

ADDENDUM TO ITEM 7, APPLICATION NO 5, DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE, 21st March 2013

APPLICATION REF: **2013/0405/P**

ADDRESS: **Building T1
King's Cross Central
York Way
London
N1C**

The following additions and items of clarification are required to address certain matters.

1. CONSULTATIONS:

- 1.1 **King's Cross Development Forum** – have commented to say that although they consider overall that the current proposal for T1 is an improvement upon the previous 2009 scheme, the Forum remains concerned about noise and wind despite the modelling that has been done:
- 1.2 Noise: The CTRL railway and Gas Holder 8 (which will host occasional public events) will give rise to a noisy environment for T1. There will also be a large car park (behind its noise porous west wall), noisy plant module, recreational area and a restaurant within the building itself. The narrow gap between T1 and building P1 to the east, could give rise to noise being reflected back to affect the residential parts of the building. In particular there could be resonance from the car park, roof atrium, or gap to the east of the building. Whilst noting that the noise sources have been modelled, the Forum would nevertheless like the inclusion of contingency plans for remedying any such problems.
- 1.3 Wind affects: Buildings R4 and R5 already appear to be affected by strong winds (which would presumably have been modelled at the planning stage). With weather reaching extremes more frequently, the position and shape of building T1 with jaws at its southern end, roof atrium and gap to the east of the building, could make it especially vulnerable to unpredicted affects. In the absence of extremely firm environmental guarantees, the Forum would like the inclusion of contingency plans to protect the outside spaces from such affects.
- 1.4 The reduction in bicycle stands by 26%, whilst apparently within the permitted standard, would seem short-sighted as well as parsimonious. It is suggested that since one car space could accommodate up to 13 extra bicycle stands, a reduction of just 1% (4 out of the 418 car spaces in the MSCP) would be all that is needed to restore the original allocation. Also, carefully designed 'roof-hung' cycle stands would not compromise car parking.

- 1.5 The Forum would wish to be confident that the residential balance in the Kings Cross Central development as a whole will be maintained, despite the replacement of “social rented” housing by “affordable rented” and “shared ownership” housing.
- 1.6 The Forum welcomes:
- The replacement of the windmills with pvs, which reduce one potential noise source
 - The realignment of the covered sports space, which will work better and confine noise more effectively
 - The change in roof planting from sedum to wild flowers, provided sufficient maintenance is put in place
 - The change in precast concrete cladding from plain surfaces to pigmented and textured ones inspired by early modern architecture
- 1.7 **Thames Water** - confirm the reserved matters do not affect Thames Water and as such have no observations to make.

2. ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT TO RESPOND TO COMMENTS RAISED IN CONSULTATION

- 2.1 The following provides an officer response to the comments made by the Kings Cross Development Forum as summarised above.

Noise

- 2.2 The same concerns about noise were previously expressed by the Forum in regard to the 2009 Reserved Matters application for T1. As is acknowledged by the Forum, the noise sources have been modelled (by Waterman Engineers) and found to be within acceptable levels. No technical evidence is offered to the contrary by the Forum or any other source. With regard to external noise from the railway in particular, this was assessed in detail as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the Outline Application and was not considered to be a serious issue for this part of T Zone due to the slow speed of the trains having just left St Pancras Station. Condition 62 on the Outline Permission did not require any special noise mitigation measures to be submitted for Zone T1.
- 2.3 Nevertheless, the window systems within T1 have been informed by the noise modelling to meet the noise criterion specified by condition 61 (relating to groundborne noise from underground tunnels) and combined with the mechanical ventilation proposed for the building would serve as a useful contingency if required.
- 2.4 The noise modelling and assessments undertaken have taken rail noise reflections into account in the calculations and have specifically

considered the “gap” referred to by the Forum. Residential dwellings facing internally onto the car park are for the most part provided with a ‘buffer zone’ of corridor space, stairwells and ancillary rooms. Rail noise breakout from the car park is not expected to be an issue due to the high level of attenuation provided by the car park wall, absorption within the buffer zone space and the residential apartment walls.

- 2.5 Breakout of noise from the T1 energy centre has also been factored in and the applicant has advised that they are planning to install absorptive linings in specific areas of the plant areas, to minimise noise break out as per the noise information submitted in response to Condition 60 under the earlier submission 2009/0415/P.
- 2.6 Other noise sources mentioned –namely the MUGA, restaurant and Gas Holder No. 8 will be managed areas and in the case of the restaurant in particular, recommended to be controlled by an hours of use condition (0730-2330hrs).

Wind affects

- 2.7 The same concerns about wind affects were also raised in regard to the previous application. The proposals were subject to detailed modelling and assessment by BMT Fluid Mechanics Ltd, first in 2008 (for the original T1 proposals subsequently approved under 2009/0415/P) and more recently in November 2012, when BMT provided the updated assessment reported in the Urban Design Report (under Guideline 2, page 65). Partly as a result of that assessment, the proposals include extensive soft landscaping to the 8th Floor podium garden as well as 3m glazed panels at either end of the passage between the townhouses and the tower to minimise crosswinds between these two elements.
- 2.8 The south-facing birds beak design of the scheme will by its orientation and positioning of the protective ‘open jaws’ will deflect prevailing westerly winds from the open terrace area in between. The section of canal towpath in front of the building (outside the area of this reserved matters application) will generally be used for leisurely strolling or short periods of standing or sitting and therefore not be unduly compromised by the localised effects of wind deflected around the building at this point.

Cycle parking

- 2.9 As stated in paragraph 6.69 of the main report, the cycle parking provision now proposed for T1 still exceeds the minimum standard required by the Kings Cross Outline Permission by 10 spaces. Whilst the opportunity to vary the number of car parking spaces for any reason would exist through the applicant being able to apply for a variation to the MSCP Management Plan under Outline Condition 50, it should be noted that the details already approved under this condition

for 417 spaces plus the 37 spaces approved within J Block and the 36 spaces approved in Building P1 is so far well below the 800 residential spaces plus 250 non-residential spaces permissible for the development by virtue of condition 49 and Section EE of the S106 Agreement.

Residential balance

- 2.10 The residential balance for the scheme was set by the 'Baseline Mix' of Section NN of the Kings Cross S106 Agreement. The S106 agreement recognised that it would need to be treated as a 'living document' responding to changing circumstances over time. As explained in paras. 6.3 – 6.13 of the main report, the changes to the affordable housing are in line with the Baseline Mix and the subsequent variations that have been agreed to respond to various needs and constraints over time. In the case of building T1, the reduction in HCA funding has necessitated a review of the affordable housing offer previously approved. Although there has had to be a slight increase in intermediate (shared ownership) units to ensure that the Affordable Rent units can be provided as 'fully affordable' [closer](#) in line with Camden target rents, this has not resulted in any net change in the number of affordable units provided overall within the Baseline mix overall –as is illustrated in Table 1 of the report.

Addendum ends