

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

At a meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held on **THURSDAY, 29TH JANUARY, 2026** at 7.15 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall, Judd Street, London WC1H 9JE

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE PRESENT

Councillors Heather Johnson (Chair), Edmund Frondigoun (Vice-Chair), Sagal Abdi-Wali, Liam Martin-Lane, Adam Harrison, Samata Khatoon, Andrew Parkinson and Tom Simon

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ABSENT

Councillors Lotis Bautista, Tommy Gale, Robert Thompson and Sue Vincent

ALSO PRESENT

Councillor Jonathan Simpson (on-line attendance).

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 Bautista, Gale, Thompson and Vincent.

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Martin- Lane.

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

Councillor Tom Simon declared in relation to item 6 (4) 9-12 New College Parade that he had prior correspondence with objectors but confirmed that he could consider the matter with an open mind.

Councillor Adam Harrison declared in relation to items 6(1) 120- 136 Camley Street (Site A), and 6(2) 3 - 30 Cedar Way as Cabinet Member previous Cabinet

involvement in Community Investment Programme decisions but confirmed no involvement in planning matters.

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.

Cancellation of 15th January 2026 Planning Committee meeting.

The Chair apologised to members of the public for the cancellation of the Planning Committee meeting on 15th January, explaining that the reason for the cancellation was due to a network outage which affected the Council's systems. The outstanding applications from that meeting would be heard on 12 February 2026, requiring two committee meetings that evening.

Withdrawal of Agenda Item 6(3) 7 Ridgemount Street

The Chair also announced that following advice from officers, Item 6(3) 7 Ridgemount Street had been withdrawn from the agenda. Officers had advised that the description of the development needed correction and re-consultation. The application would be reported to a future planning committee meeting.

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 Investment, Place and Opportunity.

6(1) 120 - 136 CAMLEY STREET (SITE A) LONDON NC1 4PG

Consideration was also given to the deputation requests, and supplementary information contained within the supplementary agenda.

Ward Councillor Jonathan Simpson spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Officer introduced both application sites together (Camley Street Site A and Cedars Way Site B) due to their close relationship. It was noted that while both applications would be presented together each application needed to be considered on its own merits and would be voted on separately.

The Planning Officer highlighted that:

- A late objection had been received from Metropolitan Companies Limited, the adjoining Landowner to Site B Cedar Way, expressing concerns that proposals for Site B might affect future redevelopment of their own land. The Planning Officer said the proposed scheme does not stop future development on neighbouring plots. The development potential of neighbouring plots had been taken into consideration in assessment of the application.
- There was a missing head of term to be recommended as part of the shadow section 106 for Site A. To secure the provision of blue badge spaces on Wrotham Road and a loading bay
- There was a slight error in the Canals and Rivers Trust head of terms in the obligation of £70,000 was to be split between both sites rather than applied to each site. It was to be split 22% Site A and 78% Site B.
- There was a slight miscalculation in the payment in lieu for the shortfall in public open space on Site B, an agreement had been reached with the applicant that the amount should be £978,480.
- There was the requirement for a cascade in the obligation for the Affordable Housing payment in lieu for Site B which meant if it could not be spent on delivery of Site A it would go into the Affordable Housing Fund for delivery of affordable homes elsewhere.

The Committee then considered a model of the proposed development. The Interim Chief Planning Officer reported that while viewing the model, Members discussed the following:

Planning Committee - Thursday, 29th January, 2026

- The location of Camley Street running across the model, the railway lines which ran from east to west across the site and the railway underpass which would be used to get from Site B to Site A.
- The level changes, although difficult to see on the model because of the scale.
- The adjacent estates of Agar Grove, Maiden Lane and Elm Village and the unusually low rise and low-density housing across some of those estates.
- The high rise blocks on Maiden Lane Estate and Kings Cross Central were pointed out to members.
- It was confirmed to members that the opaque blocks which were shown on the model were not part of the scheme but were produced to illustrate how adjoining sites could come forward both to the south of Site B and on the network rail site.
- Officers confirmed that Site B was expected to be developed by a developer and not the Council, while site A would be delivered by the Council with Site B providing the payment in lieu to fund the social housing delivery on Site A.
- Officers identified where the access point to Maiden Lane was and discussed with members the future potential to link to the high line and the fact that the scheme had been designed to take account of those access points and to knit into the public realm.
- There were questions around impact of light on the L&Q homes on Agar Grove and engagement with residents in those homes which officers would respond to when answering Committee members questions.
- It was identified that there had been a separation distance maintained to the east of the buildings from the railway lines which ran east of both sites.

Responding to Member's questions, Officers provided the following information:

With regards to Affordable Housing:

- The scheme met policy requirements, it was a mix designed to meet Camden's housing needs.
- Site A was 100% social rent while Site B provided intermediate housing.
- Larger family homes reduced the percentage by unit count but better met housing need.
- Increasing affordable housing further would make the scheme unviable

Impact on Existing Businesses:

- Officers acknowledged the concern expressed by local businesses advising that business relocation support was part of the process and construction impacts would be managed through a Construction Management Plan.

Pest control during demolition and the risk of pests affecting nearby food businesses:

- Details of a Pest Control Strategy would be added to the Construction Management Plan

- Contractors would be required to explain how risks would be managed

Impact on nearby homes (light and privacy) including loss of daylight and sunlight to nearby housing association homes.

- 20 properties were affected across both sites. Only a small number experienced major or moderate impacts.
- Separation distances of 20–30 metres were considered good for a dense urban area.
- Impacts were acceptable when balanced against benefits.
- Daylight impacts were within typical expectations for a major regeneration area.

Comprehensive development of the wider area and whether decisions should be deferred until all surrounding landowners were ready.

- Multiple land ownerships made full coordination difficult.
- The scheme was designed so as not to prevent future development on adjoining sites.
- Blank facades and mirrored layouts allowed for later development.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer informed the Committee of the need:

In relation to the Camley Street (Site A) application

- To provide delegated authority to officers to confirm Canals and Rivers Trust obligation in the head of terms in the obligation.
- An extra head of terms for blue badge parking bays and loading bay on Wrotham Road.

In relation to Cedars Way (Site B)

- To provide delegated authority to officers to confirm Canals and Rivers Trust obligation in the head of terms in the obligation.
- Construction management plan obligation - to ask the applicant for details of a site wide pest control strategy prepared by a qualified contractor. Measures to include pre-commencement surveys and treatment where necessary, sealing of buildings and drainage to prevent rodent access, ongoing monitoring and control during works, and strict site hygiene and waste management.

In relation to the Camley Street (Site A) application on being put to the vote, with 7 unanimously in favour of the officer recommendation, it was

RESOLVED –

THAT

Conditional full Planning Permission be granted following:

- Referral to the Mayor of London for his direction
- Finalisation of detailed wording for conditions following consultation with the Mayor; and completion
- Of a shadow section 106 Legal Agreement.
- Delegate authority to officers to confirm Canals and Rivers Trust obligation in the head of terms in the obligation.
- An extra head of terms for blue badge parking bays and loading bay on Wrotham Road.

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

In relation to the Cedars Way (Site B) application on being put to the vote, with 7 unanimously in favour of the officer recommendation, it was

RESOLVED –

THAT

Conditional full Planning Permission be granted following:

- Referral to the Mayor of London for his direction
- Finalisation of detailed wording for conditions following consultation with the Mayor; and completion
- Of a shadow section 106 Legal Agreement.
- Delegate authority to officers to confirm Canals and Rivers Trust obligation in the head of terms in the obligation.
- Construction management plan obligation - to ask the applicant for details of a site wide pest control strategy prepared by a qualified contractor

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

6(2) 3-30 CEDAR WAY (SITE B) LONDON NC1 4PD

[See 6\(1\) above for discussion and decision on this item.](#)

6(3) 7 RIDGMOUNT STREET LONDON WC1E 7AE

This application was withdrawn from the agenda to amend the description of the development and further consultation.

6(4) 9 - 12 NEW COLLEGE PARADE LONDON NW3 5EX

Consideration was also given to the deputation requests, and supplementary information contained within the supplementary agenda.

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Responding to Member's questions, Officers provided the following information:

With regards to loss of daylight:

- The Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance should be applied flexibly in dense urban areas.
- Losses were considered acceptable given the dense urban setting and existing layout of the neighbour's rooms.
- The garden impacts were assessed and considered acceptable.

In relation to a hotel verses housing:

- Officers confirmed that housing was not feasible on this site. It had been tested but considered unsuitable.
- The town centre location was appropriate for hotel use.
- The hotel provided economic benefits as well as housing contributions to deliver homes elsewhere.

With regards to traffic and coaches:

- Officers confirmed that coach restrictions were enforceable via the S106 legal agreement.
- No coach drop off was allowed.
- Taxi drop-offs could not be banned but were expected to be limited

In relation to energy and sustainability:

- Conditions would secure further improvements on the be lean target at later stages
- The design included energy-efficient systems

With regards to a masterplan:

- There was not an existing masterplan for the whole parade.
- This scheme would not prevent one in future.

On being put to the vote, with 6 in favour of the officer recommendation and 1 against, it was

RESOLVED –

THAT Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement 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.

Having adjourned between 20.22 to 20.27 and 21.14 to 21.18 the meeting ended at 21.51.

The meeting ended at 9.51 pm.

CHAIR

Contact Officer: Sola Odusina

Telephone No: 020 7974 6884 / 020 7974 8177

E-Mail: planningcommittee@camden.gov.uk

MINUTES END