

KINGS CROSS CENTRAL OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION

FORMAL RESPONSE

KINGS CROSS DEVELOPMENT FORUM

Prepared by Planning Aid for London

Summary

In principle the Forum strongly supports regeneration which seeks to ensure that the Kings Cross Central site plays a pivotal role in the revitalization of the wider Kings Cross area and surrounding communities.

The Forum welcomes in principle the redevelopment of the Kings Cross Central site but is not in a position either to welcome or reject the current outline application as a whole. We firmly believe the application needs revision in many areas (including housing, density, transport impact, etc), and that more information should be provided (for example on the balance of land uses, mechanisms for monitoring, community facilities and involvement, etc) before the application can be determined by the planning authorities. The amended issues would be subject to a new round of consultation.

To aid both Councils and the applicant, the Forum has prepared a joint response to the Outline application. These comments are summarised more fully below. Some comments appear in more than one category reflecting the overlapping impacts and the need to consider all aspects comprehensively. It is made clear where there is strong support across the Forum on an issue, and where there are individual suggestions or debate.

In order to make the application process as accessible to as many groups and individuals in the Kings Cross area as possible, the Forum asked independent charity Planning Aid for London to run a series of topic-related workshops. The report below, which has been written by PAL from individual responses to specific questions during workshops, is as accurate a reflection of the views expressed as possible. Participants were not, however, asked whether to accept or reject the application as a whole, and it was left to constituent groups and individuals to take such a position in their own responses.

Note: The aims of the Kings Cross Development Forum and the communities it represents are given in Appendix 1. The Kings Cross Development Forum is a Camden and Islington based organisation of around 180 community groups and individuals living or working around the Kings Cross Central site. The Forum has been meeting for two years and has had nearly 50 meetings to consider the planning brief and the planning application. The PAL workshops were a culmination of the Forum's consideration of the current planning application.

TAILED RESPONSES

ACTION 1 - CONSERVATION, LAND USE & DESIGN

Conservation Areas and Buildings

A number of responses indicate that though the two conservation areas (Regents Canal and Kings Cross CA) are noted in the proposal documents, they do not seem to be fully respected by the developers. The development does not preserve and enhance the character of those Conservation Areas.

In general there is a reluctance to see heritage buildings demolished. Buildings, especially Culross and Stanley North - and natural heritage should be retained because it would strengthen the area's identity and uniqueness (PPG 16, Camden UDP 2003, Chapter 13, Para 13.68).

The premise of creating 'cultural' areas needs greater consideration, in order to avoid exclusive 'culture' for some. There is general agreement with culture centres, museums and the heritage 'heart' as long as it also addresses the needs of existing residents (from surrounding areas) and incomers to the site.

A small number expressed the opinion that the gasholders are misplaced in zone 1. Some of them would want gasholder no 8 to remain where it is and some others wish to avoid having the gasholders in the site altogether if it is no longer going to be possible to look through them. Their use as housing runs contrary to the main purpose of conservation, which is to find new uses which respect and enhance old buildings. A leisure use would carry far more support.

A number suggest keeping the Western Transit Shed or at least the western wall and the basement.

Demolition should precede a full planning application being implemented.

Culross and Stanley North Buildings

There was strong support for retaining Culross and Stanley North building. They argue that successful design and development can incorporate significant buildings to the development's advantage (Camden UDP 2003, Chapter 13, KC11). Introducing residential and community uses (including crèche, IT, tourism) to the South part of the site is essential for safety and will be livelier in the day and evening (Camden UDP 2003, Chapter 13, KC8 - Design; Camden UDP 2003, Chapter 13, KC1 - Mixed Use Development: 'Avoid large areas of single use development').

In relation to possible uses for Culross, proposals include social housing, with a nursery on the ground floor which might be run by and to the benefit of local residents and workers on and around the site, and those working elsewhere using public transport.

For Stanley Building North, community uses were suggested such as community offices or start-up community groups. Community facilities on the site proved a strong theme throughout the responses - see Community Section. However, social

using is the current approved use and no-one would be unhappy with its retention.

For many, an issue strongly related to the retention of these two buildings, is the proposed route of St Pancras Way. There is strong disagreement the alignment proposed is the only option - a realigned road around the retained buildings would slow traffic.

It was unclear from the documents and plans as to the routes to be followed by buses - see Transport Section.

Community Benefits

Safety is an issue of great concern to for local communities and visitors. Safety is mainly related to two issues: firstly to the use of open spaces (such as accessibility to the canal, housing and activities besides offices at the south part of the site), and secondly to traffic safety (changing routes of roads, taking precautions about traffic and speed). In residential areas design should address both the community safety needs of both privately-owned and affordable property. Many responses favoured a mix of property ownerships within the same building and areas to assist with security issues (Camden UDP 2003, Chapter 13, Para 13.72)..

Provision of jobs is also very important. The heritage buildings in question are located in zone B where the major use is business and employment. Potential benefits might come to the community via job provision in the area of food and drink, hotels and serviced apartments or by increasing D1 uses in the specific zone. They would like further clarification of how this could be achieved (Camden UDP 2003, Chapter 13, KC2; Camden UDP 2003, Chapter 13, Para 13.71). Using the Canal as a key resource - as affordable transport - was supported; community bus, freight or developer-funded transport.

There was some acceptance that tall buildings would be needed on part of the site to generate funding for community benefit, but this acceptance was strongly related to agreements securing those facilities which effectively address the needs of new and existing residents on the site and surrounding areas. Many are opposed to tall buildings which impede views of grade I listed buildings, or which generate unacceptable wind tunnels.

Land Uses Generally

The Forum found the requirement for flexibility of uses (giving the maximum without minimum in some cases and varying ranges for a combination of uses within zones) too vague and they wish to see fixed limits in order to establish certainty. There was considerable support that there should be limits set for the North and South of the site, with timed reviews during the development process (Camden UDP 2003, Chapter 13, SKC 3).

The outline planning application makes it extremely difficult to make sensible points on urban design / public realm when the documents relating to these issues do not form part of the application (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, KC8, Para 13.59).

In general, people wish to see more housing and community D1 / leisure uses and more community space in the site and a reduction of office development (Camden UDP 2003, Chapter 13, Para 13.36).

As regards to the south area of the site, there was strong support for some residential elements, in order to achieve mixed use and to increase safety of this part of the site during the day and evening. Some residential use in Zone A & B was requested by a number of respondents.

The Goods Yard complex is in general considered fine, although some argue that the suggested uses take too much from the community space.

The North area of the site is regarded by some to be too great in terms of missing and, as shown, unable to develop a real sense of community. There needs to be a redesign which includes substantial open space to reflect the higher residential capacity.

Heights and Density

Overall the amount of floor space applied for was considered too high by all. There was no consensus as regards density.

The South part of the site is the one that should contain the greatest density and heights, second after zone T, but avoiding overshadowing of the Canal. Buildings should be stepped back from the Canal open space (Camden UDP 2003, Chapter 13, Para 13.19, Joint Planning and Development Brief Para 3.3.14).. People see zone T as absorbing the greatest heights but they propose that the facade should not be continuous. (One suggestion is that the tallest buildings and complexes should be put forward for competition. Such large scale development should invite exciting new (international) architecture and a unique skyline.)

The Forum would not like to see the proposed maximum heights in the residential zones but they should be lower and not massive blocks.

Areas A because of the proximity of the station should contain the greater density in the southern part of the development. Areas B and U should have a lower density perhaps 5 floors and take account of Camley Street Park and the Canal. The maximum height proposed should never be obtained anywhere in the site.

Zone T should perhaps be the highest density, however because of the towpath and because of the potential of creating a feeling of enclosure, site T should be broken up and not be a consistent block. Parking should be kept in site T. The proposed Zone A as shown in the plans indicates one continuous building which is considered too massive and oppressive as a single entity. This will create a situation with no permeability with the outside of the site from its start on Aston Road all the way to Goods Way. Given the canyon effect that already exists at the South End of York Way created by the Station and the P & O development but a continuation with a Zone A being a single structure extending north from the end of the Station right up to Goods Way will serve to exacerbate an already bad situation. This single structure should be broken into several smaller ones with space between to create views into the site from York Way (Joint Planning and Development Brief Para 2.2.5).

the application should be considering density not only the percentages of floorspace. The total build should include basement areas, so this basement total deducted from the floorspace figures.

Layout & Design

The Forum found difficulty in understanding the relative size of roads and open spaces from the plans. This is an area where further clarification is required. A comprehensive plan showing footpaths, carriageway and shared facilities (cycle/ pedestrian etc), together with clarification on taxi and bus routes would be required before planning approval can be given (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, KC10, Para 13.65)..

There is very strong concern that the park / green areas are small in relation to the overall site and community requirements.

Some members are unhappy with the street layout through the site and stress the need to facilitate pedestrian and cyclist rather than traffic movement (see Transport).

Potential large congestion problems were highlighted between zones N & S and that joining E/W zones into Copenhagen St is going to be problematic for the community on that street outside the area. Not enough community space (D & E) was provided. When there was support for the Triangle site should be developed first with the Granary complex. This would demonstrate willingness by the developers to provide social and other housing. The Triangle has the advantage of being self-contained and would not have to wait for other parts of the site to be finished (Camden UDP 2003, Chapter 13, Para 13.25).

Many responses relate to the design of buildings and spaces in the plans, and include -

that space for children in the residential areas is small and not conducive to a healthy quality of life. Open space is also vital for the health of existing and new communities in and around the site.

that there is an absence of space for young and older people

that insufficient provision is made for family homes

that the gas holders area in Zone N should be used for community facilities, in particular a sports centre or other amenity.

that sizes of rooms should be provided for housing proposals to enable communities to fully determine the quality of the proposals in what will be a high density site.

that it was not clear whether the needs of older people had been taken into consideration in the design of the housing including disability needs.

that Station Square should also provide community and cultural uses, allowing local communities to generate income

through events and restaurants selling 'ethnic' food (it is part of what the developers want to see happening - supporting doc)

Canal

The Canal is the centrepiece of the proposed development and a unique environment in the middle of London. The development is on a huge scale, and the large numbers of additional people coming to the area are likely to have a

significant effect on the Regents Canal and its environs. Currently it is a quiet retreat.

The majority of people are in favour of maximising accessibility to the Canal as long as it is achieved in a sensible way i.e., a better access at Camley Street North and not the proposed route.

The heritage of the Canal must be protected- it predates the historic buildings and heritage of the Kings Cross Railway lands. (Camden UDP Revised Deposit Draft, Section 10, RC1). Full demolition of the towpath walls is unnecessary and the Forum would prefer to see partial demolition, wherever possible, to widen the towpath, and maximize use and accessibility of the canal (Joint Planning and Development Brief, 2003, Para 3.3.26). Widening of the towpath should not encroach on the canal water. The specific area mentioned where demolition would be acceptable, is at North Square, in front of zone N and the access steps down to the towpath. They wish to keep the canal walls where safety allows, or where the walls form part of area buildings and use arches or openings to increase access while retain certain elements. The need for demolition, especially in the areas where the south and north areas connect, was understood. One response commends the removal of the southern flank as an alternative to removing the retaining walls opposite Camley Street; another asks that the canal not be enclosed within tall walls to the south along Goods Way. Generally the comments considered that demolition of the towpath walls would destroy unique atmosphere of canal. Others thought that the canal wall should be demolished, except where there are Fish and Coal building or other things to be conserved. (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, SKC3, Para 13.25).

Forum working group on this issue considers that there should be no demolition of any part of the towpath walls in phase 1 of the development. There is strong opposition to tall buildings along the Canal - issues of overshadowing, scale, environmental etc. Excessive building heights to the south will overshadow canal. This is unacceptable - the buildings should be set back and stepped away from the canal open space, and sunlight and daylight to the canal should not be prejudiced. Certain parameters must be applied to any new buildings near to the canal to ensure that they do not have an impact on the canal, the towpath and other parts of the green corridor (Camden UDP Revised Deposit Draft, Section 10, RC1, Para 10.6).

The information in the application documents was criticised as it shows the overshadowing when it is at its minimum at certain times of the year. This is misleading, and fails to show the full extent of light deprivation over the canal, which in particular relies on the morning sun. The developers must submit information to show the effect of the shadows on the canal throughout the year. The sense of openness of the canal must be retained, and it was suggested that currently the canal would be overpowered, dominated and hemmed in by tall and bulky buildings on the south side. This needs to be addressed and amended by the developer (Camden UDP Revised Deposit Draft, Section 10, RC1a).

There is general agreement that development along the canal should make the canal area more attractive and safer to use. Concerns expressed with the issue of safety along the canal, stated that security should not be seen as provided solely by better lighting. The issue of lighting in general has not been satisfactorily addressed in the planning application documents. There was some

concern about the affect of the lighting on Camley Street Natural Park, with a recommendation that lighting should be sited along the water's edge and pointed inward, away from the canal itself and the park.

Comments on the building of new bridges were evenly split between those opposed and those for their construction.

A number of responses explicitly oppose a footbridge into Camley Street Natural Park. The reasons are the loss of views (south from St Pancras Locks towards St Pancras station, and north from Fish and Coal buildings towards the locks) and that it would have an unacceptable environmental impact.

There is support for the outline application from the developers to include the commitment for provision of an east-west link, but not specify details of the bridge or link.

Other responses applied to the bridges generally and supported the need for bridges to enable good connections across the site.

The design of bridges should be traditional to retain the character of the important (but sidelined) canal corridor.

Locks beneath the Granary building should be preserved, so that they could be used in the future. One or more of the historic basins beneath the Western Goods shed could be reopened, and used for small freight.

Detail about moorings is missing from the planning application (Camden UDP Revised Deposit Draft, Section 10, RC3, Para 10.12).

ACTION 2 - ENVIRONMENT

General

King's Cross is not a pleasant area because of a general appearance of lack of maintenance, rubbish and poor state of repair of buildings.

There is prostitution and drug dealing which detracts from the sense of safety young people arriving at King's Cross who have nowhere to live need to be taken care of

The Design should help to

protect Kings Cross Central and the surrounding neighbourhoods from crime, prostitution and drugs

make it a clean, safe and pleasant area

provide more social housing

ensure a wider range of youth initiatives

ensure the local people have access to jobs from the start of the development

Trees / microclimate

Tree species should be diverse and of value to a range of wildlife species across the site.

There was considerable disappointment with the very low net increase in tree planting being proposed, and a recommendation that more shrubs and hedgerows

using a wider definition of hedgerow in terms of continuous green corridors) could be included in the planting.

Concern was raised about microclimate conditions brought about by declining light levels due to building near the canal. The canal's biodiversity will be affected by light levels.

Open & green space

Provision for open space was considered to be inadequate, especially the 'Long Park' green (?) space in the north of the site, appearing very modest for such an intense development. There appeared to the Forum to be little green space in the proposals. There was support for green lungs in the site, as there is too little green space proposed to cope with the extra people, range of activities and density.

The use and type of open space was considered to be a key factor in assessing the quality of life which would be experienced by site users. The uses of and general characteristics of the network of open spaces across the site should be agreed at this early stage. The phrase 'Park' has green connotations, but the concept plans shows it to be hard landscape. The balance between activities, traffic v pedestrians, informal v formal, greenness v. hard, needs to be agreed at this stage for the value of each space to be fully understood.

The response was pleased to see that the Long Park open space would be bordered for residential uses, and this would make it more attractive for families and residents of the local area.

In terms of open and green spaces connecting up with other green areas to create wildlife corridors, it was noted that Camley Street Natural Park already contributed to this, and that a wildlife corridor should be considered running north to south across the site.

Provision of viable public space in front of the Granary is proposed.

The need for a routing of Pancras Road that respects the relationship between Pancras station, Culross/Stanley Buildings, and the German Gym.

The overall density of the housing is very high. There is not a single garden or plotment area shown on the site. The Forum would wish to see considerably more leisure and open space in such a high density development.

There are suggested changes to several zones to improve the layout and extent of open space. These concern reshaping zone R; redesigning of 'wind tunnel' i.e. proposed park; re-routing path north to south from park at gasholders round Park and S to north.

It was considered that there is a lack of detail about the impact on the ecology and wildlife of Camley Street Park.

The response proposed that Camley Street Park should be extended south, and the green corridor extended along the south side of the Canal.

Sustainability

As a key London development site, and one with high transport accessibility, the scheme should be setting an example in terms of sustainability. There is an opportunity for it to 'lead the field' in London / the world e.g. all buildings

the site should be built to excellent BREEAM building standards, securing lower levels of car usage across the site and setting up specific mechanisms whereby users must enter into an agreed system rather than the more flexible encouragement proposals suggested by the supporting documents. The site should fully embrace the meaning of sustainability in all processes and facilities, which would bring international accolades. Individual suggestions include constructing holding tanks for rainwater on site with a slow release into the drains with foul discharge, and the need for a study of flow capacity to the main sewer to be carried out.

ACTION 3 - TRANSPORT

vehicular routes

The number of primary routes and vehicular junctions should be reduced. In particular the proposed line of Pancras Road is not popular as a route. There could be many routes within the site but not primary routes for large volumes of traffic. This is supported by Paragraph 2.3.42 of the Joint Brief, which seeks to designate majority of new roads with the function of local access roads. Any new carriageway should be for access only.

The route layout needs to take account the variation of ground levels in the site, and primary routes including Goods Way and York Way and junctions should avoid inclines, in order to cause minimum noise and pollution.

Roads should be designed to discourage speeding e.g. Home Zones (20mph or less movements on all roads; curved roads to discourage speeding- in particular Goods Street East and West are too straight. This is supported by Paragraph 2.3.42 of the Joint Brief.

Even the public transport accessibility of the site, there should be minimal/limited private car access within the site, with the exception of taxis and disabled transport. Examples given include Greenwich Millennium Village - no parking on-street, limited residential parking for both private and social housing etc. (See also Parking.)

The layout doesn't respect features like the Stanley or Culross buildings or existing railway tunnels, which are difficult to build over. The buildings could be retained and the road layout amended to the improvement of the scheme. (See Conservation)

Primary road cuts through the public realm in Market Square. This should definitely be avoided. This is supported by Paragraph 2.42 of the Joint Brief which seeks to create new urban squares and other people friendly places free from traffic.

Road widths- Generally it was thought that the road widths were too narrow to allow for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, though some respondents indicated that wider roads would encourage more traffic to pass through the site. Better designation and control of vehicles would allow more room for pedestrians and cyclists. One person noted that wider routes would result in more light into buildings.

The minimum route widths should measure from the first floor building overhang and not include any recessed ground floor level.

Public realm, roads, cycle paths, footpaths, etc should be designated public highway and adopted and managed by the local authorities.

One person commented on utility ducting when the site is developed the utility companies will be repeatedly digging up York Way and Pancras Road to lay telecoms, water, gas etc. A Section 106 agreement could build a large public utility duct, owned by the Council up the east and west sides of the site to prevent repeated disruption of the road surface.

Pedestrian and Cycle Routes

The Forum considers that the planning application should give priority to walking and cycling routes (supported by Policy KC6 of Chapter 13 of Camden's LDP (adopted 2003) and in the application the emphasis is seen to be on vehicles. A majority of respondents considered cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles should have defined paths on primary, secondary and tertiary routes and in other public realm areas. Currently only York Way/ Goods Way and Pancras Road have separate cycle routes- as a minimum all primary routes should have separate cycle lanes.

The side of Long Park should be for pedestrians only. This is supported by Paragraph 2.42 of the Joint Brief which seeks to create new urban squares and other people friendly places free from traffic.

All roads should have footpaths but not all footpaths need roads.

There is a lack of perceived pedestrian access routes in zones L and K- there should be a pedestrian route from Bridge 1 (BR1) north eastwards.

There is support for the A1/ WR1 link aligned with Wharfedale Road, as advocated in the Joint Brief at Paragraph 3.3.20. Some comments are that: "Pedestrian route A1 should be an actual link, rather than a potential one" and "Network Rail and the developers should have a joint development for bridge WR1".

Cycle routes within the site should be integrated with cycle routes surrounding the site, and measures taken to ensure that it does so as part of this planning application. It was not clear how the cycle route proposed through the northern end of Camley Park joined with a network effectively. Measures need to be undertaken outside and around the site to ensure effective integration. This is supported by Paragraph 2.3.26 of the Joint Brief.

Main crossing of Goods Way and routes over Bridges 1 and 2 need sensitive treatment. There will be conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.

Some communities, such as Islamic women, do not ride bicycles, but instead will walk or take public transport, such as trams. Acceptable forms of transport for all should be a key concern and further consultation is required to ensure that they are fully catered for.

Pedestrian and cycle routes need to be physically overlooked to increase natural surveillance for safety reasons - routes overlooked by residents in ground floor housing are safer at night than those routes running past office blocks - ground floor housing was not included in the proposals but is the preferred form of security.

Walking from west through the site to Kings Cross needs to be made safe by being overlooked by residential accommodation i.e. housing south of the canal.

pedestrian friendly measures such as two-way working in York Way, road narrowing to provide crossings at desire lines and bus stops where people need them (i.e. close to junctions and places attracting large footfall) should be introduced.

Access into the Site

There was strong opposition to Bridge 3 (BR3 and CAM1), arguing that it should be deleted from the proposals, as it is not necessary, and it is more important to protect the park. Suggested alternatives were to provide a ramp further north between Camley Street and towpath, and provide pedestrian and cycle link from Camley St to Agar Grove, or provide bridge to link development with Maiden Lane, and /or provide a third canal bridge but in a different position to link to the path on Camley Street.

A cycle and pedestrian route should be provided under St Pancras station extension to Brill Place.

There are no sufficiently direct routes from the east (Camden). One person mentioned a lack of vehicular access to the north of the site from Camden. Safe crossings of York Way should be provided in addition to those shown at junctions. Safe crossings should also be identified throughout the site on additional routes such as Pancras Road and form part of the planning application.

Access within site

Number of bridges - some thought that there should be less, others up to six. Several people thought that Bridges 1 and 2 should be combined and that it would form a direct route north and not cut across Long Park. Several people thought that Bridge 1 was in the wrong place and too wide and drops traffic in the centre of the Granary open space, which is not acceptable. One suggestion is that BR2 should be deleted (as unnecessary), and BR1 should be moved west in the place of BR2 - the site of the former Somers Bridge built in 1820), the traffic flow would be directed up the side of Granary Square. The relocated BR1 would be reconstructed in a traditional style.

Suggestions included that traffic flow should not be directed to where the canal in Granary Basin is, as this would prevent it being reopened in the future. It could potentially be used for moorings, and would be a better alternative than the proposed square.

Other people thought that the current location of bridges BR1 and BR2 is acceptable. Several people thought BR 2 should be extended to comprise a flyover/underpass with shops/ kiosk over Goods Way, to avoid crossing busy road. One person thought that priority should be given to smooth road traffic on major roads, otherwise this would lead to problems with congestion, noise and pollution as well as safety.

Impact on Public Transport & highway networks

The Forum is concerned that the trips generated from the Kings Cross Central development will significantly increase demand for public transport and congestion from vehicles on the highway network, without providing adequate improvements.

In particular the development will have a major impact on the public transport infrastructure, without making any contribution towards improvements. Comments indicate that the developer should contribute to improvements to public transport infrastructure.

There were several points made about the Transport Assessment. One considered that the assessment that existing infrastructure can cope takes no account of the CTRL St Pancras Dispersal Study. Another comment queried why the Transport Assessment included a high proportion of education journeys by car- which is against all Camden's policies and not necessary? Another person sought clarification on the number of private car trips (per person and per vehicle) generated by the development in peak hours.

There is considerable concern about the lack of integration of the transport proposals in the surrounding area with the planning application at Kings Cross Central.

The Forum considers that there should be additional bus services/ capacity serving new and existing routes in and around the site. This is supported by the Joint Brief in Para. 2.3.12 that wants to see the developer facilitating the introduction of additional/ extended/ diverted bus services that link the Main and Triangle sites with adjacent areas. Other concerns are the lack of good dedicated bus interchange facilities; lack of integrated planning of internal bus routes with outside; and loss of opportunity to rethink bus network over this part of central/ north London.

Internal bus routes may be acceptable but the Forum would need more information to know how they link with existing bus routes around the site. There was also concern expressed over the routing - routes south to north were clearer than north to south. One suggestion was that all the routes which now terminate in York Way should go via the development site, and route 31 should be extended to the site from the north.

The Forum is concerned about underground capacity and whether this will be able to meet the trips generated by the additional numbers of people in the area. One indicated that they support the developer's contention that without the construction of the Northern Ticket Hall the whole scheme is not achievable. There are concerns about inadequate circulation space on un-widened platforms and concourses for rail and underground and increase to dangerous limits on the tube.

Some people wanted to see a new station at Maiden Lane. This is supported by the Joint Brief in Paragraphs 2.3.13 and 2.3.14. It was thought that the reopening of York Road underground station had the potential to alleviate overcrowding at Kings Cross, by acting as an extra in or out station on the Piccadilly line- such as Covent Garden and Leicester Square and Charing Cross and Embankment would be pairs in Central London. In particular it could be way for passengers to disembark without having to go through Kings Cross.

Some people would like a tram around the site on existing roads. It was also suggested that this could be another suitable intermediate mode, such as a double-deck guided bus, a light railway or a double-deck trolley bus.

The proposals will add to traffic pollution- extra cars and buses and taxis increase congestion.

Highway capacity is a key issue ñ many in the Forum do not believe that there is sufficient/ lack of future capacity on York Way and Pentonville Road; Euston Road is already jammed.

There was concern that the proposed crossroads at York Way/ Goods Street/ Copenhagen Street would cause significant traffic and congestion at that junction. This should be addressed.

Have highway networks been designed to take on use of bendy buses?

There is concern about the knock on impact on available capacity further down the bus / underground/ rail routes, even if there is enough space for passengers starting their journey at Kings Cross. How has this been taken into account?

Working

The Forum thought that the provision of car parking spaces in the site would encourage people to drive through the site. To have car parking spaces in the site means private car access within the site, which many people object to. There was considerable concern as to the levels of car access in the site. Given that this is the most accessible site in London, reliance on vehicle access could be reduced substantially. Some people thought that there should be no car access in the site, whereas others considered that there should be more restrictions on access than are currently proposed in the planning application. In its current form, it was considered that the development proposals in the planning application are contrary to Policy KC7 of Chapter 13 of Camden's UDP which supports a development where car usage and car parking provision is at a minimum levels necessary.

The Forum points out that this is a huge public transport interchange. This area has the best public transport accessibility in London, and therefore less car parking is needed. Camden has examples of successful car free developments elsewhere. The majority's view is that the amount of car parking proposed in the planning application is excessive and should be reduced, though was significant support for having no car parking provision in the site. The Forum points out that for visitors arriving by train: car parking is available at train stations outside Greater London area e.g. Dorking, Guildford, Surrey stations and at Trignon, etc

A number of people felt that the multi storey car park should be deleted from the proposals.

However if there has to be a multi storey car park in the development, the majority considered that it is better in the north of the site. One suggestion is that it could be linked to park and ride.

A number of people considered that there should be no on street parking, or if any is provided, it should be for disabled people only.

Some comments were that the car parking should be restricted to certain uses, for groups of people. Many people thought there should only be car parking for disabled residents and other disabled people provided in the site. Other groups identified as having a priority need for car parking are residents with young children and the elderly. There is concern that families with children and older relatives have some form of car parking provision to ensure they will not be deprived of trips at evenings and weekends. It was thought that there should be a small amount of visitor car parking for the flats/ houses.

Some comments were that there should be no car parking for retail developments and limited car parking for leisure developments. There was general support for the Council seeking a significant proportion of car free housing as proposed in Policy KC7 and Paragraph 13.55 of Chapter 13 of Camden's Unitary Development Plan (adopted 2003). Many responses from the Forum indicate that there is too much car parking proposed, for example up to 10% of the housing should be designated 'car free'. One comment felt that 'all housing should be car free' with some exception for disabled and possibly for those who professionally provide door to door services). Another comment felt that there should be no cars at all on site, as if the development is not car free, the 0.5 spaces per unit will not be sufficient and there will be chaos on the streets- particularly if proportion of higher income housing is exceeded. There was general support for a shared car scheme available to new residents on the site, and existing residents adjacent to the site. It was felt that this could replace car parking provision, for example the multi storey car park. One person thought that perhaps a few French style electric cars should be available on loan to residents but car parking in the area should be minimal. Other than that the requirement for car parking should be reduced by provision of car hire / club facilities. Excessive provision of car parking spaces is unacceptable and inconsistent with the low car use ambitions of the developer. It would be contrary to the Parking Standards in both Camden's and Islington's adopted UDP's. Motor cycle parking should be provided throughout the site. One or two comments thought that the proposed amount of car parking in the development is at the right level.

Cycle Parking

The Forum supports the provision of high levels of cycle parking to be provided in excess of the Camden and Islington's adopted standards. More cycle parking is required to encourage cycling in the site. For the residential floorspace, in particular, there should be a minimum of 1 cycle parking place per flat, and for the 3 and 4 bedroom residential units, there should be a minimum of 2 spaces per flat. Cycle parking should be located all over the site. Secure cycle parks should be provided near each entrance of each housing block, office block transport node and recreation facility. One comment says that 'cycle parks should be all over the site, close to point of use. Facilities for some bicycle parking should be near every building which has a public use.' The Forum supports paragraph 2.3.28 of the Joint Brief that seeks the provision of on and off street secure parking with developments having locker and shower facilities where appropriate. The Forum emphasises the need for high levels of cycle parking provision close to the transport hubs. Innovative solutions are needed - multilevel racks and mechanized bike parking, usement areas for bike storage & recharging electric buggies. Cycles should be given precedence. There should be high levels of cycle parking which should be complemented by cycle facilities at the stations and dedicated cycle lanes throughout the

development. This supported by Policy KC6 of Chapter 13 of the Camdenís UDP (adopted 2003).

Travel Plan

Travel Plan and Transport Assessment should form part of the planning application, otherwise it is not enforceable. This is supported by Policy 3C.2 of The London Plan which requires developments with significant transport implications to include a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan as part of planning application.

The word "encourage" in the Travel Plan is completely worthless. More formal commitment is needed.

Compliance with the Travel Plan should be mandatory.

Canal

Proposals for canal are very poor and dismissive of sensitivities of canal and its full potential use and benefit.

Safety and perceived safety need to be addressed. Under bridge lighting desirable, though fewer bridges would be preferred.

More should be made of the canal as a public transport route. This is supported by paragraph 2.3.12 in the Joint Brief, which considers water transport as one of the main opportunities.

Variety of ways that the canal could be used for transport are suggested, including transporting materials in the construction phase; transporting waste and freight; canal buses (possibly a direct route to Camden Town and City Road) and taxis for commuters and tourists. Responses included that the canal should be used for leisure uses only, the towpath for pedestrians only, and if Maiden Lane station is not built, passengers should be ferried from Camden Road station to the west end of the dock.

There should be access for disabled to the canal and toilets should be provided within the canal towpath. Signage is required for pedestrians in different languages, and to support disabled people.

There is concern about possible overloading of canal towpath with pedestrians and family groups, with children and prams. The towpath is also proposed as a major cycle route, but this would create serious conflict amongst users. It is necessary to provide an alternative route for cyclists (such as sections of the Regent Navigation and Regents Canal in Haggerston) in order to attain the capacity required for pedestrians, and there are opportunities for this at Kings Cross. The towpath should not be developed to resemble a street..

There is one part of the towpath north of the Oblique Bridge where there is a sharp corner that needs attention.

The canal should comprise a real link between northwest and south east.

Design of bridges to be canal style to retain the character of the important (not sidelined) canal corridor.

Action 4 - Housing

Overall numbers & breakdown by type

In terms of amount of housing provision there is very strong support for more housing on the site, particularly affordable housing which addresses the needs of local people, in both Islington and Camden. Para. 13.43 of Chapter 13 of Camden's UDP (adopted 2003) recognises the acute housing shortage in Camden. It is suggested that other land uses, particularly commercial uses to the south of the canal, should be reduced by 5% of the whole percentage and that this 5% increase be given to housing.

Of the responses considered that the proposal relatively contains too many smaller (1 and 2 bedroom) units and the developers should provide more family units (3 and 4+ bedroom units) in line with the figures given for demand for social rented housing in the Joint Brief. This is supported by Policy KC4 of Chapter 13 of Camden's UDP (adopted 2003) which emphasises the need for larger family housing units. The planning application increases the number of units being provided by having far more small ones than suggested in the Joint Brief. Targeting professional people (with high income) would not address housing issues in the area. Alternatively the number of smaller units should remain as proposed, but additional larger units should be provided to meet the requirements of the Joint Brief.

It was suggested that there is a need for more young people on the site and for provision of a good primary school to address the needs of young families.

Also suggested was that within each suggested development zone providing housing there should be both public and private housing to ensure integration of socio-economic groups and different ethnicities

Although the Forum's comments indicate a strong demand for larger family social rented/ affordable accommodation, it was generally considered that the mix of different size units should be the same for market and affordable housing. There could be some social housing in small units for low paid people to be able to live in the area. Overall though, for both market and affordable housing, the emphasis should be on the larger units.

Having consulted with local communities, in terms of the type of housing ownership (rented, shared ownership, owner occupier, etc) in demand in the local area, the Forum has found that all types of housing are required, but particularly affordable housing, and especially social rented and shared ownership.

Location

More mixed development would be more socially sustainable assisting the community to live close to where they work. More housing should be located in the middle of the business area and not as far isolated as in zone F. Housing particularly south of the canal would act to improve community safety - an 'eye on the street'.

The Forum proposes that there should be some ground floor housing both north and south of the canal. Ground floor housing will give an increased sense of safety to pedestrians in the area at night time. Family housing, with access to large terraces or private/ communal amenity space, and housing for disabled people should be on the ground floor. Disabled housing should be in defensible courtyards to give a sense of community. Zones J and S were identified as suitable for

ground floor family housing. Family housing should be affordable/ preferably social rented.

It was felt acceptable that housing could be located along the canals, on upper floors (depending on ground floor use) in south of the site, and on main retail streets.

Wherever the housing is in the site, outlook is a key factor. There was concern that housing development should be well sited to improve the quality of life for residents. Housing development should be avoided where it overlooks busy roads, including York way, and pollution and noise. E.g. busy road, entertainment centre, rail track with noisy air conditioning units with rolling stock by block.

There was some agreement that the mix of different size units should be similar for both market and affordable housing, but with no more than 10% -25% single bed/ studio in market housing. It is considered essential to have the Planning Committee proportions of larger units for the affordable housing 50%, but desirable for market housing in order to have a mixed and integrated community. For example, 30% 2 bedroom units for market and affordable housing. 50% 3 and 4 bedroom units for affordable houses.

Comments related to specific zones

Housing is necessary in zones south of the canal, such as upper floors of zones A and B, though zone F is considered the wrong place for housing.

Housing in zone T should only face into the site, and not towards the railway line.

Housing in zone N (the gasholders) should be significantly reduced- this should not be a predominantly housing area, but should have a greater proportion of D1 and D2 uses, possibly including local tourism uses, art gallery, park, museum, etc.

Housing should be located away from York Way (in zones F, J, R, S, T), because of pollution and noise. Commercial uses should be on the main roads. The northern part of York Way is on a hill and ramp- therefore pollution is higher here than if it were on level roadway.

Housing should also be avoided in close proximity to entertainment centres.

Views to the canal should be maximised. Housing in P should look towards the canal. There should be housing in zone L that looks out towards the canal.

Housing should be built on the south side of Goods Way and look north over the canal.

Like zone E housing. Rehabilitation of the existing housing in Culross, Stanley North, Stanley south buildings.

Zone M should have housing.

Housing should look over the Boulevard and Long Park.

The gas holder area should comprise a museum or other heritage uses, and not solely be used for private housing.

Affordable Housing provision

The Forum considers that given the needs of local communities 50%- 70% of the housing on the site should be affordable. The London Plan says that the Mayor's strategic target for London is that 50% of (housing) provision should be

affordable. Policy KC4 of Chapter 13 of Camden's UDP (adopted 2003) also requires 50% of the net new housing to be affordable.

The affordable housing should be mixed up amongst all the other housing, so as to avoid creating ghettos. There should be affordable housing in the south of the site. This is recognised by Paragraph 2.9.17 in the Joint Brief, which says that the affordable housing should not be located in discrete areas or as large estates but should be integrated into the wider development, along with market housing, and other uses. This also relates to concerns that the surrounding social rented sector is currently being reduced through right to buy, so this right should be extended.

All housing should be integrated with no geographical separation. Affordable housing (incl. social rented family housing) should be mixed with single adult and other occupier households and others. The Forum wishes to avoid the creation of expensive ghettos. To aid the social mix and ensure a sustainable community there should be no geographical separation of the affordable/ market housing. Affordable and market housing should be in the same blocks, with family housing on the lower floors - mixing affordable housing single/ mixed adult households with larger units - mainly social renting for large families. Integration also takes place by addressing community needs and activities, and this factor will play an important role in the success of the community - see Community Facilities.

Access to affordable housing
Comments include -

There should be 70% social rented and 30% intermediate affordable housing. This is in line with the Policy KC4 of Chapter 13 of Camden UDP (adopted 2003) and the Joint Brief.

Other responses support that the percentage should be 50% intermediate housing and 50% social rented housing.

Regarding intermediate housing, it was thought that the emphasis should be on shared ownership and keyworker housing. Intermediate housing should have restrictions on transfer rules, to ensure that it stays with the intended users and is not sold off in the long term. Some responses propose that intermediate housing should include the refurbishment of existing residential units, and Section 106 agreements used to move social housing to high quality areas outside the development and impact areas to improve the social mix of the area in general. Good examples given in Camden in last 30 years include: 1. Branch Hill housing, Hampstead 2. Russell Nurseries, Belsize Park, NW3 3. Highgate New Town. There should be a range of affordable housing tenures and structures including shared co-operatives.

In terms of priority for affordable housing, a range of options were proposed including

70% should be social housing for existing families in the surrounding estates who have children in further education or for those in housing association accommodation with intermediate qualifications i.e. keyworkers.

A theme that was strongly supported was that local key workers should have priority. Local people to have a priority in the area is focus for people over

the country and abroad, but area should not be made to accommodate this otherwise it will be an unbalanced community.

Local groups (local people, disabled, elderly families, key workers, young people) should be considered and should be catered for. They will change over time, but a good mix is desirable.

Planning

The Forum believes that there should be market and affordable housing provided in each phase of the development, and the sequencing of housing (zone by zone) should be an agreed part of the outline planning permission. The housing construction should be front loaded- up to 40% of the housing should be built in the first phase to create a hub of activity by local residents. Intermediate housing- especially key worker housing- should be given priority. This is supported by Policy KC4 of Chapter 13 of Camden's UDP (adopted 2003) which says that the early provision of social and intermediate housing and other housing should be a significant element of each major development phase. Care should be taken in the phasing of the development, so that the impact of overall construction on housing is reduced.

In the first phase to support the residents in the new housing the following should be built -

School, nursery, community centres, canal refurbishing.

Footpaths and cycle paths should be high quality near residential accommodation routes to and from this.

The sequencing of housing should be part of the planning permission so that the community is viable at every stage.

The Triangle site

It was agreed that the planning application does not contain the right mix of different size units, with too many small 1/ 2 bed units proposed which was deemed unacceptable. The proposed emphasis on small units is contrary to the recommended breakdown of different size units in the Islington's AHSPG (April 2003). The breakdown of units suggested by the Forum varies.

3 and 5 bed units should be provided in line with the Council's requirements in the Joint Planning Brief but more 2-3 beds required.

More than 10% studio and 15% 1 bed: 40% 2 bed: 20% 3 bed: 20% 4 bed.

10% 3 bed and 15% 4 bed 50% 2 bed or at minimum, the levels set by Camden Council and Islington Council.

1 bed 20%; 2 bed 30%; 3 bed 30-35%, 4 bed and 4 bed or larger 20%.

There is felt to be an over supply of small executive expensive flats in the area. There are many very small housing units in the surrounding area, many of which are moving into private ownership. There should be a greater number of larger units to satisfy larger families, but there should also be some social housing in small units for low paid people to be able to live in the area. Age groups are likely to change over time.

Smaller units were considered acceptable at higher levels.

There is a need to encourage younger people on the site with the existing good provision of a primary school close by.

wheelchair- friendly housing & other types of specialist housing
There was strong support throughout the Forum for lifetime homes with many
promoting 100% being built to lifetime home standards, with a large proportion
would be wheelchair accessible, particularly studio/ one bedroom units (up to
10%).

Wheelchair/ wheelchair housing should have larger windows facing south east and
west, and low window sill heights for wheelchair access flats. Direct access to
outside space, balconies, etc. Bath in bedroom style useful.. Design flats so
that will allow wheelchair users to live or visit: open plan loft style.

Other comments include:

Affordable housing provision should be in addition to the 74 affordable units
that have been lost from the site.

Roads Way moorings should be protected, and existing residents be allowed to
stay, and be given security of tenure.

Housing design should be 'green'/sustainable.

From the information provided, several people thought that the housing density
is too high, and could only be sustained by greatly improved public transport
accessibility. One person thought that lower buildings would protect views of
listed buildings, and that housing should be provided in place of other uses.

Section 5 ñ Community & Cultural Facilities

Existing community facilities

The Forum has examined existing facilities in Camden and concluded that existing
facilities are poor or not available, and specifically a library (run down), a
advice centre (closed), good community rooms (few available) and poor youth
provision (particularly in Somers Town).

In Islington, i.e. east of York Way, there is a small park (Bingfield Park) with
an adventure playground (Crumbles Castle), a motorcycle project (Sparkplug), two
youth projects in unsatisfactory accommodation (Copenhagen Youth Project and
Prospect Youth Project), the Cally swimming pool, the Lewis Carroll children's
library and two primary schools on Copenhagen Street (Blessed Sacrament and
Copenhagen.)

New facilities

In the new Kings Cross development, a health centre and school (secondary
school and additional primary school places) should be provided. If a new
secondary school is not built, then the developers should contribute to other
secondary schools in the surrounding area. There should be a new swimming pool.
All community facilities should be located so that they are accessible to those
living adjacent to Kings Cross Central, as well as new residents on the
site. Permeability of the Kings Cross Central is an important issue. It was
thought that the proposed health centre in the Islington Triangle would be
accessible to more people if located on the west side of York Way. The new
community facilities should also be financially accessible to local residents,

particularly given the high levels of deprivation in the surrounding areas (Camden UDP, KC1, Para 13.34)

Health facilities are urgently needed to support existing and new communities. This should incorporate healthy living projects.

The question of police presence in the new area has not been addressed. The area will have a considerable population size and visitors, and needs to have police presence of the site should be specifically designated as D1 community usage. And it should be explicit about its private v public use.

The delivery and phasing of community facilities should be at front end of the development (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, SKC3, Para 13.25).

In lieu of the demolition of the Culross buildings, additional D2 usage should be identified. Give to local groups specifically engaged in community development.

The Forum is extremely concerned to note the plans lack a range of community uses to reflect cultural diversity and that no faith practicing facilities have been included in the area. Community facility provision must reflect local needs of the site and surrounding areas to ensure community cohesion (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, KC1, Para 13.36).

The Forum would like to see a wide range of museums (something that the developers have already considered and want).

The character of Kings Cross Central should be made distinct and special transport and industrial heritage of the area could be a theme throughout the retail area.

The international connections that exist historically and in modern local communities should be a theme, which could link in with the proposed higher education and adult education facility, but needs coherent articulation.

The evening economy, and leisure and entertainment uses in the development are supported, and it is thought that they will help make the area livelier (it is part of what the developers want to see happening ñ supporting doc.). It is essential that the pedestrian routes are open 24 hours a day.

The entertainment and leisure uses should be cinemas, bars, pubs, health clubs, gyms, theatres and leisure centre (it is part of what the developers want to see happening ñ supporting doc.). The developer & the council should consider the communities' needs to have their own cultural entertainment provided in the development, such as Sudanese, Eritrean, Somali or Bengali clubs or restaurants. It is thought that the surrounding communities will use these facilities if the site has sufficient public spaces, and safety/security problems in the area have been addressed.

The style and pricing of the leisure and entertainments are likely to be out of reach of many local residents. E.g. few people from Somers Town use Bloomsbury cinemas, museums etc. Pricing is key issue ñ discounts for locals needed or pricing strategies to assist (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, KC1, Para 13.36).

The developer needs to fully explore cultural awareness and address this within the proposals.

Youth activities are needed and young people need opportunities to engage in training and education

There should be no gated communities, careful consideration to building design so that the possibility of crime is reduced, creating environments that are not filled with bars and pubs.

Resources should be put into community wardens and neighbourhood watch schemes. Developers need to contribute financially to promoting KXC as a new area that is far away from its less desirable past, but unique in capitalising on its history. More education to residents on how to reduce local crime and how they can improve their own patches, more local control, not police dependent. The developers should contribute by a range of enabling support in economic and social terms

Provide employment, training, sports and community facilities plus facilitators: centre managers, youth workers and coordinators with youth clubs

Physical measures to be restricted to good urban design plus lighting of public realm spaces

Secure a S106 agreement now for the developers to implement a scheme of overhaul of all nearby facilities so that they are in good stead by the time the population increases

Multi use community building on site

Green transport

Swimming pool

Affordable sports and leisure facilities for locals

It is very important that the new quarter is integrated socially and architecturally into the existing urban grain and the Camden/ Islington border. Long York Way should not be seen as a barrier or a frontier. Residents in the new quarter will have easy access to existing community facilities east of York Way in Islington (Camden UDP, SKC1, Para 13.14). In this part of Islington there is a need for an improvement in play and youth facilities, whereby existing play and youth facilities are upgraded (suggestions are Sparkplug motorcycle project and Crumbles Castle Adventure Playground in Bingfield Park) and a new youth hub is built on the west side of York Way (Zones Q or J), serving both Camden and Islington. The new hub could provide social space, meeting rooms, training rooms and office space for local voluntary sector youth projects (suggestions include Copenhagen Youth Project and Prospex).

Community endowment or fund - respondents list a set of issues that will require revenue funding to deal with in the future. Section 106 etc will provide capital investment but not revenue grants. At Wembley, the new stadium will give 1% of operating profits to the local community for community schemes. Something similar could be done here - either gifting a building to the community or sequestering the revenues from a particular part of the development to ongoing community needs in perpetuity.

Regarding Community & Cultural Facilities, Training, Funding and Regeneration: many comments that residents and the Forum made regarding what they want to see: community facilities, training and employment, cultural facilities and funding exist only in the supporting documents of the application (Regeneration Strategy) and not the application - they also lack clarity of how they are going to be implemented and they are not binding for the development to actually deliver them. These issues should be made clearer and form part of the application.

not just be intentional and illustrative. ñ as they have a major impact on the successful integration of existing and new communities.

Section 6 ñ Business, Employment, & Training

Proposals for assistance to local people to gain employment and training are strongly supported by the Forum. However there is concern that at this stage these proposals are only illustrative. The lead-in period for the development provides considerable opportunity to ensure that local communities have the skills necessary to obtain employment when those opportunities arise providing that a programme is established in the near future (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, DC1, Para 13.14).

Local people should be given priority to own businesses and shops in the development, at a reasonable price, with help with financial planning. Consideration should be given to ensuring that these opportunities are offered to a mix of people with different ethnic backgrounds and genders.

Local people should benefit from more than 9,000 jobs out of the 35,000 to be created. A figure of 25,000 is proposed. Tied into a wide range of employment support, this should be achievable and make a significant impact on developing relationships with local communities in surrounding areas. Construction jobs would be considered separately as they are short term.

Local people should have access to senior level jobs, according to their qualifications, and should therefore be assisted to access these e.g. management training programmes could ensure that over the long development period of these proposals local communities have equal opportunities.

The Forum supported LDA Single Programme funding to support training for employment, and recommended that the programme should be delivered with local community development agencies. Recommendations from comments included:

That there should be brokerage to ensure that recruitment for jobs in the development actively proceeds in the areas surrounding the site.

That help should be provided to assist local people starting up their own businesses.

That there needs to be a trades training college that provides training for Central London's plumbers, electricians and other trades.

Should have facilities for business start-ups.

Local people can be assisted to get jobs by a) the awareness and advertising of the project itself, briefings and introductions to the range of jobs possibly available b) having more initiatives and training centres. More road shows, actually setting themselves up in surrounding wards c) a percentage of posts allocated to local people d) jobs advertised to local people and equal opportunity to BMEs.

Local authorities and developer must set up a lead body coordinating at the earliest stage.

There will be considerable impact from this re-development on rents to all surrounding businesses and properties which will rise.† Small businesses, and shops cannot afford to pay high rents and whilst trade is also likely to increase in the future, not necessarily all businesses will benefit.† It is important that the examples of trust-driven businesses within the development

that are proposed by the Forum are encouraged to prevent the kinds of high rent private landlords may take advantage of.

There was little confidence that the CTRL project had actually been successful in employing local people. The obligation to train must come first, then the jobs.

Policy KC3 (Camden UDP, 2003) states, the Council would support development that includes a range of business uses, such as a range of different sized units, including smaller and 'start-up' units and workshops; and units that have flexible physical design and layout.

The specific needs of established small businesses and start up small businesses in the area were identified as

start-up grants, staff training

subsidised rent subsidy

small business association on site so that they can form a KXC Association

lots of room for artist/workshop, businesses

small businesses should not be defined as Tesco Metros or Boots (chain stores)

low rents

long secure leases

wide range of business space (M2) be provided for movement/expansion/

contraction

recruit training and trained staff

different physical spaces e.g. artist studio types 24 hour lighting

delivery and parking integral to spaces

personnel facilities- food/drink in immediate neighbourhood = mixed development

low rents, long secure leases in appropriate locations.

Retail

The Forum agrees whole heartedly that residents' needs should be the priority in terms of retail provision. New and existing residents should have basic shopping facilities (including a small supermarket) provided in Kings Cross Central to cater for everyday needs. Other shopping normally found in a traditional town centre should also be provided in the development for residents. Many more people live close to the Angel Town Centre, or Camden High Street, and would be seriously impacted upon if those centres were undermined. Moreover, a small supermarket has just opened on the P & O site. Although there is good shopping in Camden Town, this is some distance away, and therefore particularly in a development that is seeking to reduce car use, there should be 'proper' shopping provision in the development. There are gaps in provision for shopping in certain areas around the site and KXC will therefore have to provide this, so good range of shopping and leisure; small scale shopping and supermarkets should be priorities. The development should provide a mix of large and small scale retail.

The shopping facilities on the site should be self sufficient but suitable for local needs.

A fruit & vegetable market is required - the nearest are in Camden or Angel.

Healthy eating is an important issue for local communities, and again can assist with integration.

There is concern that the proposed retail provision in the development is likely to have a detrimental impact on the surrounding neighbourhood centres. In particular, Caledonian Street will be harmed, and a comprehensive strategy and measures need to be taken as part of the proposals to combat this (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, KC1, Para 13.35).. Minimal parking provision within the new development would assist, but parking provision around the site should be reviewed to assist local businesses. In addition the proposals should look outside the site to include physical connections between new and local retail areas such as Copenhagen Street.

Opportunities for local businesses to relocate or develop new business should form part of the proposals to integrate the new site with existing communities. There was no consensus regarding whether or not additional retail units should be provided targeting visitors, tourists and passengers. However there was consensus that 'festival shopping' should be avoided. Many believe that there are already many places to shop locally for these groups and that visitors and tourists do not need any special provision in the development. Any additional tourist/ market festival shopping should be kept to a minimum.

Options for this retail provision are:

• High quality niches, such as fishmongers, organic food, fair trade products, etc.

• Craft and cultural industries producing/ selling original high quality products with links to local communities from abroad, such as Thai, Somali, Chinese etc. This could include ceramics and textiles.

• Complementary therapies cluster.

The idea is for retail to be built into the canal towpath link with Camden Local comments on the retail study from the local communities -

Somers Town does not have a neighbourhood centre, only a small community centre. We require a Neighbourhood Centre for St Pancras and Somers Town ward with the development of King's Cross (the King's Cross ward already its own centre). Assertion that Chalton St will benefit is debatable. Could drain trade away.

Action 7 - Regeneration

The regeneration programme needs to have a long term vision that integrates the site into the surrounding area, maintaining the integrity of the area as a whole (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, SKC1, Para 13.15).

The Forum believes that in order for the existing and new local communities to have a stake in the development, the developers should set up and invest in a community trust and the trust premises on the site, such as in the Fish and Co. Offices.

A fund should be set up to finance community schemes across the area (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, KC12, Para 13.72).

Local community representatives and residents should be a vital part of the development of any management board or structure for the site. The Board should be balanced to reflect the range of uses and avoid 'commercial' dominance (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, KC12, SKC1) .

There is concern that regeneration funds will only go to Kings Cross ward rather than St Pancras and Somers Town and Caledonian Wards.

Section 8 - Integration

There was a range of comments on this issue:

Public pedestrian routes across the site need to be implemented - these are currently limited. No-go or exclusive routes should not be created. Footways and towpaths will help integration but only if there are facilities, e.g. health, social, etc. on the site which surrounding people of all ages and nationalities will visit e.g. mosques, schools, dentists. The canal should be regenerated as a transport route, and double locks reopened to facilitate movements through the site.

Simple things like signage at eye level of wheel chair users can assist with integration.

This plan does not have the right kind of housing mix to ensure social integration. There has to be more affordable housing with a greater proportion of larger units - otherwise it will be permanently a childless zone, with sharp class, age and social divides with adjoining communities. There needs to be housing north and south of the canal.

The amount of public space is inadequate - there is only enough to serve the commercial buildings (sandwiches at lunch) but not enough for neighbourhood park. There needs to be more open green space that is publicly accessible, without cars surrounding it. At least 10% of the land should be for public parks. There should be an extension to Camley Street Natural Park.

There needs to be street and pedestrian friendly areas with activities to draw people into them in days and evenings, e.g. good public art and places to play. There should be ongoing and genuine involvement of community at all stages of planning and delivery. Community partnerships are really vital to making this work. However, developer must be willing to facilitate this by direct means and continuous funding.

A community trust should be established, with a land stake and shares. Optimum integration can be maximised by not having the highest levels of commercial space possible, and therefore having more possibilities for D1 (community) floor space. Community facilities should be accessible to all, not health clubs or private gyms needing enormous annual membership fees. There could be more community facilities in the area south of the canal.

Economic integration can be promoted by having a wide mix of uses, and not so many offices. There should be a range of sizes of businesses, with more small than large. Employment: get local people into jobs - this should be a priority including in the construction phase.

There should be a tourist information centre.

Sections S and R will provide opportunities for easy integration

Other general comments are: integration needs to be low pressure; the development is too intense with too much stuffed in without regard for how it will integrate, and the built realm is far too intense and does not give a homely feel.

The Forum wishes to see the developers contribute financially to the integration process (Camden UDP, Chapter 13, KC12, Para 13.72).

- to maintain the area
- socially and economically, but not one-off: continuous funding
- for community facilities, at present not guaranteed in proposal;
- for education and training (primary and secondary schools);
- for physical integration;
- route under/over CTRL to Maiden Lane;
- finance for Tram, Maiden Lane Station, York Road Station;
- route to Agar Grove and Wharfedale Road;
- route over Camley Street;
- route to link the development with Somers Town and St Pancras;
- measures to alleviate traffic on Swinton and Acton Streets;
- measures to facilitate bus service improvements on Pentonville Road.

Action 5 Management & Monitoring

There should be joint decision making in the planning and management of community facilities in a Consortium Partnership to provide a sustainable community in Kings Cross Central. The Forum strongly supports the involvement of the community in monitoring but those representatives must be fully resourced. Any consultants or staff involved should work for a community organisation, NOT the Council or developer.

The environmental impact should be constantly monitored and be undertaken by independent (not developers) organisations.

All monitoring data should be made available to local communities.

Suggested areas to monitor include

Change of uses needs monitoring in case amount of offices increases

How many local people are employed on site and what kind of jobs

How many small businesses start and stay up

How many local people trainees obtain jobs there

The impact of structures and mechanisms- e.g, KXDF for success in involving

local communities and effectiveness in terms of volunteer time

Action 106 delivery

The agreed strategy for building process

Builders access to site (traffic on surrounding roads) and impact of

construction on local communities

Working hours

Gaining and information

The impact of community consultation processes

Need to deal with various assessments including transport, townscape, heritage, and retail.

Community representatives should sit on the body that negotiates the s.106 agreements.

Monitoring should come from a representative group of the community, KXDF, CRLG, etc. there should be funding and training provided for this group to work with the Councils on a long term basis.

A support should continue.

Comments on the application information itself

Because many parts of the application featured in supporting documents rather than the application itself, it was more difficult to grasp and understand the key elements that were actually being proposed.

The parameters of the proposals contained in the application were often vague or difficult to be intangible elements e.g. land use mixes and ranges too complex and too flexible to assess the full impact of the proposals.

The extent of documentation was difficult to deal with as it consisted of so many documents with information spread around them. A strategic document together with a series of Topic documents e.g. housing or car parking showing space, layout, design ideas etc would be more useful so people can look at the area of interests in relation to

Wembley Park featured on illustrative plans even though it lies outside application site boundary and could lead to an incorrect impression of open space associated with the development proposals..

Minimum and maximum heights - there was no consistency of approach across the Wembley and Triangle sites.

APPENDIX 1 - KINGS CROSS DEVELOPMENT FORUM

Extracts from Terms of Reference Adopted 25th September 2003

Terms of the Forum

The King's Cross Development Forum is an independent community-led forum which aims to involve residents of the neighbourhoods surrounding the King's Cross development area in the area's ongoing redevelopment. It aims to:

- provide a strong and coordinated voice for all the residents of the wider King's Cross area to enable them to understand and influence the planning and development process

- maximise community participation in, and benefit from, the development, including securing the community delivery and management of projects over the lifetime of the development

- help ensure that adverse impacts of new construction and development upon surrounding communities are minimised

- ensure continuity and consistency of community participation in the planning and development process, including the sharing of information and learning on activities and projects

- build consensus among local communities and their responses in relation to the new developments

provide advice on the overall direction of development proposals within the area of consultation

raise awareness and understanding and improve the information available

build effective and constructive partnerships with developers, planning authorities and other stakeholders including through joint decision making.

provide a broadly based consultative Forum, prioritising efforts to ensure participation on the part of the under-represented

contribute to policies, plans and strategies

facilitate better communication, consultation and liaison

identify gaps in, and opportunities for, participation and benefit and seek additional resources in addressing this and any adverse impact

Geographical Area

The area covered by the Forum is that area which includes those variously described as "King's Cross railway lands", "King's Cross Central", "the King's Cross Opportunity Area" and its surrounding neighbourhoods in both Camden and Islington

Membership

Membership is open to all of the community led groups and organisations based within an interest in the area defined in above that support the Forum's aims and objectives, irrespective of the age, marital status, gender, sexuality, disability, colour, race, religion, ethnic or national origins of their members or their representatives.

APPENDIX 2

ANALYSIS OF THIS RESPONSE

This response is based on a series of 4 intensive workshops undertaken at local facilities around the Kings Cross Central site. The workshops were advertised and open to all. All comments given at the workshops were included in the draft response. This was subsequently circulated within an agreed timescale to the Forum and additional comments on the draft document included. The Response therefore represents the wider views of the Forum.

WORKSHOP TIMETABLE

Week 1 7 September (6.30pm-9pm) Workshop 1 - Housing & Regeneration & Shopping

looked at the following issues ñ Housing types (affordable/ private/ rented/ dayworker etc) and size/ location, together with the general land use balance across the site, shopping, and regeneration. (Attended by approx. 25 representatives)

Wed. 11 September (10.30am-1pm) Workshop 2 ñ Community, Business & Employment
looked at community facilities in their widest sense and include health, education, community facilities, leisure facilities, cultural facilities, as well as looking what is proposed in terms of local and big business, employment and training, including tourism. (Attended by 14 representatives)

Mon. 13 September (6.30pm-9pm) Integration & Transport
looked at proposals for integration within the site and with surrounding areas including fuzzy boundaries ñ physically, visually and community-wise. It will also include proposals for footpaths, roads, vehicles, public transport, parking and canals. (Attended by 10 representatives)

Wed. 18 September (10.30am-1pm) Environment & Conservation
will look at environment in its widest sense ñ both green issues and the built landscape - including proposals for open space, design and sustainability impact on health, and historic buildings and structures. (Attended by 14 representatives)

19th October 2004

Planning Aid for London
Unit 2
1-29 Fashion Street
London E1 6PX
Tel: 020 7247 4900