

## **THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN**

At a meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held on **THURSDAY, 3RD APRIL, 2025** at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall, Judd Street, London WC1H 9JE

### **MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE PRESENT**

Councillors Heather Johnson (Chair), Edmund Frondigoun (Vice-Chair), Nasrine Djemai, Tommy Gale, Eddie Hanson, Liam Martin-Lane, Tom Simon and Robert Thompson

### **MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ABSENT**

Councillors Lotis Bautista, Adam Harrison, Andrew Parkinson and Sue Vincent

**The minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda for the meeting. They are subject to approval and signature at the next meeting of the Planning Committee and any corrections approved at that meeting will be recorded in those minutes.**

### **MINUTES**

#### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lotis Bautista and Adam Harrison.

#### **2. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF STATUTORY DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS, COMPULSORY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND VOLUNTARY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS IN MATTERS ON THIS AGENDA**

There were no such declarations.

#### **3. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

##### **Webcasting**

The Chair announced that the meeting was being broadcast live to the internet and would be capable of repeated viewing and copies of the recording could be made available to those that requested them. Those seated in the Chamber were deemed to be consenting to being filmed. Anyone wishing to avoid appearing on the webcast should move to one of the galleries.



#### **4. REPRESENTATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE**

##### **RESOLVED –**

THAT the written submissions and deputation requests contained in the supplementary agenda be accepted.

#### **5. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DECIDES TO TAKE AS URGENT**

There was no such business.

#### **6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Supporting Communities.

##### **6(1) 293-299, 301-305 KENTISH TOWN ROAD AND 8 HOLMES ROAD, LONDON NW5 2TJ**

Consideration was also given to the information, deputations and written submissions contained within the supplementary agenda.

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

In response to questions from members of the committee, officers provided the following information:

- Regarding the marketing period of the office space, the Legal Adviser explained that provided information was sufficient for the committee to make a decision, and it was for the Committee to determine whether they were satisfied that the application complied with policy requirements.
- Officers had assessed the application and determined that it complied with policy requirements. Whilst the marketing period had taken place during the Covid Pandemic and the Kentish Town Underground Station closure, marketing had taken place over a four-year period rather than the required minimum of two years.
- Requiring a new marketing period could leave the building vacant for several more years and could jeopardise the potential benefits of bringing the building back into use, as an occupied building would increase footfall and support the local economy.
- It was noted that although the underground station closure had made access to the area slightly more difficult, Kentish Town remained well-connected by other public transport options and prospective tenants would have recognised



the temporary nature of the closure and viewed the site with a long-term perspective.

- While residential use was the council's priority land use, local policy did not require office space to be replaced with housing. Whilst more housing was desirable, the local plan supported visitor accommodation in accessible town centre locations.
- Therefore, the Council did not have the policy basis to reject the application in favour of housing, even if that might have been a preferred outcome.
- The applicant currently anticipated one to two deliveries per day, however, future operational needs may require flexibility and imposing a limit at this stage was unnecessarily restrictive, therefore there was not a planning condition to limit deliveries to the site.
- However, such matters were dealt with through the Section 106 agreement. Members concerns about deliveries and servicing would be minuted and taken into account during review and finalisation of the delivery plan.
- The delivery and servicing plan must be signed off prior to occupation, although a draft would typically be submitted prior to implementation of the permission.

Officers then responded to Members questions and concerns about transport issues, as follows:

- An increase in trips to the area was expected and had been addressed through significant section 106 contributions secured to mitigate transport impacts.
- There was confidence that the trip generation figures in the report were reasonable and based on the site's high Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 6.
- Transport projections would always vary between different developments, therefore comparisons to other local hotels elsewhere would not be useful in determining the number of trips to this particular site, due to factors such as public transport links and local amenities.
- The Premier Inn that the depute had compared the application site to was located at the corner of Delancey Street and Camden High Street which was in a different town centre. Furthermore, the application site was in close proximity to more local transport hubs including the Thameslink station, which provided direct access to both Gatwick and Luton airports.
- Even if the true figures were closer to the higher numbers suggested by the depute, the site's accessibility and mitigation measures (including promotion of active travel) meant the transport impact would be manageable.
- Overall, the scale of the development was not large enough to justify refusal on transport grounds, even if the trip estimates in the report proved to be conservative.
- There had been recent changes to road layouts in the area, particularly on Holmes Road. Whilst Holmes Road remained a two-way street, the central section was now, one-way except for cycles.
- This could mean that delivery vehicles turning into Holmes Road from Kentish Town Road could face issues making three-point turns at the Raglan Street



junction. However, this could be addressed through the Delivery and Servicing Management Plan, which would include a requirement that deliveries approach from the west, avoiding such manoeuvres.

- Taxi movements could not be controlled in the same way, but it was quite possible that taxi drivers would prefer to use more suitable routes if certain routes proved inconvenient.
- It was hoped that the site's excellent public transport access and planned improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes would reduce reliance on taxis.

The deputies responded to questions from members, setting out their views as follows:

- There were concerns regarding the practicality of access, loading, and unloading at the site due to the narrow pavement and lack of a proper street level entrance.
- Site visits should be undertaken to better understand issues.
- It was doubtful that the proposal could be adequately amended to resolve the issues highlighted within the deputation.
- A representative of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum expressed frustration at previous attempts to engage with the Council and the lack of effective enforcement around operational management plans for other local businesses.
- There should be CCTV at the site, however, previous requests for CCTV had been rejected due to funding limitations.
- It was imperative enforcement mechanisms must be in place if the application was granted.

Responding to the points raised by the deputies, the Chair reminded members that the premises were previously used as offices which could have had similar, or indeed greater, daily footfall. Furthermore, funding or installation of CCTV was not a matter for the committee to consider.

The Chair encouraged the applicant to maintain an open dialogue with local residents once the hotel was operational and suggested putting in place a method for ongoing communication.

The Head of Development Management summarised the concerns expressed by members and advised that the Section 106 Legal Agreement would include a Delivery and Servicing Management Plan and Hotel Operational Management Plan, and the following information would be required based on the discussion:

- The Delivery and Servicing Management Plan should aim to minimise the number of delivery service vehicles, consider the timing of deliveries to reduce impact, and assess the type of vehicles used.
- The Hotel Operational Management Plan will set out how the operator will liaise with residents if operational issues arise.



The Head of Development Management confirmed that both plans, once agreed, were enforceable by the Council should the operator fail to comply.

Overall, the Committee were generally favourable of the application, provided that measures were taken to minimise disruption to local residents.

Therefore, on being put to the vote, with 7 in favour of the officer recommendation and 1 against, it was

**RESOLVED –**

THAT Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and Section 106 obligations, as set out in the agenda.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment  
Borough Solicitor**

**6(2) 212-214 HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON WC1V 7BW &**

**6(3) RELATED APPLICATION**

Consideration was also given to the information contained within the supplementary agenda.

On being put to the vote, with all Committee Members in favour of the officer recommendation, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED –**

- i) THAT Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and Section 106 obligations, as set out in the agenda; and
- ii) THAT conditional listed building consent be granted.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment  
Borough Solicitor**

**6(4) CAMDEN GOODS YARD, MORRISONS SUPERSTORE AND PETROL  
FILLING STATION, CHALK FARM ROAD, LONDON NW1 8EH**

Consideration was also given to the information contained within the supplementary agenda.



On being put to the vote, with all Committee Members in favour of the officer recommendation, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED –**

THAT Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and Section 106 obligations, as set out in the agenda.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment  
Borough Solicitor**

**6(5) SELKIRK HOUSE, 166 HIGH HOLBORN, 1 MUSEUM STREET, 10-12  
MUSEUM STREET, 35-41 NEW OXFORD STREET AND 16A-18 WEST  
CENTRAL STREET, LONDON WC1A 1JR**

Consideration was also given to the information, deputations and written submissions contained within the supplementary agenda, as mentioned in Agenda Item 5

The Planning Officer introduced the application and explained that it was for a Section 73 application, which was a material amendment to an application that was previously approved.

The Planning Officer advised that a Tabled Paper had been issued containing an objection that was omitted from the report. The Planning Officer reported that a late submission was received which objected to the application but raised no new concerns.

Members asked whether it would be possible to formally designate the existing unregulated parking bays for loading and unloading only to ensure they remained available for deliveries. Members also asked whether it would also be possible to extend the parking bays.

It was noted that the Section 106 agreement for the consented scheme included a standard highway works clause, and although it did not specifically mention loading bays, it would be minuted that the Committee had requested that the bays be designated for loading and unloading only and that the bays be extended. Officers emphasised that while this would not be a formal part of the Section 106 legal agreement it would be recorded in the minutes which would advise the applicant of the Planning Committees expectations.

Responding to a question about the illegal parking issues in the area, officers confirmed that while the Planning Committee could not address illegal parking directly, there were actions that could be taken by the transport and enforcement services and the Transport Officer agreed to liaise with parking operations to carry out targeted enforcement in the area to address illegal parking.



Responding to a question about deliveries to the site, the applicant clarified that the distribution of deliveries remained consistent with the original consented scheme, with 49 deliveries expected via the tower's internal loading area and the remainder using the external bays. The applicant explained that the Shaftesbury Avenue Bay was intended primarily for servicing the residential elements of the development, not the One Museum Street tower.

In response to a further question, the applicant confirmed that the internal service yard would operate from 6am to 10pm, allowing deliveries to be scheduled outside peak hours, thereby easing pressure on the road network. It was clarified that the on-street loading bays could not have set operating times in the same way as the internal service yard, due to challenges in regulating usage.

Overall, the Committee were in favour of granting the application but reiterated that the redesignation and potential extension of loading bays should be prioritised and implemented before the building became operational.

Members requested that there be a focus on addressing illegal parking, recognising it as an ongoing issue that would require continued monitoring both now and once the development was completed.

On being put to the vote, with all Committee Members in favour of the officer recommendation, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED –**

THAT Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and Section 106 obligations, as set out in the agenda.

**ACTION BY: Director of Economy, Regeneration & Investment  
Borough Solicitor**

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was none.

The meeting ended at 8.31 pm.

**CHAIR**

**Contact Officer: Rebecca Timoney**

**Telephone No: 020 7974 6884 / 0207 974 8177**

**E-Mail: [planningcommittee@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planningcommittee@camden.gov.uk)**

**MINUTES END**