

Summarised consolidation of initial design and landscape feedback provided by LB Camden officers to Developer Team during early stages of assessment of Camden Goods Yard application (2017/3847/P).

All content arises from officers' initial view of the proposals based on the information available at the relevant stage. It should not be interpreted that an amended application would be acceptable nor can it be held to prejudice formal determination of the planning application.

Building Design

Block A

We request the following bay details :

- Office link and work space unit – from South East elevation
- Base and typical corner resi detail – from North East elevation
- Resi bay - side details – of blind and typical bay – from south east elevation

Revisions sought to address:

- the workspaces shopfronts at the base of A
- a preference for a glazed end wall to face the steps up from the mid-landing
- detailing to the planters and hit-and-miss brickwork on the side wall of the ramp

Block E1

Request for more bay details

Request review of comments from the GLA

Block C

Workspace

- Please remove workspace recess facing Interchange Square and the workspace frontage come forward to the main building line. This would reduce opportunities for rough sleeping beside the community open space.

Front door

- The canopy line is not shown on the ground floor plan. We question the need for the canopy and the manner of its interface/relationship with the angled elevations.

Bay study 2

- There are some typos (?) on the materials key – for instance '7' identifies fascia but it is coping.
- Add precast concrete annotation 9 to drawings
- Need to see more detail of the balustrade and opaque glass fitting. We question whether a glazed balustrade is the best approach.

Roof

- We would like to see the rooftop plant equipment more clearly annotated on elevations.
- What are the white rectangles on the roof space beside the roof garden?
- The drawings show tree planting on the cycle park roof. How is this achieved?

Glazed link

All content arises from officers' initial view of the proposals based on the information available at the relevant stage. It should not be interpreted that an amended application would be acceptable nor can it be held to prejudice formal determination of the planning application

- We would like to see a bay study of the glazed link, including junctions with the main buildings. If it is to be glazed and apparently lightweight then it should have real transparency and touch the building lightly. However we also consider that there may be an opportunity for the glazed link to respond to the more robust industrial and railway heritage of the site (Das 4.7.2) and reflect the gantry style walkway images shown in the DAS p269.
- What is the additional depth of the floor buildup at roof level in the glazed link?

Elevation detail

- On the taller element of block C why is the brick band above level 7 taller than the lower bands?
- How are the soffits being detailed throughout the building?
- Is the signage approach to the retail accurate ? to be added in front of louvres?

Materials

- We would like more clarity on the proposed multi-grey brick.

Balconies

- We consider that adding a corner detail on the west elevation to recess the brickwork of the column would allow the horizontality in the brickwork to predominate but reduce the sharpness of the corner.

Block D

- Concerned about the massing on the element closest to the Interchange building. We question whether the rooftop framing device is required.
- The end elevation is too massive close to Interchange - can roof level pergola be lightened or removed?
- The whole elevation should be reduced by a bay or more at the upper levels, broken-up with a recess, or by a similar move. The elevation may then need to be reconsidered.

Materials

- We would like more clarity on the proposed dark buff brick, with reddish tones (DAS).
- We would like more clarity on the proposed openable terracotta panel
- What are the materials to the balconies facing on Interchange Square?
- What materials are the doors to the ground floor flats- glass or timber?
- We are not convinced by the appropriateness of the terracotta all along the gnd floor on the Interchange side. Need to review this alongside the revisions to the elevation.
- Are the doors to the cycle store and heating room glazed?

Front elevation

- The walkway planters are important design features, but are concerned about the practicality of delivering and maintaining them. The bay details show the balustrade running through the planter – but we don't follow this logic. How will the planters be easily maintained – ideally by residents and not a management co?
- It is essential that they lend themselves to easy access.

Rear elevation

- What is the motivation behind providing a winter garden at 2nd floor level – but terraces above?

All content arises from officers' initial view of the proposals based on the information available at the relevant stage. It should not be interpreted that an amended application would be acceptable nor can it be held to prejudice formal determination of the planning application

Bays

- We would like a sketch detail of how bay/fins etc would be constructed and connected to the building.
- We would like detailed assurances that the concrete canopies over the front doors can be delivered.
- We welcome the simple uniformity and consistency of the ground floor canopy, balcony roof and floor and planter material – but would like assurances about how they are all achievable.

Balconies

- We consider that the balustrade to 1st floor flat D1-10 need to be brick to give privacy to this exposed balcony. (see DAS page 271)

Retail unit

- Why is the plant equipment located on the roof of the retail unit so close to Gilbey's Yard?
- We are not convinced by the design of the retail unit.
- The parapet feels overbearing and diminishes the quality of the shopfront. The design is not convincing.

Petrol Filling Station

Require bay details as follows:

1. West (or north) end of CFR : shopfront detail and with office above – taken from 1650-PL-301
2. Juniper Crescent elevation – stairwell and glazing detail – taken from 1605-PL-303:
3. CFR Return of glazing element – for example from 1605-PL-201: junction and detail of glass element

Block B

Store elevation

- Would like to see the two bays beside the service entrance and between the two pairs of entrance door converted into functioning kiosks with active faces to the public realm.
- As an alternative a robust canopy could be incorporated on the ground floor elevation.
- Café missing from Section AA

Roundhouse Way

- Still concerned about the inset entrances along the street frontage – where the louvred heat exchange room has greater prominence and presence than the residential entrances. The entrances should be made more engaging and obvious along the frontage – setting up a dialogue with passers-by.
- Deepening the steel beam as expressed on the façade could help
- Differential recesses of the glazed and louvred elements beneath this overhang would help with a more engaging ground-plane.

Southampton Square

- Entrance to the urban farm needs greater prominence and distinction on the elevation.

All content arises from officers' initial view of the proposals based on the information available at the relevant stage. It should not be interpreted that an amended application would be acceptable nor can it be held to prejudice formal determination of the planning application

- We would like more information about the gantry design.

Balconies

- We consider that the 2nd floor balconies facing Southampton Square need enhanced privacy in order to ensure they are well used.
- Would like more clarity on the proposed balcony details on the Camden Yard elevation – note that there may be additional considerations for these balconies arising from the acoustic comments about noise exposure.
- We are not convinced that glazed balustrades on Roundhouse Way are the best approach.

Detailing

- We would like to be convinced that the corbelled brick stepping in the bay study can be achieved and will have any visual strength given the dimensions proposed, particularly when viewed close the building, above and through balconies.
- Bay study east elevation: is '9' metal balustrade or concrete?
- We would like more details about the giant signage – eg materials, method of fixing.

Block E2

Front elevation

- The front elevation of the 5-storey elements is not very satisfactory. The high solid to void ratio looks heavy. It feels like it needs something more ordered and less showy. The half landings make a feel like a tripartite arrangement, not a villa pairing.
- This could be remedied by the revising the staircase detail – for instance by raising the first void above the level of the double-height plinth. It would help if there was some sense of hierarchy, perhaps by making the 1st floor juliets wider.
- As the building that terminates the southward view on Roundhouse Way this needs attention. Note that the current design of E2 (see below) does not match the background detail in the North Elevation of Block F (1095_07_07_200):

Rear elevation

- We are concerned about the overlooking possibilities from the rear balconies to the railside units. They heighten concerns about loss of GY privacy but also seem a little redundant at the 2nd floor level.
- Need to examine the turning arrangements between E2 and E1 - and what about windows on end elevation?

Block F

Winding Vaults Way elevation

- We would encourage a swap in location of the garden/entrances on Winding Vaults Way so that the entrance to F3-1 is adjacent to the fire escape/substation– and not the front garden space: in order to improve the quality of the garden forecourt.

Access deck

- We are unclear why there are rooflights above the Disabled parking - it hinders the spaces on the amenity deck for little obvious purpose.

Specific queries

- Is there 1st floor access from F3-3, F3-2, F3-1 onto amenity deck? - no doors shown
- What is the extra build up ceiling of 4th floor to north east core?

All content arises from officers' initial view of the proposals based on the information available at the relevant stage. It should not be interpreted that an amended application would be acceptable nor can it be held to prejudice formal determination of the planning application

- Is the garden access between F3-12 and F2-14 the best use of amenity provision for a 1-b (which has 2 balconies) when the 3b5p (F3-15) beside has just one balcony and a smaller terrace?
- As above in the block E2 comment – the North Elevation has the wrong Block E2 design terminating Roundhouse Way.

Detailing

- Core F1 North Elevation : is there a need for so many juliets? If so these must be well detailed.
- Overall across the site we want to see variety and domesticity in balcony designs.
- The balconies to studios on north elevation 1st floor are somewhat redundant – it would be better to pull back the elevation at that level.

East elevation

- Would like to understand whether there are additional design features that can further mitigate the risk of overlooking between blocks F and B. The balustrade could provide some screening if detailed appropriately.
- Balcony details - bay 404 - inconsistency between section and elevation on balcony floors
- We would like to see more balustrade details for the south east corner.

South elevation

- Duplex gnd floor units: the entrances to the duplex units at ground floor feel under-proportioned. Although the brick banding detail is positive it appears to diminish the stature of the entrances.
- It may help to make the entrances in brick, and more substantial.
- The height of the brick banding above the entrances in DAS p327 seems deceptive when compared to the elevation drawings which show it as much deeper.

West elevation

- Shared core entrances look a little out of keeping with the rest of the building. The entrances to the upper floor cores don't appear grand or robust enough.

Landscape

- We wish to see a greater prevalence of soft landscaping across the site, planting which supports a greater sense of 'greenness' and a modified approach to the character of various spaces across the site.
- There is a linked concern about how the ground floor treatment of some buildings complements and supports the activities in the public realm and character of the routes and spaces.
- The balance between 'civic space' and 'green space' in the scheme is skewed towards the former. We are of the view that the balance should be shifted towards more green space, incorporating green areas which serve as un-programmed grassy space and other green spaces which perform a stronger role in providing green visual amenity.

Southampton Square

- The character of Southampton Square should be strengthened to feel much more like a 'garden space' for the future residents.
- Should be greener with more enclosure (eg a robust hedge) and more internal separation of activities, to allow different types of users to occupy the space at the same time.
- Public routes within the area (eg Gilbey's Yard to Camden Yard) need to be formally directed around the garden.
- We would like to see the southern half of the play area grassed as a general purpose green space/lawn and separated from the play area by a hedge. The whole of the gardens (including the element near to the CY steps) need to be enclosed – although there can be a break in the boundary adjacent to the retail unit
- We welcome the narrowing of the walkway along the north of the Square, but are concerned about the potential impact of comings and goings from the Chili Farm on the immediately adjoining residents. There needs to be a clear area (eg an apron of space) directly in front of the Chili farm entrance which allows for convenient servicing and queueing/arrivals/departures of visitors to the Farm.
- Consider that the north boundary of the Square may need to move south to allow for a shallow bed of planting on the public side of the fence along the ground floor duplex units. We would like to explore these issues in more detail.

Engine House Way

- We would like to explore the potential of the wildflower meadow to be bounded on the railway side with a treatment that makes it more visually appealing than just a railway-safe wire fence.
- Would like to see the area given over to green space maximised as far as possible, and exploration of narrowing the road width on the first stretch of road from the roundabout.
- Would like to see exploration of introducing chicanes or other features to allow more build out with planting.
- We would like to understand the relationship between on-street disabled parking bays and which units they would serve.

Interchange Yard

- Have concerns about how IY reconciles the framework objectives of supporting both a strategic route and a sustainable and well-used community space. In our view the design needs to be revisited to provide more clarity of vision.
- There are various possible scenarios which would influence the final form of the Yard and the design for the space will need to be re-visited before it is implemented, in order

All content arises from officers' initial view of the proposals based on the information available at the relevant stage. It should not be interpreted that an amended application would be acceptable nor can it be held to prejudice formal determination of the planning application

to take account of any shift in the developments adjoining the site (eg to provide the Camden Lock Place link). This needs further discussion and significant revision.

- We also need to see an illustrative scheme which includes the potential link to Camden Lock Place.

Makers Yard

- We recommend that the space is more closely re-focused on supporting the potential for year-round maker activities in the surrounding workshops (for example by use of fixed/foldable canopies etc).

Chalk Farm Road pocket park

- This space lacks a convincing vision and design possibilities are constrained/hampered by the uncertainty about the sub-station and the relationship with the new PFS.
- We consider that this location offers a significant opportunity to meet a specific local need by providing a youth recreation space.

Goods Yard

- The soft landscaping and integrated play areas next to the bus stops and the way that the landscaping is accessed and divided by through routes needs reviewing to ensure that the landscape is sufficiently robust and maintainable to be sustainable and deliver the green qualities that are indicated.
- The treatment and quality of the mid-landing point is still unclear.

SUDs

- We would like to understand more about how the rain garden in the Goods Yard will be delivered. In general we would like to understand how visible incorporation of SUDs features into the landscaping across the scheme could be accommodated.

Railway Park

- We would like to see this area 'greened up' and the character shifted to become more semi-natural along a greater extent of its length.
- We consider that there is significant scope to achieve this by :
 - Removing the outdoor gym/calisthenics component (and potentially provide this function in the Chalk Farm Road Pocket Park – see above). This location is also sensitive to bats so there is a preference for low key lighting.
 - Move the linear route closer to block C thereby allowing a wider bank of green space along the railway boundary.
 - Not convinced by the mounding above the workspace arches. We would prefer to see this replaced by semi-natural green space, bounded by seating facing outwards towards Block B. We would also like to see planters along the low wall which would allow greenery to spill out over the top of the workspace arches.
- Not convinced that this part of the railway edge needs to be gated.

Camden Yard

- The micro-climate suggests that it would be better suited to including more hard landscape features – such as additional cycle parking stands in the middle of the space, adjacent to the main route to/from the steps.
- Would like to see the possibility of the wall which forms a backdrop to the steps (just beside the railway bridge entrance) being considered for use as an urban canvas – a prominent location for temporary artworks.

All content arises from officers' initial view of the proposals based on the information available at the relevant stage. It should not be interpreted that an amended application would be acceptable nor can it be held to prejudice formal determination of the planning application

- Would like to see small planting zones at the base of the arches which would allow climbers to grow up the wall.
- Concerned at the extent of inactive frontage along the base of B. Would like to see a review of the extent and placement of dead frontage given over to fire escapes etc to ensure that the optimal potential for street level activation is achieved.

Winding Vaults Way

- The DAS image p168 (WVW looking east) doesn't match the softworks plan. The smaller image on 169 is perhaps closer to the scheme?

Play strategy

- We consider that the balance between 'incidental' play provision and focal points for play suitable has led to an over-reliance on incident play.
- We would like to see a broader range of play potential in Interchange Yard. The scale of the Yard should lend itself more to the variety and provision of a neighbourhood play space (Mayors SPG) rather than a local playspace.
- We consider that the layout of the winding vault way (east, adjacent to Interchange Yard) could be improved to make it more conducive to use as a playable street, with a more meandering style approach to the road as usually adopted by traditional homezones. The areas of planting could be adjusted.

Cycle parking

- The variety and extent of activities and on the site need to be supported by more cycle parking in the public realm. Areas of major commercial entrances such as Roundhouse Way should be supported by cycle stands which are in plain sight – ideally in the median strip down Roundhouse Way. Similarly Camden Yard and Makers Yard would benefit from more cycle stands. The cycle stands outside Block C should be moved to the wide area of hard landscape beside the steps, opposite the Gym. It is unclear what purpose the cycle stands at the railway end of Windings Vaults Way (west) will serve.

October 2017

All content arises from officers' initial view of the proposals based on the information available at the relevant stage. It should not be interpreted that an amended application would be acceptable nor can it be held to prejudice formal determination of the planning application