

Expansion of Kingsgate Primary School and Redevelopment of Liddell Road

Statement of Community Involvement

Submitted in support of
Application 01 for Phase 01
Application 02 for Phase 02
December 2014



The expansion of Kingsgate primary school and redevelopment of Liddell Road.

Pre-planning application consultation July and August 2014.

1. Background

- 1.1. In 2012, the Council published a place plan for shaping the future of West Hampstead. The plan drew on findings from consultations with people and organisations that live and work in West Hampstead between 2008 and 2011, including placeshaping consultation on key issues for West Hampstead in 2011. The West Hampstead place plan identified Liddell Road as a potential site for providing new school places. The plan also identified the need to secure new employment space for small start -up businesses and managed workspace within new developments.
- 1.2. In 2012, we consulted Kingsgate primary school community regarding the proposal to expand the school to provide 420 new school places. The school governing body confirmed their support for the expansion, subject to completion of the statutory consultation. Feedback from parents was positive. The main concern from parents related to the transfer of children between the two sites and a number of options that the school could adopt to manage this were discussed.
- 1.3. In 2013, we carried out statutory consultation about the proposal to expand Kingsgate primary school as part of a mixed redevelopment of Liddell Road. Drop in events were held at Kingsgate school and Sidings Community Centre. The consultation drew on a feasibility study we commissioned to illustrate how new school buildings, employment space and enabling housing could be accommodated on the site together. The feasibility study suggested that we would need to provide up to 120 units on the site.
- 1.4. In March 2014, the Director of Children Schools and Families published his decision to expand Kingsgate primary school in September 2016 subject to :
 - Planning permission for the provision of new school buildings as part of the redevelopment of Liddell Road
 - Consultation on changes to the admissions policy.
- 1.5. Maccreanor Lavington architects were appointed in March 2014 to prepare a planning application for the redevelopment of the site. Maccreanor Lavington developed a site strategy to deliver the Council's objectives to provide the school places and maximise the employment and community benefits. The purpose of our pre application consultation in 2014 was to:
 - To promote the benefits of the redevelopment and convey the Council's vision and the school's vision for the new buildings.
 - To consult local people and organisations about the revised strategy to identify and design out or mitigate issues raised about the design prior to a planning application

1.6. This report provides details of how we consulted with local people and organisations, the key issues raised and how the scheme addresses these issues. A summary of consultation and decision making prior to 2014 is provided in Appendix A.

1.7. Local people will have an opportunity to comment on the proposals as part of the planning process.

2. How we consulted

2.1. To present our outline strategy we organised four separate drop-in exhibitions at local community centres and at Kingsgate primary school. Officers and the design team were present at each session. The events were attended by a total of 116 people. The exhibition boards are reproduced in the Planning, Design and Access Statement section 3.1.4.

2.2. To promote the drop in events and tell people how they could take part in the consultation we distributed a consultation document to 5,000 households. We also placed an advert in the local paper, sent emails to contacts from our previous consultation, mailed all the CINDEX listed local organisations and put up posters in the locality. Appendix B Consultation Document

2.3. On July 22 2014, the design team together with officers from children schools and families presented to a Development Management Forum meeting at Sidings Community Centre. The meeting was arranged and chair by officers of the local planning authority. The meeting was attended by an estimated 150 people. The presentation and notes of this meeting can be seen here:
<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment/planning-and-built-environment/two/major-developments/development-management-forum.en>

2.4. In September 2014, a special public meeting was organised on behalf of Cabinet members for Children and Regeneration, Transport and Planning, to feed back the outcome of consultation and how the strategy had been changed to address the issues raised.

2.5. In October 2014, we published online at www.camden.gov.uk/liddellroad a question and answer document. This document was a list of all the questions and issues raised during our consultation and our response to these questions. A copy of this document is provided Appendix C.

3. Responses to the consultation – what you said

3.1. 143 people completed the consultation response questionnaire and we received two letters of response. These two letters are reproduced in Appendix D. The consultation questionnaire comments are summarised below.

3.2. Who responded to the consultation

117 local residents responded to the consultation, 17 parents (not necessarily with children at Kingsgate primary school). One local business responded. The remainder did not identify themselves.

Reponses From:	Total
Local business	1
Local Resident	117
Parent	17
Other	8
Total	143

3.2 Summary of response to proposals

The majority of respondents objected to some aspect of the proposal. However, there were a number of people with a mixture of positive and negative comments.

Assessment of proposæ	Total
Negative	115
Positive & negative	18
Positive	10
Total	143

3.3 Key Messages

The table below sets out the main themes made in the comments. They are listed in the order of importance to the most number of people. Most people commented on more than one aspect of the proposal.

Objections:
Height of taller building
Lack of affordable housing
Traffic congestion
Expansion of Kingsgate primary school
Loss of employment space
Pedestrian congestion
Loss of trees
New office space that is not viable
No doctor's surgery
Water Supply
Loss of Green Space
Quantum of Development
Parking Issues
Overlooking from new housing on Maygrove Road
Support for:
Creation of new school places
Creation of new housing
Extending public space
Removal of industrial units along Maygrove Road
Moving the site entrance further away from Iverson Road

The most common objections were to the height of the tall building, lack of affordable housing, and traffic congestion, the expansion of Kingsgate Primary School and general quantum of development.

- 36% of all comments in the consultation refer to the height of the tower. Many respondents were concerned that the views provided did not convey a realistic picture of the impact of the proposed development. There was a feeling that a tall building would overshadow and overlook adjacent properties on local streets. Some people suggested the tall building should be located on the east of the site.
- Over 15% of comments referred to the lack of affordable housing for those people that live and work in Camden.
- Traffic congestion along Maygrove Road was also highlighted as an issue by 15% of the comments. Residents were concerned that the significant increase in population to the area could make traffic congestion worse. There was also mention of the need to improve car parking standards in the area as residents

were concerned that the development would add to parking congestion on the local streets.

- 10% of comments were concerned with the expansion of Kingsgate primary School. Majority of these comments revolved around splitting the school over two sites. This will force children to walk between sites along Kilburn High Road which is considered as a potential safety risk. However comments also supported the idea of expanding an 'outstanding' community school.
- 3% of comments referred to the loss of employment space. Respondents were keen to maintain employment space in the area and support mixed uses particularly residential and employment uses. Comments also highlighted that fact that more evidence is required to justify building new office space in the area.
- General comments also involved highlighting the fact that there is no consideration for a new doctor's surgery in the area. Some comments were concerned about the loss of local trees and green space in the area.
- However, 7 % of comments welcomed the idea of developing Liddell Road. They supported the idea of expanding a quality community school and the creation of public space and new housing in the area.

Other feedback

- An online petition was organised by a Conservative party campaign objecting to the height of the tall building. On 30 November 2014, this had 252 signatures ¹

4. Development Management Forum

- 4.1. The key themes recorded in the written consultation responses are mirrored in the comments made by residents attending the Development Management Forum. These are recorded in the notes of the meeting.
- 4.2. At this meeting there were requests for further views and sections of the proposals including the taller building that were not available as part of the presentation.
- 4.3. Residents and ward members asked for other options to be considered that might be able to deliver the council's objectives in a different way.

5. Public meeting 17 September – what we did

- 5.1. A further public meeting was held on 17 September 2014 at the request of members. This was chaired by Councillor Phil Jones, and addressed by Councillor Mason,

¹ <http://www.gopetition.com/petitions/noto14storeys/signatures.html>

Cabinet member for Children. We presented a summary of responses to the consultation and how changes made to the proposal as a result:

- Reduced height of the tall building from 14 to 11 storeys
- Reduced the number of housing units
- Added more trees and planting to the new open space
- Added 4 units affordable housing

5.2. Officers presented our evaluation of the option to move the tall building to the east and the positive aspects of the consultation proposal. The design team presented images and views of the new development to show the difference that the changes would make. The presentations are reproduced in Appendix E.

5.3. After the public meeting further responses were received from West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Forum and MILAM Residents Association. These letters and response from Councillor Mason, Cabinet Member for Children are reproduced in Appendix F and G respectively.

6. How our planning application addresses the issues raised in pre planning application.

The design, access and planning statement describes in detail how the planning application responds to the comments that have been made. The table below highlights how the outcomes of the pre planning application consultation have made a difference to the design.

Issue	Response in the planning application
Height of the tall housing block	The height of the tall building has been reduced to 11 storeys.
Views	The planning application includes views of the new development from different perspectives and in different season.
Affordable housing	We have introduced four units of affordable housing including a wheelchair unit for social rent.
Transport proposals	We have carried out a transport survey and analysed current traffic flows so that future capacity can be tested and mitigation measures provided.
Employment space	We have provided a workspace statement and undertaken soft market testing to confirm that there is demand for the managed workspace
Trees and open space	We have added more planting into the new open space and a green roof to the school

	development. We will not carry out any work to the Maygrove Road open space.
--	--

7. Further consultation opportunities

7.1. Local people will have an opportunity to comment on the proposals as part of the planning process.

Appendices

Appendix A	Summary of Consultation prior to 2014
Appendix B	Consultation Document 2014
Appendix C	Question and Answer document 2014
Appendix D.1	Letter from Kingsgate primary school
Appendix D.2	Letter from Sidings Community Centre
Appendix E	Presentations to public meeting 17 September 2014
Appendix F.1	Letter from West Hampstead and Fortune Green Neighbourhood Forum
Appendix F.2	Response from Councillor Angela Mason
Appendix G.1	Letter from MILAM Residents Association and
Appendix G.2	Response from Councillor Angela Mason
Appendix H	Notes of meeting with Network Rail 5 November 2014