

King's Cross Development Forum meeting notes- 10/03/2005

Annual General Meeting – Coordinating Group Nominations

Satnam Gill opened the meeting. He suggested that the Forum needed to respond to emerging changes to the planning application and this required immediate work. He therefore proposed that the AGM be postponed and that a terms of reference sub group be set up to review current Terms of Reference and consider amendments and recommendations that have been put forward. The sub group should report back to the Forum.

Concern was raised at this proposal. The Annual Review was meant to take place at the 10th March (this was noted at the last meeting in February 2005) - why was this not the case. What was going to happen to the Annual Review?

In relation to the Terms of Reference, DS raised the following points and queried:

- Clause 16:1 – Annual review and evaluation of how the Forum was working
- Clause 18:1 – Any amendments to be put through a special meeting
- CG function is to carry out the expressed decisions of the Forum
- An AR is not meant to occur more than 15 months after the TOR were agreed and signed off.

Members of the Coordinating Group explained that they had not had time to prepare an Annual Review since the last Forum meeting. It was agreed that an Annual Review should be dealt with at a future meeting. The Terms of Reference could be considered at this meeting. Noted that the elections may be affected by any changes to the TOR.

It was decided that the AGM could be postponed to May.

It was requested that when the Annual Review is prepared could it be sent to all Camden Ward Councillors.

Revisions to the Current Planning Application

Richard Kirby of Camden's Kings Cross Team outlined the discussions that have been taking place between the Council and Argents Kings Cross since December.

The discussions have been around the content of the application documents and their status in any planning decision, the physical form of the proposed development and the S106 package. Revisions to the current planning application are likely to be submitted in May/June. There would be a twenty-one day consultation period at this time.

Officers would be available to brief on and explain any changes. The kind of changes that might happen are as follows.

Key Changes:

- Main changes are likely to occur to the Development Specification and the Parameter Plans - the key planning application documents and focus should be on these documents

- Many of the supporting documents to the application will now be moved “above the line” by condition or legal agreement. It is likely that the wording and form of these documents will change. The planners expect a new Open Space and Leisure Strategy; Employment and Training Strategy; Regeneration Strategy, Green Travel Plan and sustainability documents
- Design Guidelines will come forward in a new form. They are expected to be in two parts
 1. A Design Statement with design rules which will bind the reserved matters application; and
 2. A Design Report - requiring submissions to demonstrate in a written statement how they meet design criteria
- The physical form of the development remains broadly the same. It is a high-density urban development but Council is negotiating on the bulk and mass of some of the buildings. For example: cutback to the buildings south of the canal to improve relationship with canal, also as an example changes to the buildings in the southern end of the development around the German Gym
- The shape and size of Long Park will change with further open space provision and a strategy dealing with leisure and open space
- Phasing - related to the Implementation Strategy. Council wants to see firm commitments from AKC for at least the First Phase. It is likely that there will be development occurring both on the south and north ends of the site in the first phase. The Council expect the inclusion of affordable housing in Phase 1
- The London Institute will probably take The Granary complex
- Section 106 - biggest item on this is affordable housing and bringing it in line with the requirements of Camden and Islington Councils UDPs, the Joint Brief and the London Plan.
- AKC will be providing a 2 Form Entry Primary School on the site with a childcare centre
- Planners expect to see a public swimming pool in the south of the site and negotiations are continuing over a library
- New GP surgery with 3 to 5 doctors and a health centre
- Tram – TfL still want the Tram. Camden Council are happy to have it, but do not want it to go through the centre of the site. There will be no tram depot but there is likely to be a bus garage
- Islington Council are keen to see the York Way Tube Station reopened, but Camden and TfL do not think that this is a viable option and it is not necessary for the Argent development. Islington officers reported that they were to undertake a Feasibility Study on this soon
- Bike Parking – Camden want bike parking. Likely to be an underground parking facility that will be secure and will have parking for some 800 bikes

AKC had been invited to and agreed to give a presentation to the Forum on the 14th April (meeting previously scheduled for the 7th April was changed as AKC cannot attend on this date).

Floor open to Discussion

Concern at the outlook from Maiden Lane. In particular the long block on the northern boundary of the site forming a boundary between the site and the CTRL line, would this obscure views?

Response: The planning system does not protect private views. The Council is currently in discussions with the developer about the height and articulation of this block.

There is the possibility of sound being bounced off the back of this building to the north (this may need to be addressed).

State of the linear land is still undecided and this is due to factors that are outside the control of the developers.

Una Sapientis requested that what the Forum need is a list of the main changes and these changes will formally be dealt with by the Forum. At the moment the Forum has no structure for input and hence we need to decide on a formal process with which the Council assists.

Del Brenner highlighted that people wanted and needed to be kept involved.

Richard Kirby suggested sub groups to consider key issues.

Geoffrey Roper asked RK what was considered the most crucial time for the Forum in the next 2.5 months. The answer given was April. GR later went on to say that not only do we need effective representation but also an effective reporting back mechanism so that people are aware of what is going on. Need to be active to be effective.

Hugh Lake – problem seems to be that we have a lack of representation and how much authority will we give an individual to represent all of those who make up the Forum? Seems to be that when people or a group are engaged in a subject they may end up presenting their view as that of the wider Forum. So we have a problem of delegation and people separating from their personal beliefs.

Dianna Shelley commented that we are never going to get just one point of view from the Forum.

The Chair suggested that to overcome individual groups should present their views independently and the Forum can then submit on their behalf.

General queries were raised at how the Forum can get representation at the meetings re the Section 106? Richard Kirby emphasised that the community as a whole needs to be represented and this is through a representative from the Forum.

Chair Proposed that Forum make a key issues list, which SG will send views on behalf of the Forum to Camden Council. Argument was put forward, that the Forum needs to make sure that they structure their arguments in the context of the Planning Brief and where the application and revisions are now. O'wise their effectiveness is likely to be lost. Need to adhere strictly to such an approach.

Hugh Lake presented a list of what can be addressed by the individuals and the Forum based on the key findings that were presented earlier by Richard Kirby (these are appended to this note). These points are listed below.

Can Richard Kirby add to this list the top ten consultation issues that were raised at the February meeting? This list was not included in the notes from the February meeting. (Note from Richard Kirby: Feb discussion around the main issues from consultation were taken from the summary sheet which had been circulated at the Feb meeting. Further copy attached to this note).

The emphasis is that we need to take the critical points and see how we can have an influence.

Presentation by Argents Kings Cross

Will request a short presentation by Robert Evans on the 14th – only 20 mins is wanted. He can highlight the main revisions and then the floor will be open to questions. This presentation will take place at the WMC. It was suggested by Satnam and Bill that questions are perhaps emailed beforehand to ensure that everyone gets a fair say.

Current pressure points 10 March 2005

As a result of briefings we have had on the negotiations taking place at Officer level between Camden and the Developers of the Kings Cross Site, it seems that the following area areas where local opinion may help to guide the outcome.

It is suggested that those individuals and groups, who have an opinion on these, should make these known as soon as possible. Of course, this will not prevent anyone from raising any subject as part of the public consultation exercise. As agreed at the meeting last night however, each should be very careful not to imply that they speak for the Forum.

1. Congestion in the South

There is a balance to be struck between the height and density of the buildings in the development and how far back the building line of the Southern Boundary between the stations is to be pushed back

2. Distribution of Bike Storage

Should the secure bike storage be distributed or concentrated on one place (if the latter, where?). Which bike population should be served; those who come by bike to the site or those who use bikes to disperse from the communications hubs every day?

3. Cut back of Southern Canal Buildings

How far should the buildings to the south of the canal be cut back if it means increasing the height and density elsewhere on the site?

4. School Provision

What is the balance of the argument between providing a – minimum viable - two-entry primary school (which will add to social coherence) when, to fill it, students will have to be drawn from the Copenhagen Street school, which already has vacant places and may, in turn, become unviable?

5. Industrial Site & Linear Land

Without details of usage how do we ensure that:

- Acceptable views are provided from Maiden Lane in the North
- acceptable noise and dust and smell pollution levels are maintained
- Vital ground access is provided to the North, to prevent isolation and ghettoisation taking place

6. North Wall

- How do we ensure that the view of the North Wall of accommodation provides an acceptable view from Maiden Lane in the North while, at the same time providing a should and visual barrier to residents and those living in the South?
- What can be done to reduce the ‘noise bounce’ off this wall to the North?

7. 106 Balance

Where should the priorities lie between the provision of open space and the provision of built facilities in the 106 Social Benefit negotiations?

8. The Tram

How do we get a sensible tram route sponsored? One that will be:

- Viable
- Of use within the site
- Connect the site from both the North and the South, to relieve the central congestion problem

9. Underground Station

How do we inject the case for reopening the UG station for the convenience of those on the site rather than basing the case on those commuting?

Future Forum meetings and Forum AGM

It was decided that the next co-ordinating group meeting would take place on the 17th March.

The next full Forum meetings would be set for 7th April, 14th April and the 28th April at venues yet to be confirmed where there will be a focus and push on the top 10 and 15 issues. The AGM and Annual Review of the Forum will be set for 19th May.

Any other business

Northern Ticket Hall

Government will consider paying for the Western Concourse if it can be done as a single contract with the NTH.