

Gideon Whittingham BA BSc DipTP  
Senior Planning Officer  
Development Management  
Supporting Communities  
London Borough of Camden  
2nd floor, 5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

17<sup>th</sup> May 2019

Dear Gideon

**SECTION 73 APPLICATION – MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENT  
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CLUBHOUSE BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF 20NO.  
HOUSES AND BLOCK OF 10NO. FLATS, UNDERGROUND PARKING AND RAMP  
THERETO ON THE FORMER RAILWAY CLUB DEVELOPMENT SITE, COLLEGE LANE,  
CAMDEN. NW5 1BJ**

A public consultation was held on the 9<sup>th</sup> August 2018, from 17.00 til 19.00, at The Vine, 86 Highgate Road, London NW5 1PB. The following Local residents, Camden Officers and Councillors were invited (see attached leaflet):

- Ingestre Road Estate
- Lady Somerset Road
- College Lane
- Little Green Street
- Wiblin Mews
- Gideon Whittingham (LBC)
- John Sheehy (LBC)
- Clr. Meric Apak
- Clr. Jenny Headlam-Wells
- Clr. Georgia Gould

22 people attended, of which 16 registered and provided contact details; and 1 provided a written comment. No attendance from LBC officers or Councillors.

The consultation was presented by George Dhillon and Robin Gill (ACG – Architect). The presentation consisted of 4 A1 boards (as attached) which provided details of the respective changes to the implemented consent. All visitors had the opportunity to ask questions and raise any concerns. The comments received have been summarised below:

- 1) Local residents commented that this application was previously submitted and they thought it was on council owned 'strip of land'. It was confirmed that the application was withdrawn by the applicant and illustrated with the aid of the presentation boards that the proposal is wholly on the land in the ownership of the applicant;
- 2) There was confusion on the 'mixed block', and it was thought that our proposal placed this on the 'strip of land';
- 3) It was thought the previous application was providing additional units; it was explained with illustrations that the proposal is reducing the overall mass;
- 4) Concerns were raised about additional parking on the existing development; it was explained no additional parking would be provided;
- 5) Proximity to Hambrook Court was also discussed; it was explained the proposals do not abut the existing retaining wall;

- 6) Construction method and disruption was also a concern; it was explained a Construction Method Statement would need to be approved by the Local Authority as a part of the planning conditions.

Other comments received related to the construction of the current buildings and landscape; it was explained that part of the proposed application is to regularise the construction which has already been completed.

1 resident asked further details of the tarmac at the entrance of the current development; it was explained that as a part of integration, the same finish as outside the site boundary was adopted; again this forms part of the proposed application.

1 comment was raised regarding the levels of the existing buildings; it was explained this was not a matter which is part of this application, however as we have extensive knowledge of the constructed scheme we can confirm the local authority had checked these intermittently and confirmed they were satisfied.

The consultation concluded at 19.15, all visitors were advised if they had any further queries then they may forward an email to the address provided on the invite, or alternatively write to our offices.

George Dhillon

*Attached:  
Invite  
Presentation*