services output specification.
- The Sustainability Brief.

3.4 These briefs were essential for the bidding design teams to develop a project that fully responded to the findings of these early consultations.

3.5 A summary of the consultation activity during 2008 and 2009 is provided below:

- May 2008 publication of statutory notices: Notices posted outside the school and on copies available Camden website, with the opportunity to respond. The summary of the consultations were published in an Executive Report to Camden's Executive on 23 July 2008 (CSF/2008/21)
- 16 July 2008 – Development Control Forum. Advertised by door drop to 6,000 addresses around the school, notice in local papers and letter of invitation sent from planning. Notes of the meeting published on Camden's website.
- End of July – submission for outline planning permission including a summary of consultation Planning ref 2008/3662/P.

4. BSF Consultations - IPD1 and IPD2

- 4.1 Due to the nature of the competitive BSF process and the extremely tight deadline there were limitations for the bidding design teams to have direct contact with the school and in particular with the students.
- 4.2 Within the BAM design team there was continual consultation between the different consultants and experts, this was kick-started at the beginning of the design process with an in-house day-long design session where the whole design team came together to brainstorm ideas. Then throughout the design process design team meetings took place involving a wide variety of specialist consultants to ensure that we were fully coordinated and all aspects of the design strategy were fully integrated. Consultants included: Landscape/ M&E/ Acoustics/ Fire/ Traffic/ FM/ Accessibility/ Sustainability/ FFE/ ICT/ Theatre Specialists.
- 4.3 A schedule of consultations were timetabled for each of the bidding teams, these were generally attended by the schools, governors, The Client Design advisor, Members of the BSF team from the Local Authority and Planners from Camden Council with representatives of Navigant Consulting attending some of the consultations.
- 4.4 Interspersed within these numerous meetings were Design Critiques, 2 during IPD1 and 2 during IPD2, these critiques provided the opportunity for additional Stakeholders to be involved and have a say in the design process. These were attended by school staff, local authority representatives, school board members and specifically invited members of the wider local community.
- 4.5 On 15 Sept 2009 a public meeting was held at Swiss Cottage special school. The meeting was advertised by door drop to 10,000 addresses in the local area. In addition, notice of the meeting was advertised in the local press and the libraries, and the event was also advertised on Camden Council's website.

Public exhibition

- 4.6 On the 17th March, at the end of the IPD process, a public exhibition took place at the school providing the opportunity for the wider stakeholder community to see the project and have their say. In total 79 people attended the drop-in session to view the plans and 17 people returned written feedback on the plans
- 4.7 Below is a selection of some of the responses to the Public Exhibitions:

“So far I’m impressed with the plan. I strongly support the UCL Academy in Swiss Cottage. We should think about the future not about today. Proud to be living in Camden. Great place to live. We will visit the other plan tomorrow.”

“Overall – looks good. Practicalities – as it all looks quite open: what do you plan to do to ease noise? Will there be barriers to prevent any accidents on the balcony (the wall does not seem very high)? The layout seems very mature for a school – do you know of any other schools that have a similar layout of classes, lecture theatres, etc? Is there evidence to say this layout is more effective for students learning? Where are the facilities for interventions (EAL, SEN etc)? Will 1st year intake have a phased move into the new build or wait for complete finish?”

“Very convincing diagram on a (what looks like) over-developed site. Some very nice internal movements and clear convincing strategy for the UCL school. Swiss Cottage School however looks very squashed – and not enough external space for either. I look forward to seeing another one tomorrow but this looks hard to beat.”

“I was quite happy with the information they gave me.”

“The bulk and design of the building was extremely overbearing for the area and its neighbouring building. No imagination or creativity was used. It completely has failed to try to make the building and area feel airy. The playgrounds should be more centrally located within the area and not adjacent to the borders of the site.”

“We are very concerned about the lack of play areas and large open spaces for our special needs children. The balconies cannot be a substitute for these.

Why does the Academy have to open before the Special School? The Special School has been doing outstanding work for many years and the needs of children with disability should be prioritised over an academy!

Our special needs children cannot attend a school with a building site next door. we need to be relocated. It is vital for the well being of our children.”

“Very helpful & looking forward to seeing tomorrow’s plans!”