

MOUNT PLEASANT NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

Jonathan McClue

Camden Planning Dept

Ref: 2019/2879/P Eastman Dental Hospital redevelopment

SECOND STATEMENT OF OBJECTION AND REQUEST FOR MITIGATION UNDER SECTION 105

OBJECTION SUMMARY

You have our detailed objection which has already been included on your Objections webpage. We append the following up-dated summary

- **The application itself is rushed and inadequate**
 - We do not yet know if this application is on the Agenda for the Planning Committee meeting on Sept 19th, although we do know Camden planners are aiming to have this ready for consideration by the committee on this date. **Why rush this through, since it could equally well be heard at the next planning meeting in October?** Is this urgency prompted by some financial deadline the applicant UCL faces, which they have not shared with their consultees? (? surely not Brexit –dependent money?) We have tried to find out the reasons for this inflexible timetable UCL is working to, but cannot get a straight answer. UCL told us, as an aside, that they would lose £480,000 for the dementia project if the decision was not made in September, but would not say more. This question should be answered in full at the Planning Committee meeting. There should be some clarity about this urgency, not the present secrecy -which inevitably makes people ask questions and query planning impartiality.
 - **The rush to get this application heard on Sept 19th is unfair on the Calthorpe Community Garden**, who will be unlikely to present adequate responses, by that date, to either the required information on a potential Sec 105 settlement, or on CCG's civil law agreement with UCL over the disturbances and losses they will suffer. CCG's team do not have the skills nor professional advice to present these documents quickly, since their needs for mitigation are complex and involve the survival of their whole enterprise. We think this rushed deadline puts them at an unfair disadvantage. **They need more time, and would prefer any planning decisions on Section agreements to be deferred to a later date.** We agree.
 - **This is an application for a "state of the art world-centre for dementia research" but the planning application is far from adequate, nor does it meet professional standards;** it is thin on facts (such as why the dementia research block has to be exactly the size and shape proposed), and does not deal comprehensively, indeed hardly at all, with the effects of the proposals on the immediate neighbourhood. It appears that UCL's attempt to follow Camden's planning guidance to develop the site comprehensively is inadequate and we are surprised that Camden have not told them so. *(We have given details in our previous objection, already on the table).*
- **The consultation process was inadequate, since it became clear the plans had been decided on in advance.** UCL were unwilling or unable to redesign any part of their project, and the changes they did make were small and tokenistic. There was no real discussion only a "sales pitch" (for people to like their product), and unreasonable demands, in our opinion, were made on the local neighbours, CCG in particular.
- **The proposed design is not suitable for the site, not suitable for the Conservation Area, nor for the immediate neighbourhood; it disadvantages its immediate neighbours and offers no community gain.** The design could have been amended but UCL feel unable or unwilling to do this. **We would ask the Planning Committee to reject this application and send it back for a better design. Accepting this inadequate**

application will be a missed opportunity to provide a truly excellent building on this historic site.

(Discussion points in our detailed objection already on the table)

- **There is no real community benefit at all in this application.**

We want to make it clear that although we like the principle of the Dementia Research project, there is no support from this Forum, or from its member organisations, for this inconsiderate and incoherent planning proposal as it stands.

We will ask the Planning Committee, whatever political/national pressures or financial arguments may be put upon them, to reject this inadequate application, and we ask it should be represented in a re-designed format at a later date.

REQUEST FOR SECTION 105 MITIGATION

If Camden Planning Committee do, for some unfathomable reason, accept this inadequate planning proposal as it stands, the Forum will be requesting that Section 105 mitigation is imposed on the planning permission. NCE residents and CCG team will be making their particular requests, relating to their own sites, which requests the Forum supports.

Our Forum's list of request, on behalf of the wider neighbourhood, is as follows:-

PROPOSED ACCESS WALKWAYS

- **CCTV for proposed walkways from St Andrew's Gardens through the site to Cubitt Street, to Langham Place and to Frances Gardiner student housing.** There is low-level street-crime and drug taking in this neighbourhood; local residents feel threatened and do not want this activity to increase. CCTV systems do help contain this problem. **UCL should provide and maintain in perpetuity CCTV systems on all these new walkways, to contribute towards community safety.**
- **Maintenance of the new walkways by UCL,** including supervision of opening/closing of public access at set times **so access arrangements are made clear.**
- **Public access arrangements to the site to be reviewed and updated by Camden Council,** with local consultation, **on an annual basis.**
- **Full notice to be made an agreed number of days in advance, to be given when UCL wishes to restrict public access** to their open spaces.

GREEN PLANTING

- **New mature trees and perimeter planting for St Andrew's Gardens.** There will be damage and losses to the existing planting in St Andrew's Gardens during the proposed 7 years construction period. UCL must be required to replant with mature trees and shrubs, and to replenish and augment herbaceous borders.
- **Historic remnants such as gravestones and plaques** at present incorporated on the border wall between the two sites **to be taken down with care, preserved, and incorporated into the new buildings/open spaces in a respectful manner.**
- **Green roofs and walls to be incorporated into the designs and included on all the new buildings,** as indicated but never explained in detail in this application.
- **Green planting of mature trees along Gray's Inn Road,** to ornament the new development and to combat air pollution.

BUFFER ZONES

- **Buffer zones with mature green planting are needed** round the borders of the site to integrate the new buildings into the existing neighbourhood, **to soften their dominant appearance, and to help combat air pollution**
- **If Section powers allow, restricting the building of the teaching facility structures** at the eastern end of the site, opposite the NCE site, to be set well back from the northern boundary, and the height of this eastern teaching block lowered, **to minimise dominance and lack of light for the residents of the New Calthorpe Estate.**

- **Providing the buffer zone planting which the NCE residents request.**
- **Providing green planting of mature trees on Cubitt Street, as a gesture towards community gain, and to help reduce air pollution**

COMMUNITY GAIN

- **Some form of free community use of the academic teaching facilities** for the local community during the academic holiday periods.
- **UCL to provide and pay for certain community courses in the academic teaching buildings**, as required by the local community.
- **UCL to offer certain bursaries or scholarships** to local-born UCL students for a set period of, say, 20 years

The Section 105 mitigation needed by the Calthorpe Community Garden is so great, and the issues involved so complex that CCG are in the process of preparing a detailed list. The Forum supports their application. However, the rushed inclusion of this planning application may not give CCG enough time to produce this full information in time for the planning meeting. **In that case the Forum requests that the Planning Committee does not accept a Section 105 mitigation settlement for CCG, based solely on UCL estimates, but delays their planning decision on Section 105 mitigation until CCG's alternative figures can be considered.**

Judy Dainton

Chair, Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood Forum

11/09/2019