

Members of
Development Control Sub Committee
London Borough of Camden

28 February 2005

Dear Development Control Sub Committee

Kings Cross Central Planning application

I am writing to ask for a deputation in 8 March from Kings Cross Development Forum in response to the planning application Argent.

KXDF has been meeting to consider the development of the Kings Cross site for over three years and has been involved in the consultation in the planning brief, the initial application and the revised application. We have had over a hundred meetings, workshops and tours of the site and have carried out an extensive consultation with community groups and individuals in the area over the last three years. To aid us in our consultations we have had extensive professional support from Camden, Islington, TfL, and Planning Aid for London.

On behalf of the Forum I would like to thank all the officers who supported us in reaching out to the many diverse communities and interest groups in the area. It has led to the most extensive consultation process of any planning application ever in the area.

There is a brief summary of the Forum's views at page 56 of the Consultation section of the Pre Agenda Report (17.2.06). Overall the Forum is very keen to see a viable development of Kings Cross Central that takes into account the needs of the local population. The Forum's consultation exercise has led us to a position where we are able to support many specific proposals in the revised planning application, and object to others. In addition to the specifics supported or opposed by the Forum we would welcome a further increase in social housing and a reduction in bulk.

In detail the proposals that had the support of over two thirds of those responding were:

Community Facilities
Community safety (68%)
Art in public places (74%)

A primary healthcare centre (89%)
Cultural facilities (74%)
Schools and educational facilities (68%)
Transport
Urban home zones (96%)
No vehicular access to Canal Street (88%)
Routes R1 and S1 being service and access routes only (69%)
Management of transport on the site (92%)
Reduced car parking (84%)
Revised Cubitt Square (80%)
Handyside Park (72%)
Pedestrian zone linking canal edge and Handyside Park (89%)
Housing
Minimal housing South of Regents Canal (67%)
The mix of housing units proposed on main site (93%)
50% of housing being affordable (50%)
Lifetime houses (88%)
Sustainability
Wind turbines (69%)
Proposed location of solar panels (92%)
Green and brown roofs (88%)
Ground source heat pumps (75%)
Sustainable buildings (77%)
Employment
Small business units (69%)
Access to work measures for local people (90%)
Community
The proposed distribution of community facilities (80%)
Public sports hall (81%)
Health and fitness centre and swimming pool (89%)
2 form primary school (76%)
Higher education facilities (86%)
Community meeting space (86%)
Children's centre (81%)

Community meeting space (92%)

The following proposals had a majority of people opposed to them

The potential routes for the cross river tram (55%)

The proposed cycle routes (45%)

Adequacy of response to sustainability agenda (48%)

New access point across the canal at Camley Street (53%)
--

Other proposals had neither overwhelming support nor majority opposition. The full details are available in the background documents available in the Town Hall.

I would all urge all members of the committee to read these fully to understand the complexity of the communities responses to the development.

Yours sincerely

Satnam Gill
Chair of Kings Cross Development Forum