

MINUTES OF MEETING



CHARTERED SURVEYORS

5 Bolton Street

London

W1J 8BA

Tel: 020 7493 4002

Fax: 020 7312 7548

www.montagu-evans.co.uk

Subject Chester Gate Garden – Planning Committee
Date of Meeting: Thursday 8 September 2016
Location of Meeting: Council Chamber, Town Hall, Judd Street, London WC1H 9JE

Attendees:

<i>Name:</i>	<i>Representing:</i>
Councillor Heather Johnson (Chair) (Regent's Park) (L)	LB Camden
Councillor Roger Freeman (Vice- Chair) (Swiss Cottage) (C)	
Councillor Danny Beales, Cantelowes (L)	
Councillor Richard Cotton, Camden Town with Primrose Hill (L)	
Councillor Sally Gimson, Highgate (L)	
Councillor Adam Harrison, Bloomsbury (L)	
Councillor Phil Jones, Cantelowes (L)	
Councillor Andrew Marshall, Swiss Cottage (C)	
Councillor Richard Olszewski, Fortune Green (L)	
Councillor Lazzaro Pietragnoli, Camden Town with Primrose Hill (L)	
Councillor Flick Rea, Fortune Green (LD)	
Councillor Phil Rosenberg, West Hampstead (L) - Absent	
Councillor Stephen Stark, Hampstead Town (C)	
Councillor Sue Vincent, Holborn and Covent Garden (L) - Absent	
Councillor Abi Wood, Haverstock (L) - Absent	
Councillor James Yarde, West Hampstead (L)	
Elizabeth Beaumont (Acting Development Management Manager)	LB Camden
Simon Dunn-Lwin (Team Manager)	
Alfie Stroud (Conservation and Design Officer)	
Steve Cardno (Transport Officer)	

Chris Miele
George Steele
Robert Myers
Francesca Cordeiro

Montagu Evans
Caneparo Associates
Robert Myers Associates
Chairman of Chester Terrace
Resident's Association

ITEM		ACTION
<p>1 Simon Dunn-Lwin</p>	<p>Officer Presentation of Proposal</p> <p>The land at Chester Gate adjacent to 6 – 10 Cambridge Terrace. The application to reinstate a historic garden on Chester Gate at the end of the Terrace and associated works there is a Planning Application and a Listed Building Consent Application. I ought to refer to some late representations that were received after the supplementary report was published yesterday morning. I am just going to read out some names of some further objections that came in, some of them are repeated objections raising the same issues.</p> <p>All the issues are addressed in the report and it is largely again on heritage issues and on transport traffic impact issues and if I may read out the names, I know we are on record with the public, A Mildred Keve, Sandy Sandu, Michael Webber, Francesca Codero, David Hogan and a Kevin Mackenzie who made further representations. As I say some of them are repeated objections received.</p> <p>Turning to the application, I think everyone will know where Regents Park is and the outer circle. The site is located at the end of Cambridge Terrace. It is currently a foot path to the side of the property at number 10. This is a recent picture taken by the Case Officer where some works are being carried out. There is a previous recent Planning Consent from the change of use of the property from offices to a house.</p> <p>The proposal takes part of the footpath, narrowing the road, extending the footpath out. This is an aerial shot of how it will look. This is an historical plan of how it was originally under Nash's original design for the Terrace.</p> <p>There are 12 on-street car parking spaces and with the proposed garden, 6 of these will be relocated behind 1-2 Chester Terrace. Chester Gate is a private road and part of the Crown Estate and it is permit parking only. This is an elevation of the side of the property on how it would look, this is the view of the front, proposed elevation to the front, an artist's impression. This is a CGI which shows an existing view towards Regents Park from Albany Street and this is with the proposal in place and this is how it will look. So Chester Gate is quite narrow towards Albany Street it will maintain that width all the way down, we have had transport impact assessments submitted by the applicant.</p> <p>The Crown Estates Paving Commission who are the land owners and the Highway Authority. The enforcement is carried out by the Met Police, they have no objections of the proposal. Our own Highway Officer who is here has looked at the detail of that, these are</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>further images of the historical plans. All of the representations are clearly set out in the report, quite extensively. The recommendation is to approve subject to conditions and a Legal Agreement requiring a Stopping Up Order.</p>	
<p>2 Chair</p>	<p>Thank you for that. Ok, we have deputations now. So the first deputation is Francesca Codero speaking against the application. Francesca you have 5 minutes and I will tell you when you have a minute left.</p>	
<p>3 Francesca Cordeiro</p>	<p>Objector Deputation</p> <p>Thank you Chair and Members of the Committee. I am Chairman of Chester Terrace Residents Association and I am also representing 37 objectors from Chester Gate, Albany Street, Chester Close South and Chester Close North. Chester Gate is an important thorough fair for a large number of Camden rate payers. In addition to those who only live 100 yards from the park it is also used by thousands of others who either walk, cycle or drive through Chester Gate every day.</p> <p>It is with dismay and absolute astonishment that we learnt that the Planning Officers recommendation to this panel, whittled down 37 objections into just 123 words.</p> <p>Our objections briefly are, the traffic consequences if the application was to be granted, the application proposes a windy tortious route that will narrow the passage for pedestrians, cyclists and traffic through Chester Gate by reducing the current two lanes to a single lane. This in itself will create problems to traffic flow but in addition no consideration has been given to the cycle super highway 11 or to high speed 2.</p> <p>CS11 will be closing all main gates into Regents Park and create a huge amount of traffic through Chester Gate, as will the changes to HS2 where Chester Gate is the key east west link and HS2 is not a temporary situation it will go on for at least 16 years. Both HS2 and CS11 will result in absolute gridlock and chaos on Chester Gate. Section 70, para 2 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires Camden to consider provisions of development plan so far as it is material to the application and to any other material considerations and clearly consideration of this has not been adequately given in the recommendation from the Planning Officer. The Planning Application fails to address the current London Plan Policy 6.2 providing London travel capacity. So therefore with regards to the traffic consequences we request that consideration of the planning application is postponed until the full impact of the CS11 and HS2 is known.</p> <p>The second objection is on the grounds of the heritage reinstatement. Dr Geoffrey Tyack is the leading academic and the independent John Nash Authority not only in the UK but in the world and he is based at Oxford University. He submitted a report objecting to the application to the committee and he has clearly demonstrated that the Planning Application is not a reinstatement. He provides conclusive evidence that a garden did not exist during the working life of John Nash nor did Nash ever design a garden in Chester Gate. Dr Tyack clearly states that what is being proposed now is not a reinstatement of a garden designed</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>by Mr Nash or even of a Victorian garden transiently present in 1875 but the creation of the new private garden through the appropriation of space that has been in the public domain for 190 years. We cannot fathom why this unequivocal evidence from an expert is being ignored by Camden and why they have not provided any counter evidence of an equivalent independent authority and we request that Camden review the restatement claim.</p> <p>The third objection concerns health and safety and briefly this basically means that you will have increasing problems with air pollution and also with the difficulty of traffic to pass remembering that this is against Public Transport Document Policy 6.9 and also Development Policies DP17 and DP21.</p> <p>The fourth issues is loss of car parking spaces and what is in the statement is incorrect there is confusion about the loss of permit parking spaces in fact the number goes down from 12 to 4 or 5 and it actually relies on private land and private arrangements at the back of Chester Gate which there is no real confidence that it will be carried on when the property changes hands.</p> <p>So in conclusion it is clear that the sole motivation of the application is not to increase the heritage value of Regents Park but to increase the luxury and privilege of a private home. Regents Park is a very special site of national historic importance and this application understandably commanded national media coverage and Camden is about to make a catastrophic error that will echo through history if this Committee does not reject this application.</p>	
<p>4 Chair</p>	<p>Thank you very much for that. We now also have Dr Chris Miele and Robert Myers are the Agents to speak in favour of the applicant.</p>	
<p>5 Chris Miele</p>	<p>Actually Chair we have a third member which we told the Committee Clerk about is on transport, George Steele, I am Chris Miele and I am going to invite George Steele to talk about transport matters in the first instance and we are the Planning Agents on the application.</p>	
<p>6 Chair</p>	<p>Ok you have 5 minutes between you and if you get to the end of 5 minutes and you all haven't spoken then that is it. I mean with 3 of you, can you time it yourself because I will tell you when you have a minute left.</p>	
<p>7 George Steele</p>	<p>Good evening, my name is George Steel. I am the Highway Consultants acting for the applicant. We have been working on this scheme for close to 2 years now alongside Camden Highways, with whom we have had regular discussions and also the Crown State Paving Commission.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
<p>8 Robert Myers</p>	<p>To summarise briefly a response to the comments received, with regards to CS11 and HS2, they have been through the consultation phase and they are not yet approved as such and that is an important consideration to bear in mind. They are not yet finalised and we don't know when they will be.</p> <p>Also it is important to bear in mind that Chester Gate already has restricted access, with access available only to residents, taxis and goods vehicles servicing the properties. It is not open to all general traffic. Even if CS11 and HS2 were to come forward and setting aside the existing restrictions on Chester Gate, TFL have concluded from the studies so far that there will be a significant reduction in the traffic through Regents Park.</p> <p>Therefore there is no reason to believe there would actually be an increase in traffic on Chester Gate.</p> <p>In terms of air pollution, if there is going to be a reduction in traffic in Regents Park then it is reasonable to assume that there won't be an increase in air pollution.</p> <p>In terms of highway safety, we had an independent road safety auditor carry out a review of our proposals they did not come up with any issues deemed to be severe with regards to safety.</p> <p>With regards to reducing the two lanes to one in Chester Gate, this will provide benefits in terms of visibility to the junction with the Outer Circle.</p> <p>Just lastly in terms of the parking situation, there are 12 spaces in total, we are retaining a total of 12 spaces. Those spaces that are being displaced are being re-provided at the rear of 1 and 2 Chester Gate. There would be no loss of parking and there is a pre commencement condition requiring these are provided to ensure no loss of parking.</p> <p>Just on the heritage points, I am Robert Myers, a landscape architect specialising in historic landscapes. We prepared the landscape proposals for this scheme based on the historic evidence as well as previously designing the approved scheme for the restoration of the adjacent Cambridge Terrace garden.</p> <p>Two claims have been made by the objector, that this garden was not part of Nash's plan for this part of the park or designed by him and that the garden was not in existence for very long.</p> <p>We do not understand the basis for these claims, we have seen a drawing from Nash's own office from 1825 which clearly shows this garden space and in our proposal we reproduced the size and location of this space exactly.</p> <p>Gardens such as this was integral for Nash's design philosophy of the metropolitan picturesque where buildings were placed in a park setting and the landscape of the park</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
<p>9 Chris Miele</p>	<p>extended into the surrounding streets, framing the buildings at either end.</p> <p>So the 1825 plan shows that the garden was an intended part of the Nash plan and it appears cartographically for the first time in detailed survey plan by Mayhew in 1834 to 1835 in the exact same location with a layout trees and lawns very much in the Nash manner.</p> <p>The 1872 ordnance survey plan again shows the garden in the same location, it disappears from the 1890 ordnance survey plan which the CEPC believed was a result of road widening works in 1873.</p> <p>So it clearly existed for at least 39 years and is consistent with Nash’s overall plan for Regents Park. This has led the CEPC to conclude in their letter that I quote “the original garden area did exist from quite early in the development of Regents Park and it was of a form similar to that in the application”.</p> <p>Just to sum up Chair from a planning perspective, I do not think I need to remind members of the great weight statue attaches to both preservation of heritage assets and an enhancement of their significance, which is reflected of course in national policy and the Council’s development plan policies.</p> <p>In my experience, this is quite a unique situation where an effort is being made to restore an important landscape feature that clearly was original to an element of Camden’s heritage which is of international significance. So in terms of planning considerations, very considerable weight must go to that point.</p>	
<p>Chair</p>	<p>Thank you very much for that.</p>	
<p>10 Francesca Cordeiro</p>	<p>We were not allowed to show any slides but perhaps the panel would like to see the original Nash picture which clearly shows no original garden.</p>	
<p>Chair</p>	<p>Are members that interested in seeing this plan? Have we got a slide of that? Did we have that originally?</p>	
<p>Robert Myers</p>	<p>In which case, I don’t want to trade plans but there is a copy of a plan from 1825 from Nash’s own offices showing a garden.</p>	
<p>Chair</p>	<p>I don’t want arguments about what was original and what wasn’t. Can I just ask a question and I am happy to ask the applicants or the officers. I am looking at this ordnance survey map of 1870 that shows a garden in place, so I do not have reason to deny that there was a garden there in 1870, but that looks very much to me a garden with a path through it so people can walk around and that looks very much like a public access. So do we know if this was private garden or public garden in 1870? It certainly looks to me like it was a public</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
AS	<p>garden and not a private garden because why would you have a pathway coming from the road.</p> <p>I have not seen any evidence to say definitely whether that was public access garden or not but you have drawn your own conclusion of the plan and that seems to be a reasonable interpretation.</p>	
Cllr Danny Beales	<p>That would seem like a crucial question and it would seem from the evidence we have from 1870 that the best guess that it would seem logical that it would be a public green space because it doesn't directly connect to any residential properties, otherwise it is logical to have a path. However, this is conjecture just like what Nash originally envisaged is also conjecture.</p> <p>For me a crucial part of the report is page 671 and the Geoffrey Tyack quote which is mentioned by the objectors which says that what being proposed now is not a reinstatement of a garden designed by John Nash or even the Victorian garden in the survey map which is the point raised by the chair which was significantly narrower than the garden now proposed with a creation of a new private garden with the appropriation of space that has been in the public domain for the last 190 years. On that point this is the loss of currently publicly accessible space which is for me deeply troubling.</p> <p>On page 680, two very short paragraphs deal with the loss of the public highway and public accessible space. For me it didn't really go into whether this is a positive or negative or whether it was an acceptable downside for wider public gains or any conservation gains, I think it dismisses this integral and crucial point quite a lot.</p> <p>It also goes without saying that whilst this may be in some way be connected to a previous iteration of the landscape, Nash also did not design these homes in the context that they are now in. Regents Park Estate was not there in 1820 but it is now.</p> <p>There are a number of residents living in blocks, very deprived residents living quite removed from the park. Narrowing this road which is pretty much their only access point and it is still quite a difficult access point to get access to the park, I think will be a really retrograde step which will make it less welcoming to walk down whilst making it a much more pleasant experience for the private individual who owns the property.</p> <p>The point raised by the objectors about pedestrian access is also valid. This currently has quite a direct pathway for pedestrians, but this garden creates quite a wide, round pavement that is indirect and people cannot walk directly down the street they now have to walk round in a square to walk back round again due to the loop of the corner and I think that is not a pleasant or useful experience for pedestrians.</p> <p>I think that the enclave which has now been created which is Cambridge Mews I think it might be, but it has basically created an area which is no longer overlooked by the street. It may be sheltered by trees or bushes, resulting in a small enclave where people could</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>congregate and I believe that that could potentially be a source of anti-social behaviour, and again that hasn't been dealt in the report which I think is quite concerning.</p> <p>For me there is significant harm to residential amenity of local residents and very little public benefit in exchange.</p> <p>Cllr Flick Rea A couple of things, one is that the size of the proposed garden is virtually the same width as the one in the drawing, it is parallel to the building line which goes out to the bottom of Chester Gate. If you look at the building line, it is almost exactly identical.</p> <p>The second is I am not actually certain that it might have been a public pathway, the plan from 1870 I am presuming shows the access to the garden is from the side of Cambridge Terrace, I think it probably always was.</p> <p>It would be very nice actually to walk in one end and out the other, I don't see any reason why it shouldn't, I think presumably to protect your front door from the hordes of people that would come through Chester Gate and vandalise it.</p> <p>The point is that it is charming I like it, but I don't think you should have it all to yourself, I think it should allowed to be walked through, if you look at the 1870 plan, the pathway seems to come out at the bottom and doesn't appear to come out the top, but I cannot see why the public shouldn't have a nice little garden to walk through.</p> <p>I don't think your point (Cllr Danny Beales) about Cambridge Mews applies because actually that is still overlooked by the public highway.</p> <p>Finally obviously originally Chester Gate was quite a narrow road and it was widened at some point, I think on balance I am quite happy with it but I do think you would get far more sympathy if it was an open public space because it isn't enhancing very much.</p>	
<p>11 Alfie Stroud</p>	<p>ENTER TOPIC HERE</p> <p>With regard to the questions on design impact, we consider there to be benefits to this scheme in our judgement on the existing situation, which is at the setting of the listed buildings and to the conservation area in general.</p> <p>The attempt to recreate a landscape element which did exist historically, while not exactly in this form but a garden in this location and also which was part of an original vision by Nash, albeit one that was not realised or realised in the same form.</p> <p>So there are benefits to the setting by recreating a lost historic element which is something the conservation area management plan calls for in its policies for Regents Park. There is also, slightly off design, it is generally agreed that private gardens can provide public amenity by providing views of trees and views into those gardens. We consider there is an amenity benefit as well as a benefit to the streetscape in design and appearance terms.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>On the matter of public and private access, the proposal before us is for a private accessible garden. It is important to say that we do not have decisive evidence as to when or whether it was publicly accessible. A survey plan from 1835 appears to show a consistent boundary around the garden, so it is not possible to say for sure whether it was historically a publicly accessible space.</p>	
Chair	<p>I also wondered if the width of the pavement was the same because it looks as if it is narrower with the proposals.</p>	
Steve Cardno	<p>If I address Councillor Beale's comment first about the footway.</p> <p>If members approve the scheme tonight, the Crown Estate Pavement Commission or the applicant under their agreement would have to essentially realign that footway. I do accept your point that it would introduce a kink into that footway. I think what I would say from my observations, I personally feel most pedestrians walk on the north side of the road. I do admit it is difficult to tell that because of the hoarding that is in place at the moment, because that footway is essentially closed.</p> <p>I would have thought that the proposal to narrow the road would actually improve things for pedestrians because pedestrians who currently have to cross a wide road. It is a very wide road for the amount of traffic that currently uses it and speeds are quite high as a result of that. So narrowing the road makes it easier for pedestrians to cross, they can choose which side of the road to walk on, and it might be more pleasant to walk on the south side with a new garden.</p> <p>When we had pre-application discussions with the applicant I did raise concerns about capacity at the junction with the outer circle. The applicant did traffic counts to compare the existing with the proposed situations and they were able to demonstrate that in the proposed scenario the junction would still operate well within the capacity so officers did not have any concerns in that regard.</p> <p>Regarding CS11 and HS2, I did consider those major schemes but as Mr Steele pointed out neither of the schemes have been approved yet and both have undergone consultation. I am sure you are probably thinking that both schemes will go ahead, HS2 certainly will. CS11 has been progressing for 6 years now and we still do not have anything built yet. Looking at the consultations responses, it has a positive response of 62% support or partially supportive. But Westminster have objected, Camden are supportive but we have some major reservation, for example we are very concerned about traffic displacement on to Albany Street. But as regards to potential impact on Chester Gate, officers are not in a position to actually quantify what those cumulative impacts might be.</p> <p>TFL have just agreed yesterday to do some modelling to tell us what the impact on Albany Street might be. At present I do not have any reason to say that traffic will increase substantially because of CS11. Chester Gate would not be the only gate still open to the park on peak periods, there are other gates that remain open.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
<p>Cllr Richard Olszewski</p>	<p>I have had my doubts about this. There is no doubt that if you were driving or walking past this, it might be nice to see but it has limited public benefit, it is private open space.</p> <p>I am concerned that we haven't got a definitive answer about the width of the pavements, I am also seriously concerned about the kink at Cambridge Terrace Mews in terms of pedestrian safety. If you were walking in from Cambridge Gate, you are not going to deviate, you go for the shortest line, and the shortest line will be on the outside of the parked cars because that is where the pavement goes. So I have some doubts about what that will do for pedestrian safety.</p> <p>I am a fairly regular user of Chester Gate as a motorist, but it is a fairly busy road and I would be concerned about narrowing that. It might well be the case that it might be hard to quantify the impact of schemes that have not yet formally been approved but we wouldn't be able to reverse this permission and construction if they were to be approved and resulted in issues or problems such as traffic backing on to Albany Street because it gets too busy.</p> <p>Also we closed down the options for the future, should the increase in cycling continue, because then we have less road space available to utilise either solely for cycling or for accommodation of road users.</p> <p>I think there are significant draw backs to this, which makes me doubtful about approving this unless someone can come up with something more persuasive.</p>	
<p>Cllr Richard Cotton</p>	<p>One of the details of objections we received on page 74 and 75 of our supplementary papers says that the Victorian garden was removed in 1873 to improve the flow of traffic, I suspect the flow of traffic has increased somewhat since then.</p> <p>The same objection was pointed out the impacts of the proposed CS11 and HS2, we should in the very least be taking account of them. The second point is that this seems to be a transfer of public space to private space and that surely runs counter to our planning policies.</p>	
<p>Cllr Lazzaro Pietragnoli</p>	<p>I got one question for the Conversation Officer which is, if he is aware of any other lost or existing end of terrace garden in the area because my impression is that this was not one of the original features of Nash's plan, it was a later addition. It was definitely an addition that we have evidence it was there for 39 years but then it has not been there for 140 something years, during which the traffic has changed, people at the time used carriages now we use cars, so the balance between the arguments that this garden can provide and the loss of benefits for the residents in my opinion does not match.</p> <p>The other question is about the terrible design of the pedestrian side of that part of the street. People use the south side instead of north side is because the other one there are dropped curbs. If I think about elderly people with walking problems or mums with prams going from the Regents Park Estates to Regents Park they will not go to the other side because they will go up and down. They will use the other side which at the moment is a straight pavement</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
<p>Cllr Danny Beales</p> <p>Cllr Stephen Stark Elizabeth Beaumont</p>	<p>and it is going to be a curved pavement.</p> <p>The third problem is a problem of security. We are going to create an enclave with bushes and trees which possibly at night is going to be a catalyst for some sort of activities that people would carry out in dark corners out of Albany Street, whether they are going to use it for drug dealing and other things I do not know but I would say that there are security issues about that corner.</p> <p>It seems to me we are righting it off half of the road for pedestrians saying that it is not very nice for pedestrians but they have got the other side and I don't think that's good enough. I think this is clearly prioritising less sustainable forms of transport which is contrary to Camden's priorities. It is prioritising road users and not pedestrians and I think it makes it less hospitable for cyclists. The existing wider road, although not segregated (and we are abandoning any hope that it could be segregated if the proposals is approved) means cyclists can be out of the way of cars is presumably better than one where there is now going to be fast traffic.</p> <p>I think clearly a narrow pavement would very inconvenient for pedestrians. It has very limited public benefits apart from pedestrians using the other side of the road can look at some trees now.</p> <p>Just wanted to pick up on Councillor Cottons comment against Camden's policy of converting public to private. Can officers elaborate on that please?</p> <p>It might be worth just pointing out 2 things in terms of public benefits of this scheme but you will note in the report that it talks about the NPPF and where there is substantial harm. In this case the officers assess there would not be any harm and therefore there is not a need to look at what the wider public benefit might be.</p> <p>If members are saying something different, then obviously that is members' ability to say that, but what officers are saying that there is no harm from the proposal and therefore we not need to look at the public benefits.</p> <p>With regards to our policies on private and public open space they do really relate to designated open space i.e. parks or designated land. This strip of land as far as I am aware, is not designated as public or private space so we cannot apply those planning policies in the manner we would if it was an application for a part of the park or other designated open space. Transport might want to respond on some of the issues about the width of the pavement.</p>	
<p>12 Simon Dunn-Lwin</p>	<p>ENTER TOPIC HERE</p> <p>Can I just expand on that please, because it is actually private land and it is not public land. The public has a right to pass and repass over it and hence the legal agreement requiring a Stopping Up Order but it is private land. The question was do we have specific policies about private land and public open space. This is a private highway.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
<p>Council's Legal Advisor</p>	<p>If permission were granted, a separate legal process would be required for stopping-up of the highway.</p> <p>Camden has strategic policies regarding connectivity and facilitating access, so member's views on this are not inconsistent with policies which seek to maintain linkages between spaces.</p>	
<p>Cllr Roger Freeman</p>	<p>Which vehicles can use Chester Gate, so what is your understanding. Is Chester Gate a Camden Road or a CEPC road and what traffic restrictions are there currently?</p>	
<p>Steve Cardno</p>	<p>Chester Gate is a private road maintained by the Crown Estates Pavement Commission, so it is nothing to do with Camden. As Councillor Beales pointed out it is a public right of way.</p> <p>Refuse vehicles and lorries that are visiting a resident that lives in the park for example can use Chester Gate or taxis, local residents, permit holders and people who have business in the park.</p>	
<p>Cllr Richard Olszewski</p>	<p>A further observation about the passage along Chester Gate, it will also be a kinked driving route for cars driving through there, they will have to move left or right in order to get along Chester Gate rather than in a relatively straight line at the moment.</p>	
<p>Alfie Stroud</p>	<p>In response to Councillor Pietranogli's point, there is a very complex history here, you will note on the south side of Cambridge Terrace that there is a soft landscaping feature which would roughly mirror what is proposed here. So there are lots of other features, lost features in the landscape of Regents Park.</p> <p>There is a very complex history about what was instated and what Nash's vision was, but it is generally the aspiration of community and heritage organisations in the area to try and reinstate some of Nash's original vision. We have imposed a condition asking the applicants to speak to the Crown Estates Paving Commission and the CAAC regarding the design of the landscaping to ensure it matches the wider vision.</p> <p>Not only is there no harm identified with the heritage assets here but we do think that there are public benefits to heritage assets by improving their setting and improving the street scape generally with a new area of green landscaping.</p>	
<p>Chair</p>	<p>I am going to have to get you to vote now as I do not want to have to adjourn this one and come back another day. The recommendation is to grant conditional planning permission subject to a section 106 agreement and to grant conditional listed building consent:</p> <p>In favour: Cllr Roger Freeman</p> <p>Against: Cllr Danny Beales, Cllr Richard Cotton, Cllr Sally Gimson, Cllr Adam Harrison, Cllr Phil Jones, Cllr Andrew Marshall, Cllr Richard Olszewski, Cllr Lazzaro Pietragnoli, Cllr</p>	

MINUTES OF MEETING

ITEM		ACTION
<p>Elizabeth Beaumont</p> <p>Cllr Richard Olszewski</p> <p>Cllr Danny Beales</p> <p>Head of Development</p> <p>Cllr Flick Rea</p> <p>Chair</p>	<p>Stephen Stark & Cllr James Yarde</p> <p>Abstain: Cllr Flick Rea</p> <p>The concerns that I heard members saying were that you did consider that there was an impact and therefore lack of public benefit from the proposals, impact on transport and pedestrian's safety and that can incorporate a number of the issues, such as connectivity, so those are the 2 particular issues that I took from what you were saying.</p> <p>Also the restriction of the available road space.</p> <p>I think there was a judgement that the benefit here was the heritage benefit and there was no harm to the conservation area. I think members had questions as to whether there was a heritage benefit because the heritage history is quite questionable, it was a different design space so I think there is questions backed up about some historical view that actually that wouldn't actually be an historical benefit.</p> <p>A couple of members also mentioned the anti-social behaviour problems from creating a slightly enclosed space without a public view of the road.</p> <p>I would say that would be within the pedestrian safety reason and then in terms of what I said about public benefits, members do consider the proposals to result in less than substantial harm and that there is no public benefits arising from the proposals.</p> <p>I think you have got to be careful in the historical side because there are different views on both sides.</p> <p>I think that's right, that is what Councillor Beales was saying was not demonstrated and we don't think that it has a heritage advantage. Can I delegate the wording to officers please.</p> <p>End of Committee.</p>	