

St Mary & St Lawrence

Outcome of case conference 17.11.2004:

Generally supportive but requires some further justification and amendment:

Land Uses

School – fine. Spare land for possible future expansion must be used suitably in meantime.

Res – Prefer affordable. Financial assessment required to justify no affordable. Accept student accom provided occupation by named institutions and rent levels are secured in S.106. Aidan will advise on S106 wording eg Holmes Rd and KHR

Community Use – Seek to clarify nature of existing community use. Welcome dual use of school hall but sympathetic to management issues of school as to exact terms. Dual use to be secured thro S106 during out of school hours at appropriate rent levels.

Parking – Get Tim W's comments. Likely to be too high. Don't accept any increase from existing. Disabled spaces as required incl for disabled residents(students). Use excess for cycle parking for students and additional playground.

Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required for all D1 uses

Scale and massing

(Edmund) Not out of keeping but much more intensive use than existing. Need careful assessment in relation to St Michael's Court to north (of quality but not Cons Area).

Need daylighting assessment for properties on Aldenham St

Need design amendments to scheme as a whole

Consultation

Consult Housing Assoc and Tenants Assoc of adjoining properties and estate as a whole.

Public Art

Would be welcomed if they wish to do it but we should not be insisting

S.106

Car free/capped

Highways works

Green Travel Plan

Student accom.- occupancy and rent levels

Community use –hours and rents

Phasing incl Sure Start offices

Bowie, Barrington

From: Wedmaier, Tim
Sent: 23 November 2004 15:16
To: Bowie, Barrington
Subject: RE: Polygon Rd_45-47

Hi Barrington,

Further to my email from yesterday, I have been out on site with the engineers and we have put together a list of required footway works and minor highway changes needed to support this scheme - they will start to cost these up shortly. Basically it involves removing or reconstructing crossovers onto Aldenham St, and repaving to Boulevard Standard the immediately adjoining footways which are in a poor state.

Nevertheless, we have found that the proposed site plan incorrectly shows the position of the kerbline AND property boundary near the junction of Aldenham Street and Werrington Street. This will need to be rectified. While this does not effect the siting of the building itself it will effect the amount of footway repaving required.

Also, we noted that on all 3 frontages, part of the boundary fence or building will be set back from the highway/ property boundary and they are proposing footway paving up to the building/ fence line. That is, in effect, they are providing land for wider footways. While this would be welcome on at least part of Aldenham Street and Werrington Street frontages, I'm not sure it is required on Polygon Rd where we already have kerb buildouts. Also, it is not clear whether they are intending on doing this formally (ie requesting that we adopt this land) or will it, in effect, form a private forecourt surrounding the site on 3 sides.

Regards,

Tim

-----Original Message-----

From: Wedmaier, Tim
Sent: 22 November 2004 18:13
To: Bowie, Barrington
Cc: Farrer, Dawn
Subject: Polygon Rd_45-47

RE: 2004/4555/P

Barrington, please find attached my comments on the above scheme:

TR3 - Transport Assessments and Travel Plans.

This scheme does not trigger the need for a transport assessment as outlined in Camden's adopted UDP, Appendix TR2, based on the minimal additional educational floorspace and the residential accommodation proposed.

Nevertheless, as carparking is proposed and the scheme involves (marginal) additional D1 floorspace, a school travel plan will be expected, via s106.

TR12 Non-residential carparking.

TR12 seeks to limit commuter carparking and as such Ch16 development standards set a limit on the amount of non-residential carparking allowed in any new development. This is set at 1 space per 600-1000m2 outside of central London - ie for this site, a maximum of 3 spaces could be allocated for the school. 15 carparking spaces are currently shown on the site plan. This is not acceptable.

TR17 residential carparking

TR17 requires residential carparking to be provided at the rate of approx 0.7 per 1 bed flat and 1 per 2+ bed flat. However given the student nature of the housing and the accessible location, no general carparking spaces would be acceptable, subject to a formal car-free agreement being signed (via s106) in line with TR16 recommendations. Nevertheless, this would not preclude some limited carparking (say 2-3 spaces) being provided on site for wheelchair users of the housing element.

That is, in total, it is recommended that no more than 6 on-site carparking spaces are provided (a maximum of 3 for the school and 3 for the residential element - all designed for wheelchair users). If some of these carparking spaces are allocated to the residential element, then a better connection from the carpark into the res core will be expected (so that wheelchair users have convenient, safe and direct access from the carpark into the reception area and lifts).

TR21 Pedestrians

Several doors are currently shown opening out onto what appears to be the public highway. This will not be acceptable, although this could be conditioned.

The design and location of the proposed vehicle ramp will need to be carefully considered to ensure minimal impact on on-street parking bays and minimal disruption to pedestrians. This will be designed and costed by Highway Engineering and included in a highway/footway works contribution. The footway works contribution will also need to ensure that costs of remedial (post construction) footway repairs are taken account of. Highway Engineering team to advise me on this. Other old crossovers or dropped kerbs may also have to be removed and will be included in the highway/footway works sum.

TR22 Cyclists

Adequate cycle parking provision will be expected for both the residential and school elements.

Cycle parking for the school is currently proposed at 28 spaces (14 sheffield stands). Our school travel plan officer (Simon Bishop) is happy with this number, but says that a higher number could be achieved using cycle (toast) racks rather than sheffield stands. This could be addressed by condition.

Cycle parking is also shown on the Aldenham Street frontage, presumably for the residential element. This represents both a significant obstruction to the public highway as well as an inadequate provision of safe and secure cycle parking for the student residents of the scheme. In previous student housing schemes (with UNITE) we have insisted on cycle parking for 50% of the number of bedrooms.

TR23 Servicing

Any changes to the proposed carpark to take account of the comments above will need to ensure that an area of hardstanding is still provided off the highway to allow servicing vehicles to pull off the highway and make deliveries (especially directly into the kitchen/ store as well as have access to the bin stores).

Tim Wedmaier

020 7974 5896

tim.wedmaier@camden.gov.uk

Senior Transport Planner
Forward Planning and Projects
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall, Argyle St
London WC1H 8ND

Memo

Environmental Health Team
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

Phone: 020 7974 **2638**
Fax: 020 7974 6955/5517
E-mail: env.health@camden.gov.uk

Date: 23rd November 2004

To: Barrington Bowie

From: Darren Beesley

Our Ref: EH/E07/DXB/069914

Your Ref: 2004/4555/P

Re: Planning Application
St. Mary & St Pancras CE Primary School 45-47 Polygon Road, London, NW1

Thank you for consulting this section regarding the above development.

Former uses on this site could have potentially led to contamination.

As such, I recommend that the Council impose a planning condition requiring an appropriate site investigation to be undertaken and a report including any recommendations for remediation to be submitted to the Council **prior to any construction works taking place.**

The condition should additionally state that **should any remediation measures be required, they must be agreed with the Council prior to the commencement of any works.**

We would also request that wherever possible, reports provided in conjunction with a planning application be submitted to this section in a digital format for inclusion on the corporate GIS.

Should you need clarification on any of the above please contact me on extension 2638.

Regards

Darren Beesley
Environmental Health Team



Awarded for excellence



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Director: Peter Bishop

BB

~~HW~~

Application Number: 2004/4555/P
Name: CHRIS TWADDLE
Address: 87 OAKSHOTT COURT
POLYGON ROAD
LONDON NW1 1ST
Tel: 0207 249 8995
Email: ct@kennedytwaddle.com
Date and time of comment left: 19 Nov 2004 17:34
Comment Type: General Observation
Comment: At this stage due to late receipt of the notice I add my observations/comments as follows:

1. I would like to know if CABE have been allowed to comment on this scheme which is common on a project this size. If not can they be consulted.
2. Both wings of the L could do with being at least one storey lower for all the obvious reasons ie. surrounding buildings, rights to light, high density, over development.

I will make my views more formalised in a letter.

Regards

RECEIVED
22 NOV 2004



Camden Town Hall
 Apple Street
 Ennisway
 Euston Road
 London WC1H 9ND

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications and Reserved Applications) Regulations 1989 as amended by the (Amendment) Regulations 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1997, 2002

Development Control Team

This form should be completed and returned together with the relevant fee, plus 5 sets of each appropriate application form (the original and four copies) 5 sets of drawings are required for planning applications; if Listed Building or Conservation Area applications are submitted also, total of 10 sets of drawings are required.

SCALE OF FEES

	Category of Development		Fee Planned from 01-04-02
A	Extensions and Alterations to Existing Dwellinghouses (Note: "Dwellinghouse" is defined as a building or part of a building which is used as a single private dwellinghouse and for no other purpose; is a house divided into 3 flats = 3 dwellinghouses)	- one dwelling - in total, for 2 or more dwellings	£110 £220
B	All outline Applications Site area defined as the area shown edged red on your site plan	- Per 0.1 hectares or part thereof - max for 2.5 hectares or more	£220 £5,500
C	Full Applications for New Dwellings and reserved matters for siting, design, external appearance, means of access and landscaping following outline permission	- per dwelling - max for 50 dwellings or more	£220 £11,000
D	Full Applications for Non-Residential Buildings and reserved matters for siting, design, external appearance, means of access and landscaping following outline permission. *(New floorspace means the whole of the building to be erected. No allowance is given for demolition of existing buildings on the same site).	- alterations with no increase in floorspace* - 40 sq. metres or less of new floorspace* - more than 40 sq. metres but not more than 75 sq. metres of new floorspace* - thereafter per 75 sq. metres or part thereof. - max for £750 sq. metres or more	£110 £110 £220 £220 £11,000
E	Approval of matters reserved by condition attached to an outline permission where applicants earlier reserved matters applications have incurred total fees equaling that for a full application for entire scheme (See 2 over).		£220
F	Conversion of Buildings to Flats	- per additional residential unit created - max for 50 units	£220 £11,000
G	Change of use only (except waste or materials) (NB Change of use together with "works" will be charged at the rate for works where that fee is higher than the basic fee for change of use)		£220
H	Car parks, service roads and means of access for existing development		£110
I	Minerals (winning, working, storage) or the use of land for disposal of refuse or waste materials	- per 0.1 hectare - max for 15 hectares or more	£110 £18,500
J	All other engineering operations	- per 0.1 hectare - max for 1 hectare or more	£110 £1,100
K	Variation or removal or change of conditions (NB Certain applications of this type are exempt from fees - see 1g, l and j)		£110
L	Renewal of temporary (limited period) permissions		£110

(See over)

Bowie, Barrington

From: Bowie, Barrington
Sent: 19 November 2004 12:31
To: Wheat, Frances
Cc: Traynor, Deirdre; Cronin, Tim
Subject: RE: St Mary and St Pancras - Case conference

Importance: High

Frances,

Thank you for the notes. They are both useful and helpful.

I do think that the information required, by its nature, is going to take some time to produce - such as a financial appraisal (who from our side is going to assess their appraisal?); a transportation assessment; and the commissioning of a daylight/sunlight study. The applicant was aware that some form of financial justification was required, but why do we need a full financial appraisal if student housing to finance the school would be fully secured and allocated in perpetuity and there is no Policy objection? Also, bearing in mind the school is to replace an existing one with no increase in capacity, I did not consider that a transportation assessment was necessary. Is it the case that all D1 uses require a transportation assessment in any event, even if it is proposed to replace D1 with D1, with no increase in capacity? Perhaps with the benefit of hindsight I could have requested this information at validation stage, but I am not convinced.

Furthermore, the need for design amendments to the scheme as a whole, would suggest that the application was submitted prematurely. The emphasis of the pre-application discussions were on design matters, which were largely but not fully resolved before the application was submitted. I couldn't find any legitimate reasons not to validate the application on submission, and we can hardly hold an application because "we are not quite ready", which is indeed the case.

Are we saying that, in the absence of this information, we are not in a position to fully assess the application, or that the application as currently submitted is unacceptable? Are we certain that the information requested can be submitted in time to meet our deadlines? I would imagine that we would seek to secure a withdrawal of the application should this information not be forthcoming.

The St Pancras and Humanist Housing Association Tenants Association has been notified of the application. The letter was sent out on 4 November 2004.

Can we talk about this before I finalise my letter to the agent/applicant?

Kind regards

Barrington

-----Original Message-----

From: Wheat, Frances
Sent: 18 November 2004 20:30
To: Bowie, Barrington
Cc: Traynor, Deirdre
Subject: St Mary and St Pancras - Case conference

Barrington,
I attach notes for you to progress case. Also in S drive.
Thanks,
Frances

<< File: Outcome of case conference 17.11.04.doc >>

BRIEFING NOTE for Anne Doherty

Redevelopment of St Mary & St Pancras Primary School, 45-47 Polygon
Road, Somers Town
App. No. 2004/4555/P

This concerns an application submitted under the above number and made valid from 21 October 2004 for:

the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site by the erection of a six-storey building comprising a replacement primary school on the ground and first floors and 44 student flats above; replacement "Sure Start" accommodation; school car parking; landscaping; and associated external works.

This is a joint application of the London Diocesan Board for Schools (LDBS) and Unite. The application is going through the normal consultation/notification process (which expires on 19 November 04) and is likely to generate s.106 heads of terms with regard to following; car-fee/capped housing; highway works; a Green Travel Plan; perhaps public art - refer to Circular 1/97; and controls over the nature of the (institutional) end occupier and controls over rent levels.

The single-form entry school is to be provided at no cost to the council on the back of a (speculative) proposal for student cluster units. Our preferred option was for the school to be provided on the back of a modicum of affordable housing; however, the LDBS has fully investigated the affordable housing option (the subject of pre-application discussions) and indicated that this option is not viable. In addition that option would have required a lot of units and a much-increased building envelope than is currently proposed. As submitted, the cluster unit option complies with policy and would be subject to s.106 restrictions on occupation/resale and rent levels.

Main issues here revolve around: design (incl. height and appearance), policy, the heads of terms, the need for school car parking and the appropriateness of a single-form entry school.

What would be your views on this?

Barrington
12 November 2004