



MEETING NOTES

2nd November 2006 – Town Hall, Judd Street, Room 3A

Chair – Geoffrey Roper

Number of attenders: 13, plus 2 Camden officers (Robert West, Angela Ryan) and 1 Islington Officer (Mark Hammill)

Geoffrey Roper (Chair); Rob Inglis, M.Harriott, Lisa Tang, Del Brenner, Diana Shelley, Aileen Hammond, Lisa Pontecorvo, Peter Coppack, Helia Evans, Phil Jeffries, Andrew Bosi, Stale Holgerssen(student observer)

Apologies: Cllr Barton, Angela Inglis, James Goodwin, Una Sapietis, Herman Tribeling, Rick Wickham, Abdul Rahman, Aboliwali Mohamed, Joyal Uddin, Alphonse Buapanga, Jackie casey,

Issue	Action
<p>Notes of Forum meeting held 28th September 2006- agreed by Forum members</p> <p><u>S106 (Latest Draft)</u></p> <p>RW- Lovells(Developer’s Draft) put forward by the developers was not an item for consultation, however, comments made will be reported to committee on 16th November ’06. The latest draft 106 circulated before the meeting presents no significant changes, but tightens up the provisions in the Heads of Terms to ensure delivery make them more enforceable.</p> <p>A Forum member considered the 106 to be full of legal jargon, and wanted to know whether it was possible to produce a simplified version, which only contained the heads of terms with the legal jargon stripped out. RW- explained that this would be very difficult to do because if part 2 is read in isolation then relevant links to part 1 will be missed. It is meant to be the full document and</p>	



cannot be condensed or simplified by definition.

The question was raised about how the Elected members would understand and consider it. RW- explained that members have asked to see it and there would be a summary of the S106 in the committee report to help members focus on what they should be looking at. There are no changes to the heads of terms, and most of the wording relates to how the heads of terms will be enforced.

MH- confirmed that a report relating to the S106 will be reported to an Islington Committee on 13th November '06.

A member asked whether it was possible to draw attention to the items that have been secured that were not there originally. RW- explained that the only item not there originally is a unilateral undertaking by the Developer to pay for a pedestrian/cycle link between Agar Grove and Camley Street. There are new details, for example regarding monitoring cost for the entire agreement; clear targets for local employment and training; a framework for retail outlets that govern their sizes

Community facilities- the question was asked as to whether there had been any fleshing out in relation to the community facilities. RW- explained that there is a schedule of accommodation that stipulates what facilities should be provided, e.g., large and small meeting rooms, a multi-faith room, full serviced kitchen, IT equipment, Plant room etc, however, the actual floorspace for all the above items have not been specified. A member conveyed that a Council Officer had confirmed that the community facility was going to be the size of Camden's Planning Department in floorspace terms. RW- commented that this is unlikely; he didn't have a comparison to hand but speculated that it might be the size of a tennis court or so.

A member asked where the community facility would be located, and whether there was any inkling of who is going to run it. RW- confirmed that it would be in the northern half of the site. It is not going to be built for the next 7-8 years or more and that maybe it could be one of the future roles of the Forum to influence who is going to use it, who will run it, whether a development trust be set up etc.

A member raised concerns with regards to the lack of youth space. The youth rap premises has recently closed down and the group would require a space as large as that proposed for the community facility floorspace in order to be re-housed as there are 400 members. RW- there are other spaces within the development that could hold 400 young

people, and a potential opportunity is the University of the Arts building, which could lend itself to something like a rap group. This is something that can be discussed at a later stage.

A member said that it would be good for potential users to be able to link with the Council and other relevant people to look at how floor space can be shared and be made available, e.g., used on a rotated basis. RW- explained that it would be difficult to do on a rotated basis, because of ownership, management etc

A member raised the issue of a building that was required to provide a theatre. It has a few performances a year, but the facility does not feel like a space that can be enjoyed. Another member said that it was important to get it right and ensure that the community is going to have access to the facilities.

A member asked how the 106 would ensure that students going to the University of the Arts facility would be from local schools, and the student accommodation occupied by local students. RW - explained that the reality of higher education should be accepted, and that students will go wherever the best offer is, or wherever the relevant course is being provided. Local children will have an advantage because of the connection with the Education Business Partnership, and therefore will have an insight as to what the University of the Arts are providing. It is unlikely that local students will occupy the student accommodation as they will be more inclined to live at home. Students from abroad will need accommodation.

There should be a mechanism in the S106 to insist that the Developer consults with stakeholders and schools. RW- confirmed that the Developer is already engaged with local schools and will be working with the Education Business Partnership as per the 106. MH- conveyed that the S106 for the University of the Arts should be considered when their individual planning application is submitted to the Council.

The primary school (2 form entry)- the S106 states that the school should be fit for the purpose at all times during the construction phase. However, there is no mention of the routes to the school and there needs to be something that protects the routes to new schools. RW- commented that the school is on-site for people there, and safe routes come under the CoCP(Code of Construction Practice).

Education Contribution- In the scheme of things is the education contribution a lot of money? RW- explained that it pays for a 1 and a bit form entry school. There is no

planning reason why Argent should pay for a whole new secondary school. A member expressed that there is no reason why the developer could not contribute to a solution.

A member raised the fact that the Eastman Dental Hospital was a possible option for a new secondary school.

Other contributions:

A member raised the point that the developer was paying £5m for the erection of a bridge, and that the education contribution should be more important. It was observed that the development is commercially driven and the developers want to build a development that they can sell to people.

It was raised that it is just a matter of doing the sums, and that in essence the total sum of the contributions when added together is not very generous. RW- explained that Circular 05/05 (on planning obligations) restricts the Council in what can be legitimately requested from the Developer. It is not easy or even correct to compare with other developments. The developer would be spending approximately £100m on basic infrastructure, before the development really gets started.

A member asked how much it would cost the community, as there are a lot of things that have not been taken into account and considered the contribution to be very small. RW- explained that impacts and mitigation have to be identified, and that the Councils have done this as best they can. The Developer will pay for the alterations to traffic junctions, and build all the roads.

The issue was raised about people occupying the development having to pay taxes, and what benefits would they be getting.

A member asked whether the utility companies would be able to provide infrastructure for the whole area. RW- advised that they would and that the Developer is in a position to negotiate good rates. The enabling works cost over £100m, which the developer is paying for.

It was said that the development is being presented as a huge gain to the community as was CTRL. There is an enormous impact in terms of noise, dust, dangerous practices etc, and local residents are set to get another 15 years of it. There is not a health impact assessment to ascertain health damage to the community as a result of the development. The local community is going to suffer.

Another member felt that a development like KX Central will have an effect across the whole borough. It will suck in borough resources that are not mitigated against in the S106. RW- confirmed that, for example, the Council would

get a better settlement from Central Government to maintain the roads. The Council will get more money and also obtain limited business rates.

A member said that it would be useful for the Forum to know when the next batch of planning applications are submitted, so that they could have the opportunity to influence the next batch of S106 agreements.

Local employment and training - a member said that the connections should be done locally well before the S106 is agreed. RW- explained that this issue is dealt with early on and starts with construction training.

It was also raised that the Council should ensure that the Police and Environmental Health Officer have a connection with the local community. RW- confirmed that this is the sort of discussion that should take place with the liaison groups that are proposed as part of the Implementation Panels.

A member considered the S106 text circulated before the Forum meeting to be incomplete as there are gaps in relation to the schedules that have been referred to, the definition of small business space is different from what was understood in the heads of terms, start-up business leases are commercial leases for a maximum of 12 months. The 106 is very badly drafted and is ambiguous. RW- commented that the completed S106 contains what is needed..

Unresolved matters from 28th September meeting

The chair asked whether the Forum wanted to resolve the issue of whether members should be identified in terms of who said what at Forum meetings. **Forum members elected to postpone this item.**

KX update- Western Concourse

RW- the Council are still awaiting a few, very late consultation responses, and have asked Network Rail to re-consider certain aspects of the scheme, e.g., canopies (glass on the main roof is going to be too expensive to build); entrance; default landscaping position; access to the eastern side; and various matters in the Environmental Assessment and Transport. New designs will be submitted in December and there will be a formal re-consultation exercise.

Dates of future Forum meetings:

Thurs 25th Jan '07 (7pm-9pm at the Town Hall, in Committee Rm 2); Thurs 15th March '07; 10th May '07; and 12th July '07.

A.O.B

Co-ordinating Group will have the duty to frame the agenda for Forum meetings in the future. The next co-ordinating Group meeting has been arranged for Tuesday 9th Jan '07 at the Town Hall in Committee Rm 3A, commencing at 6pm.

Tram Route

Some members do not want the Tram route to go through Phoenix Road and Brill Place cutting a small community in half. A 900 signature petition was submitted 2 years ago, and Councillor Robinson has pledged his support.

RW- TfL were told not to go down this particular route. Consultations will be undertaken from 14th November '06 (every household along the route will be consulted). It is a TfL consultation, not the council's. There are two alternative options for the route. The choice of route will not hold back the King's Cross development as either can be accommodated within the development proposals. The Council's preferred option for the route is along Euston Road.

Co-ordinating Groups election

The chair conveyed that the King's Cross Conservation Area Advisory Committee have elected Angela Inglis to be appointed to the Co-ordinating Group. **The Forum agreed the nomination.**



For more information contact Camden's King's Cross team on 020 7974
2565 or email kxteam@camden.gov.uk
or Islington king's Cross team on 020 7527 2297/3505/2381
email: kxteam@islington.gov.uk