



MEETING NOTES

12th July 2007 – Room 10, Friends House, Euston Road

Chair – Geoffrey Roper

Present: 19

Geoffrey Roper (Chair: Regent's Sq U.R. Church); Del Brenner (vice Chair: Regents network); Fiona Maclean (LNBA: Battlebridge Moorings); Hugh Lake (CSQCAAC); Rebecca Maxwell (Drivers Jonas); Harry Wanless (British Library); Angela Inglis (KXCAAC); Peter Coppack (CRG); Vivienne Lewis (LBC- Community Development); Rita Waligo (LBC-Community Development); Aileen Hammond (Camden Civic Society); Diana Shelley (Cally Rail Group); Phil Jeffries; Norman Shepperd (CSNA); Martin Davis (Cally Rail Group); H. Evans (Ossulston Tenant & Residents Association); Ryan Kemp (Copenhagen Street); Anne Boston (Camden cycling Campaign); I. Shrubshall (AtisReal)

In attendance:

David Reidy (LB Camden)
 Gavin Sexton (LB Camden)
 Angela Ryan (LB Camden)
 David Morrissey (LB Camden)
 Lucy Shomali (LB Islington)

Apologies: Lisa Tang, Michael Edwards

Issue	Action
-------	--------



Notes of the previous meeting confirmed as accurate.

Matters arising: -

PJ- enquired about the date when the Council is expecting the next planning application from Argent

DR- confirmed that there is not an actual date but that the University of the Arts application is expected to be submitted in September this year.

GR- Announced the consultation details for the reserved matters application for the proposed shared service yard.

DB- Asked whether the Council were expecting a planning application for the bridge over the Canal.

GS- advised that this would form part of the "Eastern Goods Yard" application.

DS- Requested that the Forum be given notice of each application via email. It was made clear that formal notice would only be given in accordance with Camden's normal procedure, however **AR** agreed to do an informal email to members in the meantime, but expressed concern about how the Forum will be consulted when all of the applications start going to mainstream development control rather than via the present dedicated Kings Cross Team. **DR-** advised that the Forum need to discuss how the issue will be dealt with in the long run.

Presentation land at rear of British Library (Ian Shrubsall): - (copies of the site prospectus were made available to the meeting)

- ❑ There is to be a land swap between the landowners (formerly British Library, now Department of Culture, Media and Sport - DCMS) to achieve a more cohesive development.
- ❑ The site has a planning brief, which is in line with Camden's UDP. The relevant information is being given to potential purchasers. Development potential replicates what is in the brief. There is a section on potential opportunities in the commentary at the end of the prospectus.
- ❑ There is a restriction on the amount of development, by virtue of rights to light.

- The indicative sketch shows possible way that the site can be developed (1 X commercial block with residential and open space situated to the rear) however, this has not been endorsed.
- Expressions of interest from potential purchasers ends in August, and DCMS as vendor hope to appoint a developer by the end of the year 2007.
- Parties will be short listed in September.
- First stage of consultation and emerging concepts is expected next year '08.

Questions: -

HE- There are additional issues apart from the land swap issue. An Access Road is proposed through Ossulston Street and there are concerns about the impact that this will have on the people in the surrounding area (Ossulston St is already very busy).

Also raised concern about what is going to happen before the land is sold, as there is a rumour that part of the British Library site is going to be used as a Travellers' site. **IS-** There are no plans to do anything else other than preparing the site for development once CTRL leaves.

In response to an enquiry about British Library's view on the sale, **HW said** the British Library clearly has an interest, but it is not their land. They are solely in support of the land swap, as the library has no space to expand on their current piece of land. The swap takes away the current access road and therefore an application has been submitted for a proposed access road in Ossulston St. It is envisaged that this will not generate too much traffic.

PJ- BR exposed bidders in their bidding process, will this be the same? **IS-** has no knowledge of the expressions of interest they are going to receive. They will be sifted down to credible parties, look at their concepts; best value and prices then look for final short list.

Socially responsible criteria? What about bids that

do not provide 50% affordable housing? **IS-** The marketing material states what brief expects, it is made clear what is required. **DB-** asked whether density has been considered. **IS-** explained that this has not been stated, as there is no clear indication about the mix of uses. The site lends itself to high site coverage/high density scheme. **DB-** the site lies next to a grade 1 listed building (St Pancras station), which needs to be considered. **IS-** Anything that is put forward would have to be carefully justified. The baseline position is that the scheme should be modest; anything above that will need special justification, the scheme is for the developer to decide.

PJ- What amount of money would be expected for the site?

IS- Advised that the information was confidential and could not be disclosed until the site was sold. In regard to the amount of money sought for the site, the government has strict guidelines to adhere to, but the nature of any detailed proposal will also be a factor.

UNID- Does the UDP in its general discussion safeguard that interested parties must liaise with each other, to ensure a cohesive development over the two sites? **DM-** The planning brief makes it quite clear that the Council would expect a comprehensive design, and that any development of the two sites should relate well with one another. **GR-** equally concerned about permeability to the Mainline Station.

RKMP-enquired whether the Council was expected to give permission for an 18-storey building. **IS-** confirmed that the sketch drawing was impressionistic, not intended to give precise indications of building heights.

Presentation- future of the forum (Hugh Lake): -

Six slides outlining the summary of the presentation given on the 10th May '07, enabling works, first major phase, second major phase, planning applications expected and way forward-possibilities.

GR- there are a whole lot of hidden issues. Need to think about the way forward as well as the objective the forum hopes to achieve. **HL-** There is a need to look at the future of the group as a whole. Do the group have the resources to do an exercise as presented or do the group respond to planning

applications as individuals, through a dedicated group or as a Forum.

PJ- There is a need to set up a process, given that there are so many people concerned with different aspects, e.g., The Cally Rail Group is concerned with construction impacts. Need to build on expertise already available and recycle/share it.

DS- should start from where forum is and take it step by step. The Forum is not the community. The community is split over two boroughs and the forum is not representative of this. It is never going to be "the community" and the aim should be to make the forum as representative as possible.

UNID- There are two relevant models that forum can build upon: -

- (1) 'The Roundhouse' model where they went out into the community to find out what the community wanted;
- (2) University of the Arts who find out what the community wants in relation to the remits of the current art schools.

AB- The Forum can at least aspire to be proactive in getting information out to particular groups.

UNID- Should not expect service from Council officials who promise things and never commit. The forum needs to understand that they are all working together. The exercise is microcosmic, and the Forum needs to be vigilant.

HE- It is important that all sources of communication are used to reach people. When the members of the Forum attend meetings there is a need to feed back to the community they represent. The feedback should not only be oral but also done in written form.

GR- communication by different modes means that it is going to cost money. **HL-** A way forward is through creative exchange. The forum can turn themselves into a consultancy for local area groups. The Forum is in a position where they know about specific topics because they have engaged with the community and know that people can respond.

GR- This would not work as well as it might because members in the two boroughs are those who ought to have direct knowledge of where other agencies' workers are. The Forum does not work well with other

departments within the Camden Council apart from planning or with other agencies.

RKMP- Scrutiny has been overlooked. Scrutiny comes up in government papers all of the time and is something that the Council should encourage. **HL-** advised that he had tried to get ward Councillors from all political parties in the borough involved. This proved difficult and there was very little interest because of the fact that they were all from different political parties. **DS-** confirmed that Councillors have attended meetings when requested by Islington. There are some Councillors on the Forum list who will attend meetings when they are interested in a specific topic. This is not for the Forum to organise.

GR- advised on three options for the Forum: -

- (1) Form working groups to work on particular applications;
- (2) Comprise a programme for the immediate future;
- (3) Form themed working groups who have a continuing working role.

DB- The important thing is to build up the Forum, widen it and draw more people in. If membership were more representative then representations would be more reliable and balanced. This will need a lot of resources and a lot of work. The Forum as it stands will not achieve the momentum to carry on for the next 15 years. There is a need to make meetings more attractive, e.g., having guest speakers to attract people to an event. **HL-** The Forum needs to choose an option and test the process. The University of the Arts is the most credible as it is very interesting, it is big, and it is public and can attract quite a lot of low priced high value help. Need to go out into the community and tick all the boxes in the process (H Lake's diagram).

Report back from the Design Panel Meeting (Del Brenner): -

- Has attended two meetings on 26/04/07 & 20/05/07
- Membership of panel is not representative. The 1st and 2nd meetings were made up of developers or architects. There were only 4 people from the wider community. This needs to be addressed.
- Presentation of proposal was fairly worked up. The open space in Granary Square was so detailed

that most of the time was spent describing fountains, locations and the artists who were going to design the benches. The configuration of the square, pedestrian/cycle routes and access need to be considered. Planning issues are not being considered, e.g., safety issues.

- Presentations are promotions and are disappointing

Questions:

HL- what decisions are the group making? **DB-** The group are not making any decisions. **DR-** the design panel do not have formal decision-making powers. It is for brainstorming and for people to discuss ideas. The forum is invited so that they can feedback to the local community. **AB-** hopes that DB alerted the panel to make more of transportation issues, permeability etc., **DB-** confirmed that he had.

PJ- there has been involvement with the application for 6 months, it is due to be submitted in 2 months so a lot of the ink will be dry by the time the application is submitted. Need some sort of report as soon as possible so that it can be picked up for people to make feedback.

DB- Argent conveys that they are complying with the planning permission granted and that some things are "set in stone". **PJ-** maintains that it is an outline application and the ways in which it can be implemented are diverse.

General

AI- KXCAAC can look at the issue of the future of the forum and she can report back. One possibility is that the KXCXAAC can act as a link and members could be invited to the next forum meeting, which may also expand forum membership.

GR- Should groups be formed? **PJ-** There is the beginning of a working group now and the group should collate the current information and find out what more information can be obtained ahead of the application.

PJ- is student accommodation still being provided?

DR- it is not part of the University of the Arts application. Student accommodation is allowed for in

the outline planning permission but its implementation cannot be verified at this stage.

DB- There is a need for a Co-ordinating group meeting to be held in the next 10 days, and additional people need to be invited to ensure that a decision about the future of the forum is made.

The group decided that the next co-ordinating group meeting should be convened on 16th July '07.

Next Full KXDF meeting subsequent to the one scheduled for the 20th September '07 (Town Hall Judd St Committee Rm 3-Subject to change, members to be informed) is to be held on the 15th November '07

A. O. B

PJ- Ian Shrubshall from Atisreal (Rep: for DCMS) confirmed that he would be pleased to attend a meeting to discuss the shortlist of prospective developers for the BL site before they formalise the decision.

DS- reported back re the Triangle planning application. The application was rejected at the West Area Committee on 10th July '07.

Please note that UNID- means that I could not identify the person who made the specific comment.