

[headed paper – Save Britain's Heritage]

Alison Fairhurst
Government Office for London
Riverwalk House
157-161 Millbank
London SW1P 4RR

28th March 2006

Dear Ms Fairhurst

Kings Cross Railwaylands Application: support of request for call in

SAVE Britain's Heritage writes to support the call made by the Kings Cross Conservation Area Advisory Committee for the First Secretary of State to call in the application for the redevelopment of the railwaylands behind Kings Cross / St. Pancras for consideration at a public inquiry.

The development of this major inner city site is of national importance, and it is vital that the development sets the best standards in new architecture, conservation and regeneration. While SAVE is in general supportive of the proposals, we do not believe that they are sufficiently developed in terms of the conservation of the historic environment as they need to be in order to meet national policy and guidance as laid down in PPG15 – Planning and the Historic Environment

Specifically, SAVE is seriously concerned at the proposed demolition of two buildings as a part of the scheme, the Culross building and the listed Northern Stanley Building. The reasons for demolition are more to do with roads - an attitude redolent of the less inspired days of planning in the 1960s – rather than outright community benefit.

The Kings Cross Conservation Area Advisory Committee has demonstrated how these two buildings – both statutorily protected, one by listing, the other by virtue of the conservation area – can be retained. This serious contribution to the discussion over the future of the site has been ignored, in spite of concerns at the loss of both buildings having been raised early in the process by the KXCAAC and SAVE.

SAVE supports the view of KXCAAC that the alternatives to demolition have not been properly explored in the current planning application, in particular as the application is an outline application, not a detailed application, and that the grant of permission by Camden Borough Council did not properly take into account the alternatives to demolition including the possibility of retention.

Yours sincerely,

Adam Wilkinson
Secretary