

*This document contains the proportions of, and comments by, unnamed participants who accepted or rejected proposals in the workshops on the revised outline planning application of 2005 facilitated by Planning Aid for London. It includes also a summary of the position of the Forum, so that it could be the response of the Forum in the consultation on the application. In the form now available it omits results from two of the workshops, on the heads of terms for the section 106 agreement and on the triangle site (for people who were unable to attend the other workshop on the triangle site).*

**KINGS CROSS CENTRAL  
OUTLINE PLANNING  
APPLICATION (REVISED)**

**FORMAL RESPONSE  
by  
KINGS CROSS DEVELOPMENT  
FORUM**



Collated by Planning Aid for London

Nov. 2005

## CONTENTS

	Page No.
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	3
<b>THE CONSULTATION PROCESS</b>	3
<b>RESPONSES</b>	
Section 1 - Conservation & Design	3 <sup>rd</sup> Oct. 2005
Section 2 - Open Space & Public Realm	3 <sup>rd</sup> Oct. 2005
Section 3 - Transport	6 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2005
Section 4 - Triangle Site	10 <sup>th</sup> Oct 2005
Section 5 - Community Facilities	10 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2005
Section 6 - Housing (Main Site)	10 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2005
Section 7 - Employment & Training	17 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2005
Section 8 - Environmental Sustainability	17 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2005
Section 9 – Planning Obligations (Section 106)	20 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2005
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
Forum Terms of Reference	

## BACKGROUND

An outline planning application was submitted to London borough of Camden on 28 May 2004 in relation to the Main Site at King's Cross Central. The application was registered under reference number 2004/2307/P. An application was also lodged with London borough of Islington in connection with the adjacent Triangle site at the same time. The Forum previously provided a response (in October 2004) on the proposals for Kings Cross Central. This response included what has been termed the 'Main Site' and the 'Triangle' site. The Forum is now responding to a revised application for the same sites.

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 welcomed in principle the redevelopment of the Kings Cross Central site but, despite subsequent amendments resulting in the current application, is still not in a position either to welcome or reject the current outline application as a whole. As the responses show there is overwhelming support for some proposals and equally strong objections to others. A number of issues show mixed views. The Forum believes the application still needs further revision and that more information should be provided (and particularly on securing mechanisms for monitoring, community facilities and involvement) before the application can be determined by the planning authorities. Central to the responses is a belief that surrounding communities (some of whom may eventually form part of the new community on the site) have easy and direct access to all that the new development has to offer, that local communities benefit from the development, and that existing facilities are improved and new ones provided to meet the demands of the populations that will visit, live on, work or play within the site.

To assist both Councils and the applicant, the Forum has again prepared a joint response on the revised Outline application. These comments are summarised more fully below. 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 (PAL) to run a further 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 again it was left to constituent groups and individuals to take such a position in their own responses. However the responses are formed largely from a number of questions based on the revisions and major issues of the proposals, and replies clearly indicate the level of support for each issue.

Where there have been no revisions to the application, then the Forum's response remains the same as in its original response submitted in October 2004 – this document is not reproduced here as it is already in the public domain.

**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 three years to consider both the planning brief and the planning application.

## THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

The response in October 2004 arose from a number of workshops based on topic areas agreed by the Forum and considered to be of most concern to local communities.

Both Councils received a revised planning application for Kings Cross Central in May 2005. The Forum has therefore concentrated its efforts on those revisions and its views are contained in this current response. Again the views were gained through a series of workshops run by Planning Aid for London (PAL) and organised around topic areas selected by the Forum. Where there have been no revisions, then the Forum's response remains the same as in its original response submitted in October 2004.

A number of meetings were held with the Forum and its Steering group to identify key issues around which workshops would be based. A subsequent presentation event explained the application and provided each participant with a range of application documents, plans and supporting information. A programme of detailed topic workshops followed. The workshop programme is detailed below. The Forum and PAL are grateful to Officers from Camden and Islington who organised the venues, refreshments etc and attended each event.

All events were held in local venues close to or on the site. Each started with a short presentation, given by Camden Officers, on key elements of the revised application on the chosen topic area. This was followed by a question and answer session managed by PAL. A workshop session followed, with supporting information sheets provided for participants to take away. These explained some key parts of the application and compared what was now proposed in relation to the previous application and reminded the Forum of its previous response. Information was also available (hard copies or by email) to those who required it on previous workshops. As requested by the Forum, the workshop session itself consisted of a series of questions, allowing participants to indicate their level of support, and providing opportunities to give reasons for those views. The response was then calculated using the Forum's voting procedures, and is intended therefore to show the Forum's majority views. The responses are shown in Sections 1-9.

**Schedule of meetings: 7- 9pm.**

Monday 3 <sup>rd</sup> October	Open Space/Public Realm / Design and Heritage
Thursday 6 <sup>th</sup> October	Transport
Monday 10 <sup>th</sup> October	Triangle site / Housing / Community Facilities
Thursday 13 <sup>th</sup> October	Presentation and discussion with the applicant - Argents Kings Cross
Monday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	Environmental Sustainability / Employment and Training
Thursday 20 <sup>th</sup> October	Planning Obligations (Section 106)

Note: A further event was held on Monday 24<sup>th</sup> October regarding the Triangle Site (an additional event held on behalf of London borough of Islington). The response resulting from that event has been provided to that Council.

**Further information is available from the Kings Cross Development Forum c/o Satnam Gill, Principal, Working Men's College , 44 Crowndale Road, London NW1 1TR, 020 7255 4700 and Planning Aid for London 020 7247 4900**

## **APPENDICES -**

### **KINGS CROSS DEVELOPMENT FORUM**

#### **Extracts from Terms of Reference Adopted 25<sup>th</sup> September 2003**

##### **Aims of the Forum**

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

- a) 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
- b) maximise community participation in, and benefit from, the development, including securing the community delivery and management of projects over the lifetime of the development
- c) help ensure that adverse impacts of new construction and development upon surrounding communities are minimised
- d) ensure continuity and consistency of community participation in the planning and development process, including the sharing of information and learning on activities and projects
- e) build consensus among local communities and their responses in relation to the new developments
- f) provide advice on the overall direction of development proposals within the area of consultation
- g) raise awareness and understanding and improve the information available
- h) build effective and constructive partnerships with developers, planning authorities and other stakeholders including through joint decision making.
- i) provide a broadly based consultative Forum, prioritising efforts to ensure participation on the part of the under-represented
- j) contribute to policies, plans and strategies
- k) facilitate better communication, consultation and liaison
- l) 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 or with 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.

Topic Area: 'Conservation and Design'

Number of Participants: 39  
Number of completed question sheets returned: 28

Responses to Questions:

**Question 1:** Two of the three gas holders in Zone N have been lowered in height from approx. 41.5 m to 28.5m & 31.5m. Are you satisfied in the reduction of height of the gas holders?

Support: 55%

Object: 37%

Not sure: 6%

Does not matter: 1%

**Cont. Question 1: comments for responses**

'All the triplets were and should be the same height. It follows that all three infills should be the same to retain the unity and none should be higher than the holders.'

'Gas holder in the +60-70m AOD range is too high (12 levels).'

It is residential, if the reinstatement is to be 'read' correctly in industrial history terms that the infill buildings should mimic the original bells. I never saw any bell above guide frame.'

'Keep overall height of all three within the height of the historic guide frames, will heights significantly staggered, i.e. all three to be lowered more relative to stated levels.'

'The bells did not go above the frames, so the building must not either. Also concerned about the circular courtyard in relation to geometry of the frames.'

'As long as they are functional it does not matter'

'Do you mean heights of housing or actual gas holder?'

'We feel the use of them and their localism is wrong. They ought to be positioned south of the canal and given a non-domestic residential uses, so to allow a larger design-contract-opportunity to the frames.'

'How does it refer to adjoining buildings? Sight line for different level e.g.'

'Major historic element of the Kings Cross area-very widely known and recognised. Greatest advantage should be made of item, so no justification for reducing their importance so they should be presented to their best advantage, so any infill should be relatively smaller so as not to dominate.'

1. The frames of the gasholders should retain their initial height. 2. All the holder infills should be below the frame so that the outline at the very top can be seen. This is the thrilling effect that these structures have on the eye. The interior design, whatever it is, should be broken up so that the eye can travel through parts of the design as it did in the past.'

'You are showing as plans and elev. Section of a project that is not even part of the application. I agree on the general level but this is not a substitution of need / Housing-public realm-community-necessity. The problems are elsewhere.'

'The frames are at the same height, the bells could rise or fall within them but not over the frame tops.'

'All gas holder infills should fall below the frame for conservation aesthetics.'

'As long as they are functional and aesthetically pleasing to surrounding environment.'

**Question 2: Do you support or object the relocation of the Gas Holder frames in Zone N?**

**Support: 62%**

**Object: 26%**

**Not sure: 10%**

**Does not matter: 2%**

**Cont. Question 2: If you object, how would you suggest the relocation of the Gas Holder frames in Zone N?**

'This is a very vexed question and needs considerable care; what reinstatement must not do is encourage misinterpretation of the original site.'

'Surrounded by huge buildings which hide this historical value. This archaeological value is destroyed by this relocation; they should stay where they come from.'

'Should ideally be retained in their original position in Zone B.'

'Make it away from Camley Street.'

'Leave in present place in Zone B. Heights should be lower than offices and better canal and Camley Street.'

'E.g. public use at ground and basement level (double height) and commercial use floor above-mainly structured in steel & glass so that provability of viewing is achieved (rather than solid walls).'

'Western Yards should be retained. Plenty of room to move the gas holders over, and yards shed would make an appropriate setting for the holders. Also an important historic canal basin below the Yard, shed should be restored as it has an important function '

'All gasholders should stay in the southern part of the site. They are much more suitable for offices rather than houses, for community events in the lower part of the holders, and maybe for a restaurant on the top of

one of them. Or why not make one of the gasholders a hotel in the southern part of the site in Zone B. Gasholder 8 is a landmark and can offer commuters, residents and workers all sorts of activities within. The gasholders shown on the plan in Zone N look out of proportion with St Pancras Lock and the tow path. The buildings that are presently opposite the lock look much more in place. I will expand upon this in an individual paper to the council.'

'Return them to Zone B where they must be.'

**Question 3: Gas Holder No. 8 will become 'Flux Park'. It will be designed to include a new ramp that winds around the inside of the frame to allow the development of two public viewing platforms. Do you support the design of 'Flux Park' including its ramp?**

**Support: 85%**

**Object: 5%**

**Not sure: 9%**

**Cont. Question 3: If you object to the proposals, then why not?**

'Community function space is good idea as long as it is easily accessible for community use and not expensive.'

'Probably the best solution.'

'Object to the name – confusion of scientific concepts and misuse of language. I am afraid to the history of technology.'

'It looks like a little ghetto placed around offices. It is the ideal place to grow up new young criminal.'

'Ramp would be better going right up to first cornice level.'

'Support if it is kept in Zone B.'

'The location of it bilkers. It ought to be grouped with the other side of the canal.'

'Gas Holder No 8 has interest and importance- its own right, and no need to make it full of activity, very contrived. It is attractive and can be appreciated just as it is. It has become one of the 'icons' of the Kings Cross over all by itself, and has never been 'animated' to make people appreciate it-and treasure it.'

'Support if it stays in the southern part of the site in Zone B-allow site line to clock tower and provide more light on Camley Street Natural Park and on the canal. I would like to see spaces through the gasholders so that some light could filter through all the time. See my early comment on pages 2, 3 and 4.'

'Too poor/no necessity. The project is just a sketch; people can barely understand / back to the drawing boards.'

'Not appropriate use. Better to leave empty.'

'Support the basic idea, provided that it is acoustically protected, e.g. roller-skating and roller-boarding to be banned, likewise other noisy interference, music etc. If that's impossible, I'd prefer using the gasholder to include an arboretum / botanic garden.'

'View what?-Nothing to see/view, must be green space not concrete, presently (as presented) will attract 'undesirables' rather than youth playing and will be no go graffiti zone.'

**Question 4: Gas Holder No.8 'Flux Park' is proposed for community uses. What community uses would you like to see incorporated into the development of 'Flux Park'?**

'A community centre for local organisations, including individual, and room for meetings, events and offices.'

'It could support a variety of uses e.g. public performances; play area, exhibition square-keep the design as flexible as possible.'

'Anything which will be able to attract long term budget for maintenance.'

'Community use should include facilities similar to spaces which cater for multicultural and / or multifaith uses.'

'Fluid space which changes between theatre, market, carnival, sport can happen.'

'Opportunities for festivals/celebrations for people interested in the Regents Canal. For example: Venice Lock Canal Festival / Angel Canal Festival.'

'It could be filled with a lake at the bottom, mimicking the gas seal in the original holder.'

'Use should be low-intensity, not managed uses which leave exclusive of the general community.'

'Community concert, community festivals.'

'Festivals, concerts, youth facilities.'

'Something for children and young people.'

'Something for young people and children.'

'Something for children and young people.'

'To be used by a community land trust, which consults on uses.'

'If the lower two floors of some, if not all, were 'community use' all sports of uses-music, theatre, exhibitions, (skateboarding)'

'Visitors to view the canal and also use platforms for visits specially to view area visible.'

'Unique open space, does not need to be animated.'

'As can be seen from my previous comments Gasholder 8 and the triplets have infinite possibilities for community use. But as I suggested above offices would fit in them extremely well together with the other community uses: museum, cinema, sports hall, open space, theatre or gallery, exhibitions, skateboarding etc. Commuters could use them more easily if they were in the southern part of the site.'

'Community use for children. Should not be allocated only in one point at the site / too early proposal.'

'Any community uses that local community would like-what is safe, kept clean and a feeling of safety and a space any all could use. Uses; community shows, concerts, festivals, student shows, music, moving artists.'

'Change of the name.'

'Adventure playground or activity for youths to help with behavioural problems with youths in area.'

'Must be green e.g. Eden project style-but needs sunshine for that.'

**Question 5: A building extension is now proposed to the Southern Stanley Building which makes it more accessible and reduces building changes. After seeing the new proposal do you support the design?**

**Support: 57%**

**Object: 24%**

**Not sure: 18%**

**Does not matter: 1%**

**Cont. Question 5: If you support or object, then why? Are there any other changes you would like to see?**

'Object; Stanley Buildings is a very special example of a Victorian structure which should be kept in its setting.'

'Support; the details of final P.P will be critical.'

'Support; Make it a community facility and have opportunities for multicultural use.'

'Object; would like to see Stanley restored and visible in the round.'

'Support; make it a community facility.'

'Support; Removal of 2<sup>nd</sup> Stanley Building / Proposal offers opportunity for imaginative scrutiny. This must be sympathetically worked up.'

'Object; The Pancras Road route is still in dispute, and there is the loss of Stanley North is not taken as real.'

'Object; Stanley Buildings should be kept and used for social / community uses.'

'Object; the urban and conservation design is still a desalter here. Could you not look at the CaTUDIS alternative master plan from last year's response?'

'Support; the new building is too dominant. It would be more suitable to have the Stanley Building as the main part-with addition of new building. The second Stanley Building could be retained-plenty of space as no 'motorway' is being proposed for the roadway, and if traffic has to proceed at a reasonable speed-then so be it.'

'This part of the site which includes Culross Gym and Stanley Building needs more work. I do not agree with the embedding of Stanley Buildings South in order that a road should run right by the station. Keep the space in front of the German Gym and Stanley Buildings free of traffic, and keep Stanley Building North. They show the past which is essential for future generations, and besides they are a good design and fit with the rest of the railway buildings. And by keeping the space free of traffic it will be a commuter, community, worker friendly area. The road can stay going around the gym as it does now.'

'Support; What happened to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Stanley Building-what happened to Culross Building- which is the alteration-I only agree the overall urban concept.'

'Object; should keep both parts of building.'

**Question 6: Parameter Plan KXC001 confirms the application includes a new bridge across the Regents Canal to provide access from Camley Street and Somers Town to the Zone M / N (and vice versa). Do you agree with providing a new access point across the canal in this position?**

**Yes: 38%**

**No: 53%**

**Not sure: 10%**

**Cont. Question 6: If NO what would you do to improve accessibility for communities from the Camden side to access the new development?**

*'Surely the comments below relate to the imposition of the footbridge on Camley Street Natural Park—the duplication of names seems to indicate this.'*

'Make a pathway further up the canal where there are also steps.'

'Where is it?'

'I am concerned about adverse effects to Camley Street Natural Park. Can a bridge not be put at extreme end of outside park?'

'Should not impinge on park. Argent could provide extra land for park not to take part of it.'

'We would love a bridge, if no land taken from park.'

'Agree with new access, but not at the expense of Camley Street Natural Park.'

'Insufficient into location –proposed appearance'

'Use towpath and oblique bridge to Camley Street. Proposed bridge does not give access to Somers Town and impacts Camley Street Natural Park negatively.'

'There is already a perfectly road bridge, a few years away that can early be adapted for access to site.'

'Agree with objections made by London Wildlife Trust. Proposed bridge should not be in expense to wildlife.'

'It should be sensible to reinstate the Plimsoll Bridge, i.e. directly across from the proposed to be demolished, ramps to the Plimsoll.'

'Impact of park too great. Goodsway still has to be adequate route.'

'Agree, but do not want to damage the park.'

'Agree, but do not want to damage the park.'

'Agree, but do not want to damage the park.'

'Reinstate pre-circle access via Brill Place and through station.'

'Use an upgraded access from the bridge.'

'An alternative location is required which does not affect Camley Street Natural Park.'

'Spend a bit of time and money on improving routes for the north at oblique bridge. A bridge service at Camley Street over the nature park is far too obtrusive, and deposits people at a very isolated spot.'

**Question 7: Cubitt Park (previously Long Park) has been widened, do you support this new design?**

**Support: 62%**

**Object: 16%**

**Not sure: 19%**

**Does not matter: 3%**

**Cont. Question 7: If OBJECT what would you do to improve the design?**

'Need to see detailed plans, but much better than the wind tunnel.'

'This is probably an improvement.'

'Prefer it not to be sterile, manicured, but to develop it on its own.'

'Whatever shape it is, it should incorporate opportunities for wildlife. Bird, bat, boxes, wildflower meadows, wildlife habitats incorporated into design. Also opportunities for artwork to be displayed-sculpture fountains etc.'

'Cubitt Park itself is good, but Goods Street to its east is much too cramped for respect to be given to historic buildings to its south.'

'This park remains the type of a moderate square, surrounded by oversized building.'

'Should be bigger and green, not large part paved. Better landscaping, not just grass / hard paving.'

'The internal North of Canal area park does not really matter, provided the master plan round the canal is re-worked-resulting in a wider canal.'

'If it is to be the main 'park' it needs to be a larger space and wider than a narrow shape. One important characteristic of a park is that you can go into a park. A higher green space does not give this characteristic-especially if it is overlooked by large buildings.'

'Needs to be a proper park, not a wind tunnel. There is not enough large open space in this development.'

'Where is it?'

'It is still a totally defective park, not proper open space.'

'Cant see how this path will be or stay green – buildings are too high to support a green path.'

### **Attendance at workshop**

#### **Organisations**

Cally Rail Group  
Camden Central Community Umbrella  
Camden LA 21  
Camden Sq CAAC  
Camden Sq Neighbourhood Association  
Friends of Regent's Canal  
Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society  
Kings Cross Community Development Trust  
Kings Cross Chinese Group  
Kings Cross Railway Lands Group  
Neighbourhood Association  
Regents Network

#### **Individuals**

Abuk Deng  
Amanda ?  
Angela Inglis  
Diana Shelley  
John Jacqueline Shirley  
Kirsty McArdie  
Leslie McCartney  
Nahha Mohamed  
Gordon Meenn  
Phil Jeffries  
A. Delarue  
Herman Tribelnig  
Ragaia Ishag

W. Schupbach  
Hassiro Andreis  
S. Russo

**KINGS CROSS WORKSHOP (03/10/2005)**

**Topic Area: 'Open Space & Public Realm'**

**Number of Participants: 39**

**Number of question sheets returned: 30**

**Responses to Questions:**

**Cubitt Square**

**Question 1: Do you support or object to the amendments made to this proposal?**

**Support: 80%**

**Object: 9%**

**Not sure: 10%**

**Cont. Question 1: Comments for responses**

'This whole development does not use the potential of the site.'

'The space should be bigger.'

'Only object to the name.'

'Less of a wind tunnel now.'

'Opportunities for local, cultural, and environmental events.'

'A remnant of historic Plimsoll viaduct needs to be retained.'

'Good name'

'Its value is as an open space, it does not have to be 'animated' as full of facilities. An open space has value by being open and empty, but well landscaped etc.'

'The amendments need to be much greater. Still prone to wind.'

'0.9h of green for KX. Great!! / Sorry, forget Handyside Park!!'

'By joining it up to Cubitt Park – removing the road.'

'Still feel area so small for amend of people, in summer, that may want to use space for events. Activities are to be in Flux Park-cannot this just be green space to enjoy the grass?'

**Cubitt Park**

**Question 2: Do you support or object to the amendments made to this proposal?**

**Support: 61%**

**Object: 23%**

**Not sure: 15%**

**Does not matter: 1%**

**Cont. Question 2: If you object, how would you suggest the 'Cubitt Park' meets the needs for open space provision on the site?**

'An improvement on the previous wind tunnel, but still a bleak square surrounded by high buildings-wasted opportunity.'

'This is an improvement and absent planning brief, could it be better?'

'The space should be bigger, too much hard pavement.'

'Its location is wrong, needs to address northern end of good sheds train assembly are.'

'Much free.'

'Because there will be noise and traffic.'

'Not big enough; overshadowed by high buildings (wider should be better); too much hard paving.'

'Widened, but not nearly enough. It is not a 'park', it is an open space. We are not forked by the ground name.'

'Any amendments for the better are welcome, but this concept is still too limited, resize and shape.'

'Less objectionable than the 'Long Park' needs to be surrounded by lower buildings to allow it to breathe and trees to survive.'

### **Handyside Park**

**Question 3: Do you support or object to the proposals for the three different areas within the Handyside public space and their suggested uses?**

**Support: 72%**

**Object: 16%**

**Not sure: 12%**

**Cont. Question 3: If you object to the proposals, how do you think the public space could be used or redesigned?**

'Too soon to say / looks as if the right use would be safe space for children.'

'Take space from K and J.'

'Include interpretation boards to educate public about Canal Environment / Biodiversity.'

'The developers should draw awareness to the fact the park is on the location of the 1850 railway station.'

'Good addition to the scheme.'

'I cannot see a plan or notes giving info. Do you mean the 'Corniche' strip along the N canal bank? If so, 'YES'.'

'Take space from zone K not zone J (residential and community).'

'Certainly an improvement on previous plans but still too small.'

'The uses may be difficult to maintain in practice. The planting will fail unless the light access is improved.'

'This children's area is close to be used by schools, children's' clubs, nurseries. Support it; it must be close to children facilities to be used to their potential.'

**Question 4: Handyside Park will link up to a larger pedestrianised zone along the canal side edge. Do you support or object to proposals to link these two areas to form a larger pedestrian area?**

**Support: 89%**

**Object: 1%**

**Not sure: 10%**

**Cont. Question 4: If you object to the proposals, please give your reasons**

'The developers hope it will link up, they assume a lot about the canal which they do not own.'

'Total object to the public 'corniche' space on the canal.'

'Not sure about the 'pedestrianised space', but connecting Handyside Park with wider open space is a good idea.'

'But what activity will take place?'

'Only façade.'

'Support, but there are real problems about the canal space.'

'Will this be safe for children?'

**North Square & York Square**

**Question 5: Are you in support of, or do you object to the proposals for these two sites to act as gateways into the north of the site?**

**Support: 53%**

**Object: 9%**

**Not sure: 37%**

**Does no matter: 1%**

**Cont. Question 5: If you object, please give your reasons for doing so**

'How will access and junctions on York Way be designed?'

'Both areas will be very exposed to side traffic.'

'Not convinced that York Way needs any more underused open space along its length; the present open space at corner of Caledonian Road and York Way is distinctly under loved (apart from the lovely elephant benches).'

'Support but needs to be carefully landscaped and tree planted to give a relevant green open space. It looks like it could be a black oasis stranded between busy roads / isolated.

'York Square access to York Way threatens to be a very fast, dangerous junction, therefore a useless 'open space'.'

**Question 6: Will these proposals meet any of the needs for public or civic space that local people have?**

**Yes: 67%**

**No: 8%**

**Not sure: 19%**

**Does not matter: 7%**

### **The Regents Canal**

**Question 7: Look at the landscape proposals for the canal area. Do you support or object to the proposals for the improvement and layout of towpaths, lighting and zone for planting of native species?**

**Support: 60%**

**Object: 21%**

**Not sure: 20%**

**Cont. Question 7: If you object to any of them, please indicate how you would achieve the objectives for the site?**

'Object still clearer! Argents have already betrayed their total ignorance of the canal / I am waiting for the views of canal experts' opinion.

'Support, but safety? e.g. towpath wall.

'Layout of towpath is too indistinct to judge.'

'Towpaths should be much widened and the north walls cut back (as near the bridges).'

'-Loss of historic walls –Congestion and navigational issues from over use of water space adjacent to nearer bend.'

'Would not like to see all the high walls around the canal opened out, against its historic character.'

'This is not the right question at all, because the canal is enclosed, too much along the Southern edge, very noisy and high traffic.'

'Character of the canal is not taken into account.'

'If trees are planted, they will die in a few years from lack of light.'

'More openings / Visual S. / Shadows?'

'Keep the canal walls especially south of Granary. Space near gas holder site will not be safe.'

'Remove high walls enclosing canal may be heritage but modern ASB is the problem-walls down will help.'

'Would like to see more green space along canal.'

<b>Cont. Question 7: Taking account of planning policy and what you said above, is there anything else that would improve the revised proposals for the Canal?</b>
--

'More honest. Camley Street Natural Park is not part of the development but has been presented as if it is.'

'Make accesses and towpaths to canal towpath to include feeling of safety especially for elderly.'

'-Widen the towpath, cut back the north bank –Set back the road on the south side (Goods way West) to provide canal side walkway.'

'Opportunities for more wildlife habitat alongside canal, and opportunities for water buses in future.'

'By keeping it separate from the developers zones. There was no contact between the canal and the surrounding areas except through the various basins etc.'

'Step access to the site from the Canal would improve both.'

'Yes, get rid of Goods Way and align it with the centre of the South of the canal site-run behind the new buildings. Clearly this would make economic sense because of the improved urban environment.'

'More activity on the waterway. Need to encourage visiting boats, waterway passenger transport, water freight etc. None of these has been considered.'

'Green Realm and Connections between Water and Park.'

'Design to keep green, an illusion of a space.'

## The Gas Holders

**Question 8: Do you think that the proposals for Gas Holder No.8 (Flux Park) and the other gas holders will meet the needs of children and families in the area?**

**Yes: 40%**

**No: 27%**

**Not sure: 33%**

**Cont. Question 8: Which parts of the proposals do you support and / or object to, and if you object please state how the proposal could better meet the needs of the site and local children / people?**

'Flux Park probably yes, but other unclear.'

'Good connection to primary school, function space for community use, could include facilities for elderly, places for playing games (chess, dominoes), elderly like to have safe space for socialising.'

'Support educational potential; in particular have opportunities for local festivals.'

'The name Flux Park is inappropriate, and its use should be to allow the best industrial historical interpretation.'

'The use of Gas Holder No.8 as a park / amenity is good, but must avoid 'selective' community use.'

It is quite difficult to know what this might look like, but seems ok. Not a good name though! (Flux Park).'

'It will work as a very important and interesting open space unlike any other open space anywhere.'

'I support the way in which Gas Holder No. 8 is to be used, but do not think the other gasholders will necessarily meet the needs of children and families. How will the residents deal with noise from gas holder no.8?'

'It could locally, if this would be ONE of the other proposals.'

'The name is not appropriate. Not good use of gas holder.'

'Should be all green space.'

'Not real closer to children's park and Handyside Park-these children's facilities should be closer to residential units.'

'I am concerned that it will be too noisy, especially for the flats in the gasholders.'

## Attendance at workshop

### Organizations

Cally Rail Group

Camden Central Community Umbrella

Camden LA21  
Camden SQ CAAC  
Camden SQ Neighborhood Association  
Friends of Regents Canal  
Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society  
Kings Cross Community Development Trust  
Kings Cross Business Forum  
Kings Cross Chinese Group  
Kings Cross Railway Lands Group  
Regents Network  
WMC

**Individuals**

Abuk Deng  
Amanda Nicola  
Diana Shelley  
Kirsty McArdie  
A. Delarue  
Leslie McCartney  
Herman Tribelnig  
Hassiro Andreis  
Gordon Meenn  
Nahma Mohamed  
Phil Jeffries  
Ragaia Ishag  
Virginia Stanley  
W. Schupbach

**Kings Cross Workshop (06/10/2005)**

**Topic Area: 'Transport' (QUESTIONS 1 of 2)**

**Number of participants: 33**

**Number of question sheets returned: 20**

**Responses to Questions:**

**Car parking – Main site**

**Question 1: Do you object to or support the proposed reduction in car parking spaces on the Main Site?**

**Support: 84%**

**Object: 16%**

**Cont. Question 1: Comments for responses**

'The quantity of car parking spaces has not been sufficiently revealed. –The multi-storey car park should not form point of the purposed development.'

'Should be even less.'

'I also object to the demolition of any listed and 'a positive contribution' buildings unless the case and tests have been satisfied under PPG 15.'

'More emphasis on alternative modes of transport car clubs, electric cars, mopeds, electric bikes, free bikes to use around site. For example; Amsterdam. Since this is the most major transport hub in London there doesn't seem a need for parking at all except for disabled / priority groups.'

'In planning how the car spaces are worked out phase with some developments are with no car parking facility (i.e. car free residential development).'

'Where the multiplex structure would be reduced / scrapped towards different areas of the development. No need for multiplex. Learning from previous urban mistakes.'

'Less car parking-more public transport provision.'

'Private cars should be rendered irrelevant on world class public development.'

'Proposals are not radical enough. I think major effort should be made to make car free as possible, and show what can be done in a central London to cut down on cars. Only disabled car parking and some for key workers who may need instant access to transport for their work or to get to work.'

'Much less – this is Central London. The justification for very high densities is public transport accessibility congesting the roads makes public transport poor. Cars should be actively discouraged.'

'Plenty of public transport in the area; -800 spaces is far too many in multi-storey car park -Euston Road and York way will be even busier with all this extra cars -Area is already very air polluted -Aim for car-free housing and visitors to use public transports.

### **Car Parking – Triangle Site**

**Question 2: Do you object to or support the proposed reduction in car parking spaces on the Triangle Site?**

**Support: 63%**

**Object: 26%**

**Not sure: 10%**

**Cont. Question 2: If you object to the proposal, do you consider that there should be MORE or LESS car parking spaces on the Triangle Site? Please give some details of what changes you would like to see to the car parking proposals on the Triangle Site.**

'There should be fewer car parking space provided on the Triangle Site / No temporary car parking provision in the triangle, i.e. no interim car parking provision on the site.'

'I consider that all listed buildings and/or 'positive contribution buildings' can be returned and incorporated into the proposed scheme.'

'Support additional 'public' cycle parking.'

'-Less car parking, for the reasons given above.

'-Absolutely no temporary car park as currently proposed for this site (i.e.: for the next 15-20 years).'

'Think parking should be restricted further, help to reduce road traffic congestion, noise pollution etc...Parking for disabled and key workers only.'

'Also object to its use as a 'temporary' parking site until it is developed-if it ever is.'

'What have 31 car spaces got to with health and fitness?'

### **Cycle parking – Main Site**

**Question 3: Do you object to or support the proposals for cycle parking / storage spaces on the Main Site?**

**Support: 55%**

**Object: 22%**

**Not sure: 21%**

**Does not matter: 1%**

**Cont. Question 3: Comments for responses**

'The quantity of cycle parking provision is sufficient but should not be concentrated in two locations (i.e.: greater distribution).'

'Not nearly enough cycle spaces. UDP requires 1.5 cycle spaces per unit overall. So there should be minimum of 3400 for residential plus 2000 for commercial (1 per 250 sq m).'

'As many as possible.'

'No cycle lanes were mentioned.'

'Support the amount but there ought to be greater distribution through the site.'

'Good idea to have a cycle parking facility that is fully serviced and to encourage people to cycle to trains. Could there also be cycle parking facilities (underground) for all offices on the sides (north of the canal) as well as south.'

'Support the amount, consideration needs to be given to providing a wider distribution of locations for cycle parks. Two kraals are not the answer.'

'Necessary in order to encourage cycling partly for users of network rail stations; Cycle parking at Kings Cross station is already over-subscribed.'

#### **Cycle Parking – Triangle Site**

**Question 4: Do you object to or support the proposals for 250 cycle parking / storage spaces on the Triangle Site?**

**Support: 52%**

**Object: 25%**

**Not sure: 1%**

**Does not matter: 21%**

**Cont. Question 4: If you object to the proposal, do you consider that there should be more or less cycle parking spaces on the Triangle Site. Please give some details of what changes you would like to see to cycle parking proposals on the Triangle Site.**

'Okay for private provision / Need public provision of cycle parking on site.'

'Should be more; 1.5/unit minimum: 375 minimum and 2/unit: 500 ideal.'

'As many as possible.'

'Too much cycle.'

'If the Triangle Site could become less localised and original.'

'Support amount for private, but should have additional public provision at this site.'

'Also make sure there is some secure cycle parking for children using facilities at Cubitt Park, proposed primary school, and also in area around gas holders, and public spaces in the north of canal (in front of Zone G).'

'The site is private and enclosed, does not see to benefit anyone.'

'Especially for healthy / fitness users. In general there are usually not enough bike parking spaces. There should be 250 at least.'

### **Attendance at workshop**

#### **Organisations**

Cally Rail Group  
Camden Cycling Campaign  
Camden LA21  
Camden Square Conservation Advisory Committee  
Camden Square Neighbourhood Association  
Friends of Regents Canal  
Kings Cross Community Development Trust  
Sudanese Children in Need  
Towfiq Somali Community

#### **Individuals**

Abuk Deng  
Diana Shelley  
John Jacqueline Shirley  
Terence Ewing  
Gordon Meenn  
Hassiro Andreis  
Helia Evans  
Leslie McCartney  
Nahma Mohamed  
Phil Jeffries  
Virginia Stanley

**Kings Cross Workshop (06/10/2005)**

**Topic Area: 'Transport' (QUESTIONS 2)**

**Number of participants: 33**

**Number of question sheets returned: 18**

**Responses to Questions:**

**Cross River Tram**

**Question 5: The Cross River Tram is NOT part of the planning application, however the planning application shows which streets would have the capacity to support the Cross River Tram if it went ahead in the future? Do you object to or support the potential routes of the Cross River Tram within the Kings Cross Opportunity Area as shown on 'Local Route Options for Cross River Tram.'?**

**Support: 42%**

**Object: 55%**

**Not sure: 1%**

**Does not matter: 1%**

**Cont. Question 5: Comments for responses**

'Not Camley Street or Brill Place, major issues with cyclist's safety.'

'No tram-Hydrogen cell buses if any new form of transport introduced.'

'-The CRT will not happen, it is too expensive.

-The only route that works is Euston Road with a terminus in the front of Kings Cross.

-One tram scheme might buy a fleet of hydrogen fuel cell buses.'

'I believe acceptance would be helped. If image could be projected of what tramways and trams are like nowadays.'

'Believe a terminus between the stations is the most logical location.'

'Euston Road.'

'I object the Euston Road, I support the Midland Road and Boulevard.'

'I do object any proposed route for a tram. I do not think there is need for a tram within the Kings Cross opportunity area. It should be an area to take opportunity for the benefit of the local people.'

'Object Euston Road, support Midland Road and Boulevard.'

'Prefer Euston Road. Not to go through Somers Town (where there is great opposition). But would prefer improved bus services to expensive and unsightly tram.'

'Cannot visualise the decade ahead how tram will enhance transport, may end in Camden.'

'I definitely think it should go to Kings Cross / St Pancras, but as long it is within easy walking distance (no more than 10-15 minutes) then no particular preference yet as to route. It depends on how noisy it is going past residential streets.'

'-Prefer Euston Road / avoids Somers Town and increase potential for Islington connection. –Object to in-site termini dead ends.'

'Although it would be even better if it went into the Kings Cross Central area, as originally proposed (there were going to be two branches – one ending at Camden Town and the other Kings Cross Central.)'

### **Pancras Road Scheme / Surface Interchange Plan**

**Question 6: Have a look at the handout 'Pancras Road Scheme'.**

**There are two sets of options relating to whether or not the station enhancement proposed by Network Rail goes ahead or not. The developer has designed for both.**

**Option 1 and 3 show the site with the station enhancement built. One shows wider pedestrian crossings but less taxi facilities and the other narrower pedestrian crossings and more taxi facilities. Option 2 and 4 show the same but showing only the space reserved for the station enhancement. Which do you support?**

#### **With Station Enhancement**

**Option 1: 40%**

**Option 3: 8%**

#### **Without Station Enhancement**

**Option 2: 35%**

**Option 4: 10%**

**None of the above: 7%**

**Cont. Question 6: Comments on preferences.**

'All have far too much emphasis on taxis. Taxi pick-up should be from York Way. Cycle lane should be reinstated.'

'The station enhancement should happen. Pedestrian-only areas should not be reduced by provision of a taxi lane.'

'Pedestrian provision is more important than taxi queuing.'

'Pedestrians have precedence over taxis - latter can stack off site, vide Heathrow.'

'The plans weren't set out specifically enough.'

'-should make pedestrians priority –businessmen getting off trains should also have opportunity to take buses too, not just taxis –priority cannot be for just taxis but all transport including walking.'

'Because we need more taxi lane.'

'Extern taxi lane is good, give the space for taxis.'

'Option 2 without station enhancement and without taxi lane because there will be less movement of taxis.'

'Extra taxis.'

'Want to keep the elegance of the station (minus canopy at the front) and access for taxis. Don't want a shopping mall there.'

'Difficult! As a showcase station, I don't want visitors from abroad waiting for a long time for a taxi as this creates a bad impression of the city. I guess if there is interchange for pedestrians below street level between two stations then maybe the pedestrian access doesn't have to be so wide.'

'Station enhancement is for another day. Taxi provision should be made whatever else is proposed.'

'More crossing space for pedestrians over Pancras Road.'

### Urban Home Zones

**Question 7: Do you object to or support the proposals for the Urban Home Zones in the north of the Main Site?**

**Support: 96%**

**Object: 4%**

**Cont. Question 7: Comments for responses**

'Would look to finer tuning at realisation much is being done in European cities that could inform design here.'

'Object to scale and design.'

'Good as far as they go, but should have housing and home zones south of the canal.'

'Support proposals to make traffic slow.'

'The proposals so far are good, but there should be housing in home zones, south of the canal.'

### Car Access

**Question 8: Do you object to or support the proposals for:**

**a) A new one way route for access and servicing vehicles extending around Cubitt Park**

**Support: 44%**

**Object: 24%**

**Not sure: 13%**

**Does not matter: 20%**

**b) Routes R1 and S1 (running north / south through the centre of zones R and S) carrying less traffic as a result of being access & servicing routes.**

**Support: 69%**

**Object: 10%**

**Not sure: 1%**

**Does not matter: 19%**

**c) No vehicle access on Canal Street (2) and Holder Street (except emergency access and controlled servicing) to create a new Pedestrian Zone.**

**Support: 88%**

**Not sure: 2%**

**Does not matter: 11%**

**d) No vehicle access on Wharf Road (except emergency access and controlled servicing) to create a new Pedestrian Zone, and removal of Junction 5 (where Wharf Road joined York Way).**

**Support: 97%**

**Object: 2%**

**Does not matter: 2%**

**Question 9: Are the revised proposed routes for traffic and pedestrian movement within the site adequate?**

**Yes: 38%**

**No: 37%**

**Not sure: 25%**

#### **Cont. Question 9: Comments for responses**

'Routes defined as 'Pedestrian routes' of 5m width are inadequate for shared use; allow 8.5m width to allow for segregated cycle track.'

'Need to know more about proposals at the periphery. York Way beyond the triangle; Camley Street up to the NW. How a re-opened Maiden Lane will impact on route organisation.'

'Minimal car access increased. –Priority should be given to working with the design encouraging easy access for all users and trying to make environment vibrant with art and good planting schemes.'

'Because less traffic and cars on the site.'

'Not enough space for roads.'

'More roads.'

'Object to the lack of integration with the existing area. In particular closing Wharfdale Road will throw all the traffic onto the street opposite Copenhagen Street, to the detriment of existing residents, particularly children.'

#### **Cycle Routes**

**Question 10: Have a look at the handout 'Transport 2'. Do you object to or support the proposals for cycle routes within and surrounding the site?**

**Support: 34%**

**Object: 45%**

**Not sure: 11%**

**Does not matter: 10%**

#### **Cont. Question 10: Comments for responses**

'Remove taxi lanes on Pancras Road and replace with cycle route. Allow cycle access through coach route opposite Brill Place.'

'Look to the route up Camley Street being shown as very important. It opens up the side to the North West.'

'Stronger links to the North West via Camley Street.'

'Cycle route canal towpath has been removed on Sustrans website, because British Waterways (owner of canal towpath) has made pedestrians the priority.'

'I want cycle lane on Pancras Road.'

'I strongly do not support the cycle route or cycle lanes on St Pancras Road. Should not be allowed, neither should shared route with other vehicles.'

'want cycle lane on Pancras Road.'

'There needs to be a special lane for cyclists.'

'Retain St Pancras Road cycle route at least up to dedicated cycle park at St Pancras Station.'

### **Bridges**

**Question 11:** Have a look at Transport 1. Do you object to or support the proposals for four bridges within the site, including the proposed Bridge 3 crossing Regents Canal and Camley Street Park?

**Support: 43%**

**Object: 41%**

**Not sure: 12%**

**Does not matter: 3%**

### **Cont. Question 11: Comments for responses**

'Not Camley Street Park Bridge. Alterations to Camley Street Oblique Bridge instead.'

'Strongly support proposed bridge between York Way and Block A.'

'Was earlier mediocre about the Camley Street Bridge-now warmed to it.'

'Object to Camley Street bridge still, but 4<sup>th</sup> bridge linking upper level viaduct with Wharf Road viaduct is a very good idea.'

'It is not good for the park.'

'Support, but disagree with the bridges over the park.'

'Is not specified the bridge that will link the main site with Somers Town. To propose a proper bridge connection between these two areas.'

'Disagree with bridge over Camley Street Park.'

'Object to bridge into Camley St Natural Park. Map doesn't show four bridges. Don't object to bridges 1 & 2. Camley Street Bridge should be moved north to avoid damage to our small, but much loved nature reserve.'

'I do think a bridge is needed near the Camley Street, in order to give access both ways off / on to the site.'

'Can't answer for bridge 4, no purpose given.'

'The Camley Park bridge would cause a lot of disruption to the park.'

### **Management**

**Question 12:** Have a look at the handout 'Transport 2'. Do you object to or support the proposals for management of the site, once the development has been constructed?

**Support: 92%**

**Object: 3%**

**Not sure: 3%**

**Does not matter: 3%**

**Cont. Question 12: Comments from responses**

‘CCC supports public management of traffic routes.’

‘Strongly support proposed adoption of traffick streets within the development.’

‘Ultimate users must have a part in management and evolution of spaces and roads.’

‘Must ensure users are locked into decision making process.’

‘Council is more able to load often to the site.’

‘Totally against making the road private. A management committee formed by whom? To maintain the open space. Instead of the council or L.A controlling parking & collecting refuse, we will be having more control from TfL, LEA.’

‘All roads should be publicly owned. However they are badly designed and located and will have a negative impact on existing neighbourhoods. Why no question about Copenhagen Street and how it can be protected from the traffic from the development.’

‘Managed and maintained by development estate may be answerable to residents and business association and council.’

‘I am interested in finding out more about proposals to link east of York Way across the railway line at Kings Cross. I would like to see more access between Kings Cross and Waterloo Station as there is direct link (2 tube trains at present) and no direct bus link.’

‘Whatever the road network ends up being, the roads remain in the wrong places.’

**Attendance at workshop**

**Organisations:**

Camden Square Neighbourhood Association  
Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee  
Towfiq Somali Community  
Kings Cross Community Development Trust  
Camden Cycling Campaign  
Camden LA21  
Cally Rail Group  
Friends of Regents Canal  
Sudanese Children in Need

**Individuals:**

Diana Shelley  
Virginia Stanley  
Gordon Meenn  
Terence Ewing  
Abuk Deng  
Helia Evans  
John Jacqueline Shirley  
Nahma Mohamed  
Phil Jeffries

Topic Area: 'Triangle Site'

Number of Participants: 34

Number of question sheets returned: 26

Responses to Questions:

**Buildings Heights**

**Question 1:** Do you support or object the proposed heights of the buildings for block A?

Support: 36%

Object: 15%

Not sure: 34%

Does not matter: 15%

**Question 2:** Do you support or object the proposed heights of the buildings for bloc B?

Support: 52%

Object: 17%

Not sure: 30%

Does not matter: 1%

**Question 3:** Do you support or object the proposed heights of the buildings for block C?

Support: 60%

Object: 1%

Not sure: 25%

Does not matter: 15%

**Cont. Question 3: Comments for responses**

Not sure how raised proposals for block A will be with Islington residents.

This particular site is not suitable for housing of any sort let alone high density housing.

Think the blocks should be lower – I think it is misguided to have tall residential blocks.

The site is unsuitable for high density housing. It lacks good access which is essential for high density housing.

(2) All 12

High buildings is fine for the site

### Location of Access Road

**Question 4:** Do you agree with the location of the site access road being moved west. Further away from the Thameslink Tunnel Structure?

Support: 82%

Not sure: 17%

Does not matter: 1%

**Question 5:** Do you support or object the proposal of a shared access being created to allow access over the Thameslink Tunnel to provide access to the north?

Support: 62%

Not sure: 24%

Does not matter: 14%

### Cont. Question 5: Comments for responses

Question 4 really up the CTRL but is this revised site area within Argents powers?

Not sure that these proposal changes in the gift of the developer or to be negotiated with CTRL.

More space for vehicle movement.

### Car Parking / Cycle Storage

**Question 6:** 123 car parking spaces have been allocated to the residents of the site. This is a reduction from 185 allocated in the first application. Do you support this decrease?

Support: 99%

Object: 1%

**Question 7:** 31 car parking spaces have been allocated for the Health and Fitness Club. This is a reduction from 60 spaces allocated in the first application. Do you support this decrease?

**Support: 67%**

**Object: 21%**

**Not sure: 6%**

**Does not matter: 6%**

**Question 8:** There will be four visitor parking bays allocated in the front of bloc A. do you think that 4 visitor parking is enough for the site?

**Support: 50%**

**Object: 34%**

**Not sure: 8%**

**Does not matter: 7%**

**Question 9:** There as been no parking allocated for the retail outlets (staff or customers) on the Triangle Site. Do you support or object to this proposal?

**Support: 56%**

**Object: 36%**

**Does not matter: 8%**

**Question 10:** There is to be secure storage for 250 bicycles at the basement level of the site. Do you support or object to this proposal?

**Support: 100%**

**Cont. Comments**

Question 9, if developers' claims about public transport are to be believed, there is no need for any public.

No parking for Health and Fitness except for disabled. 1 cycle square per unit will not be enough.

(Q8) Encourages employment of local people.

No cars to people attending Health and Fitness Club. Retailers would need more.

Cycle parking should be available to the public.

More visitors parking, less Health Club parking.

Think there should be more visiting parking bays. Don't think need 123 car parking spaces for residents. Support cycling spaces.

No car for Health and Fitness Club – people should walk / cycle.

The important thing about road traffic access to the retail outlets is that deliveries and rubbish / recycling collections are off road.

More disabled parking.

I think more parking for retail staff.

Shops not viable without parking.

### Habitat Area

**Question 11: Do you support or object to the proposed habitat area in the Triangle Site?**

**Support: 85%**

**Object: 8%**

**Not sure: 7%**

**Question 12: Comments for responses**

Community meeting area?

Habitat area should not be tokenistic – green and brown roofs, more wildlife habitats, bird and bat boxes etc...

Community centre, jobs / training centre, youth club.

Perhaps this could be a place for community building – see my comment on Community Facilities sheets.

Community job training centres, young clubs and cultural & education centres.

The Health Club from the Main Site.

Youth clubs, community centre, cultural centers.

We want to see another centre sport.

### Uses

**Question 13: It is proposed for the site to contain 123-1 bed flats, 113-2 bed flats and 10-3 bed flats. Do you support or object to this allocation of size of flats?**

**Support: 69%**

**Object: 21%**

**Not sure: 8%**

**Does not matter: 1%**

**Cont. Question 13: Comments from responses**

More 3 bed flats.

I do not agree with housing here anyway.

More family apartments 3 beds and more.

Insufficient 3 and 4 flats.

Want the housing transferred to main site; except for a small block (4 storeys) on the triangle site, facing York Way.

The three bedrooms should be bigger than the one or two bedrooms.

3 Bedrooms flats should be much higher. Larger flats of 4-5 bedrooms should also be available and in large number.

I think is not enough, we needed more flats about 2 - 4 beds.

**Question 14: The proposed amenity space for the residential units will be located at 1<sup>st</sup> storey level above the retail outlets. Do you support or object to this proposal?**

**Support: 91%**

**Not sure: 7%**

**Does not matter: 2%**

**Cont. Question 14: Reasons**

'Platform' garden as described seems fine - a mini garden.

Makes shopping easier.

Site wouldn't allow it anywhere else.

Don't want this level of residential on this site.

Will not be viable without parking.

**Question 15: There are to be 84 affordable units on the Triangle Site. This is approximately 34% of the units on the Triangle Site. Do you support or object to this ratio?**

**Support: 63%**

**Object: 20%**

**Not sure: 17%**

**Cont. Question 15: Reasons**

Why not 40% like average for the rest of site?

Should be higher.

Should be 50%.

Agree with affordable housing but not on this site. If there is to be affordable housing then it should be at least 44% in line with the main site.

Needs to be reaching the minimum threshold.

Should be higher.

Should still be aiming for 50%.

Want to see 60% affordable (30 social + 30 starter housing) 40% market across whole of the scheme.

We need more 50% or more.

The low income.

Should be higher 40%.

**Question: Any other comments**

Consider new proposal to evaluate impact. Building over railway – right of Block C.

Have green space on roofs too.

**Attendance to workshop**

**Organisations:**

Camden LA21  
Kings Cross Community Development Trust  
Friends of Regents Canal  
Camden Square Neighbourhood Association  
Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee  
Islington Society  
WMC  
Cally Rail Group  
Sudanese Women's Association  
Sudanese Children in Need  
Regent Square United Reformed church  
Iraqi Women's League  
Somali Community  
Towfiq Somali Community  
Camden Cycling Campaign

**Individuals:**

Ben Godber  
Leslie McCartney  
Ragaia Ishag  
Saida Garang  
Virginia Stanley  
Hassiro Andreis  
Angela Inglis  
Arti Nanda  
Stephen B. Azugwathi

## KINGS CROSS WORKSHOP (10/10/05)

### Topic Area: 'Community Facilities'

**Number of Participants: 34**

**Number of question sheets returned: 26**

#### **Responses to Questions:**

#### **Floorspace – Main Site**

**Question 1: Do you support or object to the general scale of provision of community facilities on the Main Site?**

**Support: 49%**

**Object: 33%**

**Not sure: 19%**

#### **Cont. Question 1: Comments for responses**

'Not enough, all of revised development Specification 3.31 i) – ix) should be included especially the call for a multi-faith centre which was called for in almost all ethnic groups in wide community.'

'The developer must admit to a minimum area of at least what they currently purpose.'

'Would like to see more – reason is in Question 10.'

'Please also put provision for NHS dental facilities as part of healthcare provision.'

'The allocation and distribution of facilities is well spread. However there needs to be a specific community centre constructed encouraging multi-faith and cultural exchange.'

'No facilities for community use.'

'More space for community is needed. I think that the facilities listed in 3.31 are also requisite for such a development. Industrial Heritage, Art Galleries, Multi Faith Centre, Art Centre Exhibition space, library.'

'We need centres, youth centre, cultural centre, worship centers, clubs, and night club. That is what we requested before, and there is not here at the moment. We need something clear.'

'We would like to have community caters.'

'Because we do not know how many groups or schools.'

'Support the scale of community facilities but would like adult education function near the housing.'

'There never can be enough. How is the criterion set? Facilities need to be accessible (affordable) to all. Don't require private health clubs and pools.'

'There should be more community facilities open to the existing communities of Kings Cross. There should be a commitment to NHS services in medical centres; affordable sports facilities; there are no commitments to a community asset for the existing community in Kings Cross who have had to suffer all the inconvenience of these developments.'

'Overall amount of floorspace has been reduced with only a marginal shift south of canal.'

'Support is conditional and viability. The facilities should be available to key workers as well as residents.'

**Question 2: Do you support or object the general the general distribution of community facilities throughout the site?**

**Support: 80%**

**Object: 6%**

**Not sure: 14%**

**Cont. Question 2: Comments for responses.**

'Just needs total floorspace to increase possibly on rooftops or below ground.'

'Diversity and varieties in different way.'

'Proposed facilities seem to be sensibly distribution.'

'Support, although I am unsure why children's park near York Way is so far from proposal school.'

'Should be in the Gas Holders.'

'But needs to be a specific centre for building or asset, for the community.'

'But would like to see the supply and facilities listed in 3.31 for commuters/passengers on public transport, residents and workers.'

'We would like to have community centres.'

'I am concerned that community facilities are for private use, not public use. Sports facilities should be provided in a way to make them available to local young people.'

'How important is to shift these facilities south? Quality and style more important?'

'While the provision of a walk-in primary health centre in Zone E and swimming / fitness facilities in Zone B are to be welcomed. It is felt that the public indoor sports hall is remote from the commercial area south of the canal.'

### **Indoor Sports & Leisure Facilities**

**Question 3: Do you support or object the proposals for a public indoor sports hall, providing**

**facilities for badminton, basketball, volleyball & 5-a-side football, in zone Q?**

**Support: 81%**

**Not sure: 18%**

**Does not matter: 1%**

**Cont. Question 3: Comments for responses.**

'Leisure facilities must be affordable to wider community not private health clubs.'

'Some of the rooftops could be used for sports facilities.'

'Support the proposal for the site, not sure if it is the best place.'

'Excellent, also use roofs for gardens-nurseries / children games.'

'We need public indoor sports.'

'The document does not explain whether or not that communities could access these services or not in terms of cost, at least some explanation (may be percentage) should be offered.'

'Support, but need financial support and good management. Empty and badly run facilities abandoned in London.'

'Support but must make it affordable and achievable to local people.'

'Support, but should be affordable for the many and not the few.'

'As long as these are affordable.'

'Seems reasonable.'

'All facilities must be readily accessible to workers as well as residents on the site to make them viable.'

**Question 4: Do you support or object the proposals for a public health and fitness centre, including a 25 meter swimming pool, in zone B?**

**Support: 89%**

**Not sure: 11%**

**Cont. Question 4: Comments for responses**

'Pool should be Olympic training facility and used to train future Olympians.'

'So long as it does not price people out.'

'As long as this is affordable.'

'Facilities seem ok, it causally public but is the location right?'

'As long as it can be used for the community.'

'Certainly swimming pool.'

### **Educational Facilities**

**Question 5: The proposal is for a two form entry primary school in Zone P. Do you object to or support the proposal for school provision?**

**Support: 76%**

**Object: 18%**

**Not sure: 6%**

### **Cont. Question 5: Comments for responses**

'Yes, possibly not a church school.'

'There are a number of schools around, but one is needed in locality to children do not have to travel so far. Also gives a slightly large choice which always helps to improve quality.'

'Has it been thought through that there are schools south of Copenhagen St.'

'There will be a need for a secondary school as well.'

'Prefer to see many uses to improve facilities at existing primary schools.'

'No provision of secondary school so only goes halfway to meeting forum demands.'

'There is good to be more primary schools and library.'

'Would like further education facilities on the site.'

'The residential equipment of the development requires this as a minimum.'

'Unlikely to be viable without importing children. These will come from Islington which has a surplus of places.'

**Question 6: Higher educational facilities could be located in Zone L to provide new facilities for the College of Central St Martin Art & Design. Do you support these proposals for higher educational facilities on the Main Site, along with up to 650 students housing units?**

**Support: 86%**

**Object: 1%**

**Not sure: 13%**

#### **Cont. Question 6: Comments for responses**

'This is positive and should improve what clarities of this Zone.'

'Only if there was a commitment that facilities would be open to communities e.g. extended school model.'

'But need further education as well. There are plenty of higher education (university) facilities in this area. More is ok, but balance required with further education.'

'Facilities should be open to wider public to use, Further education facilities need to be included.'

'Support only if there is good provision for elderly and families on site. Otherwise the site will be taken over by one sector of the population.'

'Yes would like to see expansion of educational facilities to improve further education.'

'This would give a special character to the area.'

#### **Medical Facilities**

**Question 7: The proposal is for a primary health care walk-in centre of up to 750 sq m, possibly in Zone E and a primary health care centre of at least 1250 sq m in Zone T. Do you support these proposals for medical facilities on the Main Site.**

**Support: 86%**

**Object: 6%**

**Not sure: 7%**

**Does not matter: 1%**

#### **Cont. Question 7: Comments for responses**

'Facilities welcome, but is zone T appropriate for the use (i.e. next to railway and central to side)? Zone E primary health care should be NHS but is obviously 'envisioned' as a private medical care.'

'Only if NHS runs.'

'Accessible, not pushed into a corner.'

'Would need to consider noise and vibration effects due to proximity of CTRL embankment.'

'Need dental care provision'

'1250 sq m facilities should be more central.'

#### **Children's Centre**

**Question 8: The proposal is for a Children's' Centre of at least 645 sq m including nursery, drop-in / crèche, medical and other facilities in Zone T. do you support these proposals?**

**Support: 81%**

**Object: 6%**

**Not sure: 13%**

**Cont. Question 8: Comments for responses**

'I do not support if it is going to replace children's centre at Coram's-only if in addition to that.'

'But what about other children?'

'Could be more in depth analysis and projection would guide in the overall volume to be provided.'

'What about youth centres as well as children? Very tricky to run, but someone needs to take the challenge of YOUF.'

'Children's Centre should not be privately owned.'

'Why not? Yes please, may be better as several smaller facilities distribution through zones P, R and S.'

'Again the children's playground, how canal and York Way would be close?'

'Will this be enough provision? Will this facility be used by office workers, students as well as local residents?'

'A nursery linked to the school is essential.'

'Should be more central.'

'They can look at the flora and fauna on the railway bank.'

'Might be better for the south where it could be of use to workers on the site.'

'The new facility proposals would seem to be essential'

**Other Community Facilities**

**Question 9: The proposal includes community meeting space possibly in Zones Q and P. do you support these proposals?**

**Support: 92%**

**Object: 8%**

**Cont. Question 9: Comments for responses**

'Support but at least one of these spaces should be specified not just 'possible'.'

'Needs to be open to ethnic minorities to hold meetings and celebrate festivals, with kitchen facilities, etc.'

'Yes more please.'

'But also needs a sustainable community for existing communities living around Kings Cross Central site, also people as move into area.'

'Some of the space given to the 'amenity of the area' should be made available for community meeting rooms.'

'Support idea- not sure about zones P and Q.'

'There needs role allocated for the wider community.'

'Need more.'

'More space.'

'Plus some office space for community organisations.'

#### **Question 10: Comments**

'Visitor / tourist information centre/ art galleries / natural art centre/ exhibition space.'

'Need children's nursery facilities for the workers on the site.'

'Community facilities for use by local interest groups-admin space, computer graphic, etc.'

'I feel there should be a large building where community organizations can all be housed in-this makes it easier to find all community groups. This one large overall community building could be proved in zones Q or P.'

'I would definitely like to see some facility set for religious worship. I would also like to see facilities set for the elderly as quiet meeting areas.'

'Worship areas, more community centres and community workshops, job centres and job training centres.'

'The gas holders would be better suited to leisure uses than to housing. Any use which takes advantage of this space would be better respect its heritage. Housing units would go to the eastern side of Zone B.'

'A specific community centre of totally allocated for the wider and new communities.'

'Office for community groups including existing groups.'

'A sustainable community asset. Drug / alcohol treatment or services centre at north of site as these problems are currently being moved north by police as development proceeds / Secondary school.'

'The residential areas need their public places. Need affordable office space for voluntary and community sector organizations.'

'Facilities for different religion groups and worships / multi faith centres.'

'Further Education facilities.'

'Admin space for community administration otherwise it has to be run from people's homes etc. Very inconsiderate, and community workers are too often under valued.'

**Attendance at workshop:**

**Organisations:**

Islington Society  
Iraqi Women's League  
SWA  
Regents Square United Reformed Church  
Camden LA21  
Working Men's College  
Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee  
Camden Square Neighbourhood Association  
Somali Community  
Cally Rail Group  
Kings Cross Community Development Trust  
Regents Network  
Friends of Regents Canal  
Kings Cross Chinese Group  
Towfiq Somali Community  
Sudanese Children in Need  
Copenhagen Play and Youth Partnership

**Individuals:**

Virginia Stanley  
Alison Blackwood  
Ben Godber  
Leslie McCartney  
Angela Inglis  
Arti Nanda  
Stephen B. Azugwath  
Said Gancing  
Abuk Deng  
Ragaia Ishag

**KINGS CROSS WORKSHOP (10/10/2005)**

**Topic Area: 'Housing (Main Site)'**

**Number of Participants: 34**

**Number of question sheets returned: 28**

**Responses to Questions:**

**Question 1: Do you object or support the proposal for 1700 flats on the Main Site?**

**Support: 47%**

**Object: 39%**

**Not sure: 14%**

**Cont. Question 1: Please give a reason for your answer. If you object to the proposal, do you consider that should be more or less housing on the Main Site?**

I am [not] sure what is feasible in terms of density, if more could be provided then I would favour more.

But is it more is good.

Would like to see more flats, up to 200 excluding students.

More family accommodation and more bedrooms.

The number on the site should be more than 1700.

Support this figure as appropriate the floor and inclusion of more 3 and 4 bedrooms units.

Because the original proposal is not like this, we need more houses – like what we request before.

Good to see a commitment to a significant proportion of resident uses on the site.

I would like to see more housing in the area because as a result of development the demand for houses will increase.

Less than what was proposed?!

There should be more housing and a smaller proportion of office space because of problems with homeless in Camden and capacity of transport system at Kings Cross.

More housing – affordable.

Although I support this I would still like to see more housing.

Please indicate how. All housing could meet life, the hotel standards being affordable and high density?  
Please e-mail answer: [suburban.studio@archiworld.it](mailto:suburban.studio@archiworld.it) or forward to KXRLG.

More housing to provide a better mix as the commercial element especially south of the canal is very over done. The number 1700 could be satisfactory if the quality was improved or they were large units.

More houses for elderly, possibly grouped by ethnicity (Chinese, Somali, Sudanese, etc...)  
Housing corporation and housing association must be very carefully chosen, some much better than others.  
Because house prices have escalated in Central London many shared home owners cannot afford to buy the remaining 50%!

There should be more housing – particularly family accommodations. 3 and 4 bedrooms.

Should be more.

Prefer to see less dense housing. Larger units.

Reduction in housing density from previous plan is relevant but concerned about high density of new proposals-which are not clear.

Would how ever like to see longer units available.

Provided that all units all planned so as to ensure that the principal available rooms away south and west aspect.

**Question 2: Do you object or support the proposal for only minimal housing south of Regents Canal?**

**Support: 67%**

**Object: 25%**

**Not sure: 2%**

**Does not matter: 7%**

**Cont. Question 2: Please give a reason for your answer. If you object to the proposal, do you consider that should be more or less housing South of the canal?**

This area will be less attractive to live in being sandwiched between 2 railway lines and minimal “green space”.

Options for these could be improved for further review.

It would be preferable to have people living throughout to avoid *no-go* areas at certain time of the day. However it may be possible to achieve that in other ways.

Does not matter because Southern area will be busy and possibly noisy travel lines and probably commercial / entertainment concentration.

We request big houses before. Big houses are very important for the community.

Residential uses would not own sufficient to provide “eyes on the street...” therefore does not matter.

There should be a more mixed housing and more 4 bedrooms flats constructed on the site and there certainly should be more housing south of the canal.

We demanded that houses be located also in the market area.

It would be unsuitable for housing because of transport links.

My views have changed on this because of all the land to be kept back for railway development. However no housing south of the canal would make a dead area. Eye in the towpath.

Where Culross and the two Stanley buildings would be retained and another, revised, humanised plan would be put forward by the developers.

More housing required to humanise the area other wise the area south of canal will be a ‘Canary Wharf’ which would not suit the character of the area.

Houses south the canal in zone F needs careful design so that the least amount of sunlight is lost from the canal.

South of the canal will be more noisy.

Because we want as many as possible, must be north. We would sacrifice the block south for twice the number in the north.

Smaller units for professionals. More units above offices.

South of the canal is more “city centre”.

Would also like to see housing south of canal-don’t want to end up with one side of canal an office ghetto. At night when, if no housing, few people would be there, perhaps more single units south of canal and larger units north of canal.

This area which adjoins the two mainline stations, the obvious location for commercial activity.

**Question 3: Do you object or support the proposal for the mix of different size housing units on the Main Site?**

**Support: 93%**

**Object: 2%**

**Not sure: 5%**

**Cont. Question 3: Please give a reason for your response. If you object to the proposal, do you consider that should be more or less larger flats on the main site?**

At least a 1/3 of the properties should be 3 and 4 bedroomed flats for this will allow families to stay in the area. A real push should be made to up the provision (if not here on this development when is it going to happen). This should be across both social and non social housing.

We need more large rooms not smaller.

I support the proposals for the mix of different size but more 4 bedrooms.

Would like to see: 12% four bed, 22% three bed, 35% two bed and 31% one bed.

There needs to be significant provision of 3 - 4 bed properties in the social housing. 1 bed – 1,056; 2 bed – 528; 3 bed – 352; 4 bed – 264; *total* 2,200.

Is not enough 15% four bedroom

Because community needs more big houses.

The developer has not committed to a specific mix, therefore impossible to say.

Should be more 4 bedroom housing.

Not big different than what was proposed before (almost the same percentages).

There should be more 3 and 4 bedrooms flats and possibly larger, because of high number of student's flats there will be a huge proportion of 1 bed / studio flats if the present proposals are accepted.

Support, more focus bedroom.

Should be more 3 and 4 bedroom flats.

Very important to have family units.

Unclear – the housing main site plan is showing blue zone to the all extent of the north part of the site. This is not connecting. Mixed use is not clear from the application.

Not too many 1 and 2 bedrooms. Needs to be pushed, as developers don't like families and children - a bit untidy.

There should be a lower percentage of one bedroom flats.

But the proportions of single bed units should be lower.

Would like to see more larger flats.

What is a 'significant population' at socially rented 3-4 bedroom flats? Not sure mix is all that different from before.

**Question 4: Do you object or support the proposals for at least 40% of housing being affordable?**

**Support: 66%**

**Object: 32%**

**Not sure: 2%**

**Cont. Question 4: Please give a reason for your response. If you object to the proposal, do you consider that should be more or less affordable housing? Please give some details of what type of affordable housing you think is a need for on the main site.**

Still think should go for 50% affordable housing on site (excluding students housing).

I think it should be more percentage of affordable housing.

I think we should push for 50% affordable with 40% social.

I support but details are lacking.

At least 50% affordable, *preferably* 30% social, 30% low-cost *starter* homes, 40% market (on both sites).

50% or more.

Support in principle, depends what "affordable" actually means.

There should be at least 50% of affordable housing for 1000 housing units however I would strongly support the Mayors proposals for 50% affordable housing for 1250 housing units. There should definitely be more housing in the main site.

Yes with the support for higher percentage.

There should be more and it is important that at least 70% is social rented. There should be a cap on prices of intermediate housing to ensure they are truly affordable for the existing communities in Kings Cross.

I think it should be more percentage of affordable housing.

Should be more, at least 48%.

There is a great need for this type of housing in this area to prevent potentially beneficial new resident and also to meet sustainable travel.

How and where? – Please email KXRLG.

40% is better than nothing. But a bigger percentage would better reflect the character of the area. We don't want this development to stick out like a sore thumb by being too different, it has to blend in.

There should be a much higher percentage of socially centred housing. I would prefer 60% affordable housing.

Should be more.

It is a good proportion (could be higher 50:50?)

Should be more like 50% and I think to make a more informed decision, you need to know how much is social housing and how much is shared ownership-which is still very expensive for most people.

**Question 5: Do you object or support the proposals for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Accessible housing on the main site?**

**Support: 88%**

**Not sure: 12%**

**Cont. Question 5: Please give a reason for your response. If you object to the current proposals for Lifetime homes and Wheelchair Accessible housing, what other commitments would you like the planning application to include?**

Support the aim of Lifetime homes and wheelchair access. These should also apply to non-social housing, so that some of the wheelchair accommodation and lifetime houses is also in the market rate housing. Disability does not always equate with low income!

Lifetime home should be a minimum requirement as the cost of building in these requirements. So why not?

We want to know is the percentage we needed more information about this one.

I support the idea but is not clear how many houses it would be?

The principal of 'lifetime homes' only reduce the quality.

All members of the community should be catered for.

This is something needed with an aging population.

Support the idea but need to know numbers.

Precedent idea

But lifetime houses are a standard for low-density social housing. Does not fit on the site.

Seems to respond well to focus previous comments.

**Question: Do you have any other comments about the proposals for housing?**

All housing should be built to highest standards e.g. Sound and energy insulation not just the expensive housing.

The student housing is unclear and in the right place. This does not make sense but without the plans in front of me I can't remember if it were unclear whether the student housing was in the right place or not. It should be built to a high standard but it is appropriate to utilise parts of the site which are unattractive for long-term living.

We needed more housing family.

We need everything. Come clear.

Housing should be mixed use and more affordable and more housing should be built.

More quality 3 and 4 bedrooms housing.

Supply at least

50% affordable

30% social

30% low cost homes

On both sites, object to housing in gasholders

The design of the triplets look too heavy above the lovely two paths and small St Pancras lock.

Please go back to the drawing boards and re-think area T, R and Q.

Housing should be built sooner than later, thus improving community safety of site.

More quality 3 and 4 bedroom housings.

### **Attendance at workshop**

#### **Organizations**

Cally Rail Group

Camden LA 21

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Camden Square Neighbourhood Association

Friends of Regent's Canal

Iraqi Women's League

Islington Society

Kings Cross Community Development Trust

Regent Square United Reformed Church

Regents Network

Somali Community

Sudanese children in need

Sudanese Women's Association

Towfiq Somali Community

Working Men's College

#### **Individuals**

Alison Blackwood

Angela Inglis

Arti Nanda

Ben Godber

Catherine Packard

Leslie McCartney

Saida

Stephen B. Azugwath

Ragaia Ishag

Hassiro Andreis

M. Khuhali

**KINGS CROSS WORKSHOP (17/10/2005)**

**Topic Area: 'Employment and Training'**

**Number of Participants: 24**

**Number of question sheets returned: 18**

**Responses to Questions:**

**Question 1. Do you agree that the amended application meets the employment (planning policy) aims as set out in the London Plan?**

**Support: 43%**

**Object: 11%**

**Not sure: 46%**

**Cont. Question 1. Comments for responses**

Make it different from other city office development. Give it a character. Aim more at small business than large business / more integration with the community.

Not enough attraction of local industry types of employment.

I haven't studied the London Plan.

Don't think if projects present local businesses and only 9,000 are allocated to local people is not enough so who is in really benefits-non-local people.

It is not clear yet how the local needs will be addressed.

The 4 aims of the London Plan are covered.

Aspirations are laudable but are all of the figures e.g. 28K F/T Jobs realistically achievable? This falls to developers' powers to deliver.

I am particularly concerned that the jobs available for local people will be limited, the variety and quality of jobs and the effects on small existing business in the surrounding area will be impacted.

**Question 2. The majority of jobs to be created will be in the office / business sector mainly located in Zones A, B and C. Do you agree that the business sector should be the main employment of this proposal?**

**Support: 81%**

**Object: 14%**

**Not sure: 5%**

**Question 3. The amendments to the application more clearly define what Argent intends to provide with regards to employment and training. Do you think the proposals from Argent give a good level of commitment to local employment and training?**

**Support: 42%**

**Object: 20%**

**Not sure: 38%**

**Cont. Question 3. Comments for responses**

I would like to see more awareness that there is a community. Do not create it like Paddington Basin / Community ownership somewhere.

I am not clear as to whether or not local people will be targeted for these jobs and how efficient the level of training will be.

Not enough-only 9,000 out of 25,000! Do not view what type of jobs will be available.

Not very clear, what kind of jobs (level) training and education should be dealt with immediately.

Although the creation of offices / business jobs will provide employment for communities coming on the excellent transport routes, the opportunities through the long construction phase as well as small workshops will provide opportunities for local unemployed and school levels.

Their intentions may be sound, but no guarantee that it will happen.

Must find ways of tying down actual businesses on site to employ local people.

How far they will deliver on side, this is unclear.

Want these more spelled out.

The indication of provisions in regards to employment and training is not clear and although up to 40% will be proposed for local people, it is not clear what these jobs will be.

**Question 4. Comments on main three things they would like to see**

1. Regulation, financial support; 2. Businesses to be diverse / artistic input; 3. Train local people to create businesses that will attract an imaginative environment.

1. Education about availability of space and rest; 2. Communication to accommodate their needs locally; 3. Financial initiatives.

1. Providing grants; 2. Providing facilities with good transport accessibility; 3. Providing training.

1. Mentoring / support; 2. Business support; 3. Space for small businesses.

1. Training; 2. Grants; 3. Access to promises.

1. Training; 2. Business Support; 3. Grant.

1. None grants to start the business; 2. Training; 3. Good business environment.

1. Training; 2. Location in reasonable rates; 3. Facilities.

1. Free training and education; 2. More language training courses for BME communities (must include childcare); 3. More mentoring schemes for starting small businesses.

1. Local information pack.

1. More than about 10 small business units; 2. Small units should be mixed into the main commercial areas, rather than set aside in their own little ghetto.

1. Financial support; 2. Technical support business plans e.t.c; 3. Marketing of parking.

1. Contribution of suitable premises that will be based on a sustainable fashion to targets business; 2. Promotion of development to potential small business; 3. Affordable leases.

1. Encouragement to buy locally; 2. Local supplier lists.

I believe that the provision for small businesses appears to be insufficient; many businesses in the area would like the opportunity to have their existing businesses within the development. The developers' idea of 'collective ownership' is a welcome initiative for small businesses who are struggling to pay high rents. I would like to see this encouraged in a way that would prevent the rise of rents for existing businesses in the surrounding areas. This is a great concern as the development will inevitably impact on the value of property in the area, this will relate to the rise in rents for small businesses, which will threaten their livelihood and the survival of essential small community shops. The way forward is to offer support by encouragement of collective ownership schemes and sympathetic integration. Also support from local authorities will enable the social enterprise concept to make the necessary impact to be inclusive of the above ideas.

**Question 5. In the amended application the developer provides further proposals for small businesses, including provision of 10 units, and a Community Development Finance Institution, do you think these proposals will benefit local businesses?**

**Support: 69%**

**Object: 10%**

**Not sure: 11%**

**Does not matter: 10%**

**Cont. Question 5. Comments fro responses**

Would like more provision for small businesses / show cases for local businesses as part of any showcase for the development as a whole.

These go some way to meeting my points at Question 4.

3,500 sq m. could provide much more than 10 units.

Not enough.

They can benefit potential future businesses not existing local businesses, it would appear start-ups, not relocates.

No specified information. I require more information.

Would like to see more units.

As explained overleaf, provision of 10 units is insufficient, and these would not benefit local businesses. Careful consideration is needed to overcome the likely impacts of the development on small businesses in the surrounding areas. A community development finance institution would be helpful for the community and the small businesses, however the above concerns would have to be eliminated.

**Question 6. Would you or your organisation make use of the proposed access to work measures, e.g. website, advance notices e.t.c.?**

**Yes: 90%**

**No: 10%**

**Cont. Question 6. Comments for responses**

CRG doesn't have a wider community role which would enable us to take up these. Individual members may use facilities in a personal capacity.

Obvious.

In a small way only. As a local church trying to serve the Kings Cross area, we would make info available at Regent Square United Reformed Church.

Must be translated into community languages.

Does not apply to me or my work.

Although I am not clear about the proposed access to work measures, I presume it will encourage local people to access work more easily; therefore I would support and make use of the system.

**Question 7. Comments on provided training**

The developer, the council, the employers, the local community. 'All of these bodies should be part of the training.'

The developer, the council, the employers, Camden central partnership, the local community.

The developer, the council, the employers, Camden central partnership, the local community, Kings Cross community development trust.

The employers, Camden central partnership, the local community.

A new partnership formed of all the above, Kings Cross Working.

Kings Cross Community Development Trust.

Kings Cross Community Development Trust.

Kings Cross Community Development Trust.

The developer, Camden central partnership, the local community, Kings Cross Community Development Trust.

The developer, the council, Camden central partnership, Community Development.

The developer, the council, the employers. 'If it worked, this would be a good idea, no guarantee it would be effective.'

Working Men's College.

The employers, the local community, a new partnership formed of all the above.

The developer, the council, the employers, Camden Central Partnership, a new partnership formed of all the above.

A new partnership formed of all the above and other 'to work in partnership where possible to use local trainers from social enterprises.'

**Question 8. Comments on groups that should be prioritized for employment and training.**

School leavers, unemployed.

BMEs, disabled, school leavers initial academic achievements who may not be able to exploit the wider London jobs.

Local people, BME, young people, locally trained people.

Young people obviously / Retraining needs more attention.

Women, single mothers, youth, disabled. These are the neediest groups.

Young people, single mothers, ethnic groups.

Single mother, young people, BMEs.

BMEs, single mothers, young people.

BME communities, single mothers particularly from BME and Sudanese, young people. 'These groups are currently excluded and are the most disadvantaged groups.'

School leavers, local unemployed, mothers (childcare).

Local college and GCSE students for internships early on.

Kings Cross Community Development Trust, Camden / Islington Councils. 'Because it is their priority to provide training to local people.'

Long term unemployed, women, minorities, disabled, youth, targeting children who are 8 years old now.

Young people (who lack academic qualifications and need incentive and confidence in applying for jobs) / Long term unemployed (because they may have lack of skills and experience or have not been given the opportunity) / Women with young families (time off to bring up a family may induce lack of confidence or the necessary training needed and to apply for part time work) / Older people (redundancy and the age discrimination faced within workplace) / BME Communities (language barriers and skills required to be accepted for work)

#### **Question 9. Comments on training types to get benefits**

Skills training, high-tech, and key worker, manual labour / Household labour, cleaning job training, training for jobs that don't necessarily require a lot of English, but English can be learned on the job.

Community facilitators.

Training / briefing on what is available, how to provide the maximum benefit to the local community. Training for business opportunities / model of community facilitators trained by Kings Cross Community Development Trust. Training on the variety of jobs available.

Training for business / Community facilitators training.

Training for business / Community facilitators training.

Community facilities / Training for business.

Training should cover all fields of qualification.

In respect to the sustainability in the building project, it seems expedient that training offered should be served towards new technology.

Incorporating training for 'green industries' involving young people and school students in things such as creative of green roof spaces, drainage.

We could provide language, IT financial training.

N/A – Most active members not seeking work in regeneration area.

Language skills training e.g. French for companies linked to Paris e.t.c. by Eurostar. / Office / IT skills / Administration skills / Hospitality skills / Food hygiene.

Communities in Trust is a developing social enterprise presently offering consultancy services and working with organisations and local authorities of Camden and Islington, particularly for the Kings Cross area. We would like to see partnership working for the benefit of all residents and people working in the area. We would like to see a range of training opportunities available for varied types of employment and not

restricted to retail, leisure, construction. There is opportunity to develop training programmes in creative arts, media, by working together with local people within the area, as well as others.

I would like to add that there was insufficient time to make informed comments as asked, although the facilitators were able to point to the relevant proposals it was difficult to assess what was involved and what might be of consequence. I was only able to look at two of the questions for both of the workshops and therefore requested to take the questionnaires home to complete. As a consultant and being involved in community engagement, I do not believe that this is the right method of consultation, however considering the timescale allowed for this process, it is inevitable that valued comments will be lost in this way.

### **Attendance at workshop**

#### **Organisations:**

Kings Cross Chinese Group  
Regent Square United Reformed Church  
Regents Network  
Working Men's College  
Communities in Focus  
Iraqi Women's League  
Kings Cross Community Development Trust  
Sudanese Women's Association  
Cally Rail Group

#### **Individuals:**

Nahma  
Shadia Rahman  
Virginia Stanley  
Angela Inglis  
Abuk Deng  
Muna  
Nick Gordon  
Jane Riddiford

**KINGS CROSS WORKSHOP (17/10/2005)**

**Topic Area: 'Environmental Sustainability'**

**Number of Participants: 24**

**Number of question sheets returned: 24**

**Responses to Questions:**

**1. Wind Turbines**

**Question 1. A: Do you support or object to these proposals as an effective commitment to sustainability?**

**Support: 69%**

**Object: 22%**

**Not sure: 10%**

**B: Do you support the proposal for the wind turbines to be located in the zones detailed in Parameter Plan KXC021?**

**Support: 48%**

**Object: 15%**

**Not sure: 29%**

**Does not matter: 8%**

**Cont. B: If you object to the locations, please outline why and suggest locations you think that should be considered.**

As long it doesn't disturb the residents.

Zone T.

Object to locations on York Way; more should be nearer to CTRL.

Concerned that the position of the wind turbines will negate the effectiveness of the green / brown roofs as wildlife corridors.

If there are only 14 yes, could be located in zone T.

Good idea to be located on tallest buildings, will there be noise? Will people be able to have their windows open if these are located? Why not put on top of car park?

Unwilling to say definitively without site visits and discussion.

**C: Look at the Parameter Plan KXC014, the illustrations in Figure 24.1.8 and 24.1.9, and table on page 4 of this sheet, for the dimensions of the turbines. Do you support the proposed heights and size of the turbines?**

**Support: 43%**

**Object: 16%**

**Not sure: 40%**

**Does not matter: 1%**

**Cont. C: If you object, please outline your concerns about heights, and or any other concern you may have about wind turbines here**

Too high.

Need to think through variable heights, massing of turbines rather than ordering uniformity.

The building compact fabric does not support turbines, a new approach to the York Way. Urban approach as filter between the compact development and Islington on would suit turbines.

Noise, reflection of light.

I am concerned about the height of the building on the York Way.

Unwilling to commit without site visits and discussions.

Perhaps noise might be a problem.

## **2. Photovoltaics (Solar Panels)**

**A: Do you support or object to these proposals as an effective commitment to sustainability?**

**Support: 90%**

**Object: 8%**

**Not sure: 2%**

**Cont. A: If you object to the proposals for solar panels, please outline why here**

Not enough of them.

Support where appropriate.

More panels across the site.

More locations should be chosen. In the long run energy costs will go up considerably and this development should be a model for city sustainability.

Support the proposal but do not think the amount 'effective'.

Would like to see them on every building not just 'show case' building as a publicity stunt. Would like at least 30% full commitment now.

Need to be more radical about this, more solar power throughout the development.

Do not believe that so few will have any effect on energy consumption therefore form no effective commitment to sustainability.

More of this type of renewable energy throughout sight.

Not economical feasible.

Shouldn't be only the odd 'show case' building, should be a commitment to be used wherever possible.

I fully support solar panels.

**B: The proposals state that the panels be located in zones B (overlooking Pancras Square), K (Handyside Canopy) & M (canal side overlooking Cubitt Square, gas holders triplets & Granary Square). Do you support or object to the plans to site them in these areas?**

**Support: 92%**

**Object: 7%**

**Not sure: 1%**

**Cont. B: If you object, please give your reasons for doing so**

Support, but it seems that it is not clean enough.

Why just there? Apart from the lost opportunity of there were no panels on the railway terminal, there is surely a case for solar panels in other buildings.

Support, but do not understand why they are limited to such a relatively small area.

Support, but you should be more daring.

Support, but as stated in previous section would like to see them in other places.

The proposals do not go far enough, solar panels should be used throughout.

Support, but there should be more places too.

Support, but do not understand logic of such limited provision.

10% more.

More please. Energy production target (1%) is very integrated.

### 3. Green / Brown Roofs

**A: The revised application states that at least 15% of roofs on new buildings will be 'Green' or 'Brown' roofs. Do you support or object to this commitment in the revised application?**

**Support: 88%**

**Object: 8%**

**Not sure: 4%**

**Does not matter: 1%**

**Cont. A: If you object, please state why**

Should be more.

Should be more than 18%.

Support but certainly this suggestion will change if part of the development where green development built purpose.

If thought worthwhile why not you have green and brown roof throughout. Too many of the statements are paying lip service to sustainability.

Possible pedestrian access to roof tops / interconnecting.

Must not be retrofitted, needs to be integrated into design from beginning.

To low figure, should be a minimum of 25% especially if there is a serious commitment to SVDS.

Should be more than 15%.

Support, but I believe the % could be a lot higher, i.e. at least 30%, also at least 15% should serve an educational function and at least in a limited way to be accessible for the public, e.g. conservation, science workshops or social functions.

Also consider doing more. A lot of businesses that would be located in their office want to improve their 'green' credentials. Why not extend to these roofs?

Support, but should be in more places too.

Why only 15%? Surely this could be extended to more buildings?

Should be aspiration to increasing the proportion.

Why only 15%?

Significant increase in green / brown roofs.

**B: The locations of proposed 'Green' or 'Brown' roofs are shown on Parameter Plan KXC 021. Do they in your view provide an effective 'green corridor' for wildlife?**

**Yes: 60%**

**No: 10%**

**Not sure: 30%**

**Cont. B: If you said no, how would an effective 'green corridor' be created through 'Green' or 'Brown' roofs on the site?**

Maybe but why not throughout?

Different blocks; P, S, R and T. it will help the taking piece of a real park rather than a dog-walking area (Cubitt Park).

Not enough needs to have more wildlife habitat opportunities, rest boxes, bird, boxes, redstart, peregrine falcon etc.

Need to cover a larger area of the site.

It is a start. Why not consider the offices.

By putting in more green and brown living roofs and enough diversity of species over and above sedum matting.

Yes, but why not make it larger?

No idea. This is a factual question which needs specialist knowledge to answer sensibly.

Probably too high, too exposed and too disconnected to be effective as a habitat for wildlife but I am not an expert.

Should be increased.

#### **4. Heating and Power**

**Do you support or object to the proposals relating to installing piping for ground source heat pumps Beneath Cubitt Square and other public spaces, as well as in development zones A, B, J, K, L, N, P, Q, R, S and T?**

**Support: 75%**

**Object: 1%**

**Not sure: 17%**

**Does not matter: 7%**

**Cont. If you object to the proposals, please give your reasons why here**

Put this piping into more of housing and offices.

Concerned about the siting of the last pump in proximity to where gas was stored.

CHP should use biomass fuel only for beginning of project.

## 5. Sustainable Buildings

**Do you support or object to the proposals in the revised application to design all new buildings to achieve the BREEAM and EcoHomes 'very good' ratings as a minimum, with an aspiration for reaching 'excellent'?**

**Support: 77%**

**Object: 14%**

**Not sure: 9%**

**Cont. If you object, please state your reasons here**

Go for 'excellent' from the word go, and not for a few 'show case' buildings.

I didn't see any sustainable building in the compact area.

Need to go beyond 'very good' minimum standards need to be surpassed. Renewable energy standards as proposed are tokenistic.

Why is it limited to homes? Housing will account for a relatively small proportion of the development, so for a serious commitment all these standards should be applied to all the buildings.

Would prefer to see 'excellent' in terms of the present BREEAM. Standards need to continue rising in coming years.

Support, but why not go for excellent?

Support, but uneasy about how far they go.

Would like to see commitment to % being excellent.

## 6. Sustainability

**Do the revisions in the Kings Cross applications adequately address your concerns regarding sustainability?**

**Yes: 16%**

**No: 48%**

**Not sure: 36%**

**If the revisions do not address your concerns, please state why below**

Higher targets are needed to be committed to.

I am looking for a positive and unequivocal statement of real targets (that have been proved already) and not a listing of aspirations.

The revision sits on the ground of the previous and not adequate; widen approach to the sustainability of the area.

Of all the standard sustainable development proposals 1% is extremely low for a percentage that Argent has put forward. They should strive for the mayor's 10% and beyond.

Tokenism, all the ideas are good in principle but it's all proposed on too small a scale.

We have to consider what energy sources will be available in 2020. Why not build to the future.

Energy reduction little more than a token percentage and symbolic actions in visible.

Please see Financial Times 15/16 October article on sustainable homes and where China is developing eco cities. If China can look at it for a whole new city why cannot we look at it for part of London? This is one of the greatest opportunities in London to showcase UK groundbreaking technology and design in environment sustainability. How about doing some carbon emissions trading for carbon reductions to be achieved?

Commitments are minima and, in particular do not address problems of air-conditioning requirement of office buildings, which comprise so much of the development. Worried that outline application may allow commitments which prevent future improvement.

I think all buildings should achieve BREEAM 'excellent' ratings (and design excellence too). Does not a site of this size offer a lot more scope for innovation in terms of the integration between buildings, systems, public space and management required to achieve environmental sustainability? Any new ideas?

I think 10% should be 15% reduction in energy. Use canal for recycling.

There should be more emphasis on passive energy conservation.

Too many of the proposals are aspirational rather than specific. No means of carrying out, as well as using water rather than road transport.

#### **Wind Turbine Proposals Chart (From the Environmental Statement)**

<b>Development Zone</b>	<b>Rotor Diameter</b>	<b>Height – up to</b>	<b>Number-up to</b>
T	5.5m	15.0m	5
J	5.5m	13.0m	5
Q	9m	19.5m	2
R	9m	21.0m	2

This table should be used with Figures 24.1.8 and 24.1.9 from the Environmental Statement to give a visual illustration of the wind turbines along York Way and along CTRL line.

**Other Comments:**

**-Water Use and Sewerage-**

Useful proposals relating to surface to absorb mm of water. Units of measures, such as low, toilets, use of rainwater etc may be inappropriate for outline planning permission but should be pursue. Likewise low-carbon style offices.

I am concerned that so many aspects of sustainable design are not even mentioned, passive solar design etc.

### **Organisations**

Cally Rail Group  
Camden Civic Society  
Camden LA21  
Camden Square CAAC  
Camden Square Neighbourhood Association  
Communities in Focus  
Friends of Regent's Canal  
Iraqi Women's League  
Kings Cross Community Development Trust  
Kings Cross Railway Lands Group  
Regents Network  
Regents Square United Reformed Church  
Sudanese Women's Association  
Workings Men's College

### **Individuals**

Angela Inglis  
Frances Madders  
Helia Evans  
Nahma  
Shadia Rahman  
Virginia Stanley  
Jane Riddiford  
Ragaia Ishag  
M. Khugali  
Nicole Gordon