

# **KING'S CROSS STATION ENHANCEMENT**

## **REPORT ON CONSULTATION**

**April 2006**

# KING'S CROSS STATION ENHANCEMENT – REPORT ON CONSULTATION

## CONTENTS

	paras.
<b>1 INTRODUCTION &amp; BACKGROUND</b>	
Purpose of the Report	1.1-1.2
Broad Approach to Consultation	1.3-1.7
Overview of Consultation	1.8-1.16
Report Structure	1.17
Acknowledgements	1.18-1.19
<b>2 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION</b>	
Introduction	2.1-2.5
Chronology of Stakeholder Engagement	2.6-2.8
Summary of Key Issues	2.9-2.13
Conclusions	2.14-2.15
<b>3 PUBLIC CONSULTATION – APPROACH</b>	
Introduction	3.1-3.4
KXSE Leaflet	3.5-3.11
Network Rail Website	3.12
Station Exhibition	3.13-3.15
Briefing and Q&A Sessions With Community Groups	3.16-3.19
Conclusions	3.20
<b>4 PUBLIC CONSULTATION – RESULTS</b>	
Introduction	4.1-4.2
Response to KXSE Leaflet and Network Rail Website	4.3-4.10
Comments Recorded at Station Exhibition	4.11-4.12
Summary – Responses Via Leaflet/E-Mail and Comments Made at Station Exhibition	4.13-4.15
Issues Raised at Consultation Meetings	4.16-4.18
Conclusions	4.19-4.21
<b>5 CONCLUSIONS</b>	5.1-5.12
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
1	Chronology of Stakeholder Consultation Meetings
2	Leaflet Mailing List
3	King's Cross Consultee Groups Invited to Meetings on 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2005 and 18 <sup>th</sup> January 2006
4	Detailed Comments/Queries Received Via Leaflet Returns and E-Mail
5	Detailed Comments/Queries Received at King's Cross Station Exhibition
6	Issues Raised at Consultation Meeting With King's Cross Development Forum and CAAC Members – 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2005
7	Issues Raised at Consultation Meeting With King's Cross Development Forum Members – 18 <sup>th</sup> January 2006





King's Cross Station Exhibition – November/December 2005



King's Cross Development Forum Briefing – 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005

# King's Cross

creating a world class station



Network Rail plans to develop King's Cross station into a world class transport hub that meets the needs of the 21st Century.

We aim to:

- create a modern, spacious station with a comfortable passenger environment
- provide convenient connections to St Pancras, the Underground, buses, taxis and the surrounding area
- make a positive contribution to the upgrading of the King's Cross area.

Pick up a leaflet or visit the Network Rail website at [www.networkrail.co.uk](http://www.networkrail.co.uk)



King's Cross Station Enhancement – Publicity Poster

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

### Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this Report is to explain the key components of the consultation programme that Network Rail has implemented in preparation for submitting its planning and listed building consent applications in respect of the King's Cross Station Enhancement works (KXSE) and to identify the responses that have been obtained from stakeholders and the public. The Report identifies the various bodies, groups and individuals that were consulted and highlights:
- the particular stages in the consultation process when they were consulted;
  - the main topics/issues that were the focus of consultation;
  - the key issues/comments that were raised at each stage by these bodies, groups or individuals.
- 1.2 It should be noted that this Report is principally concerned with 'external' consultations on KXSE and does not therefore cover discussions on highly detailed technical/integration matters with partners such as London Underground (LUL), Department for Transport (DfT) and Argent King's Cross (AKC) (previously Argent St George (AStG)).

### Broad Approach to Consultation

- 1.3 The approach to consultation adopted by Network Rail in respect of KXSE featured a series of key principles, as follows:
- the early involvement of key stakeholders such as staff of London Borough of Camden and English Heritage and neighbouring developers (Argent St George and London and Continental Railways) in the identification of key issues, the formulation, refinement and evaluation of station development options;
  - maintaining interactive dialogue with key stakeholders in respect of important design and development issues over the whole consultation period;
  - conducting a wide ranging consultation process involving all identified stakeholders to obtain their views as the station design development work proceeded;
  - informing, and seeking the views of the general public and community groups on the proposals for the station.
- 1.4 This approach greatly aided the design development process by providing meaningful input on important concerns and ideas that led, through numerous iterations, to the gradual refinement of the station proposals.
- 1.5 A series of *tools* were used throughout the consultation process which were considered to be the most appropriate means of explaining the KXSE proposals and eliciting responses at different stages of the design development process, and which took account of the needs of different types of consultee.
- 1.6 For *stakeholders*, the principal vehicles for consultation were:
- Workshops/meetings – mainly involving the 'core stakeholders' (see Section 2 below);
  - Briefing Sessions – mainly for non-core stakeholders;
  - Station Masterplan Working Group – involved 'core stakeholders' towards the end of the design development process.

The rationale for the above is explained in more detail in Section 2.

- 1.7 For *community groups and the public*, a multi-faceted approach was adopted which featured a number of consultation tools, as follows:

(a) Public Consultation – late-November 2005 to March 2006

- Leaflet distribution – leaflets were sent to identified community groups, local councils and members of the public. The leaflets included a pre-paid postal comment form.
- Network Rail Website – this included a section on KXSE and provided an e-mail feedback link.
- Manned Exhibition – a manned exhibition was held over a 2-week period at two locations in King's Cross Station. Leaflets were distributed to the travelling public and staff were available to answer questions and record comments made.
- Poster campaign – King's Cross Station, London Boroughs of Camden and Islington premises.

(b) Community Groups – sessions were held in December 2005 and January 2006 with the King's Cross Development Forum and Conservation Area Advisory Group.

## Overview of Consultation

- 1.8 The consultation period for KXSE has been extensive and sustained. It commenced in April 2003 and was completed in March 2006 and involved:
- some 40 stakeholder workshops/meetings/briefings;
  - a public consultation period lasting for approximately 4 months;
  - meetings with community group representatives (King's Cross Development Forum and Conservation Area Advisory Committee).
- 1.9 Appropriate measures were established to both record issues and concerns raised by all consultees and to ensure that appropriate responsive action was taken in regard to the KXSE design development process. To this end, Network Rail employed a dedicated Consultation Manager for KXSE whose specific remit was to prepare and implement an in-depth consultation programme which engaged all key stakeholders, organisations, groups and the public at appropriate points in the design development process.
- 1.10 The consultation programme consisted of three main stages which essentially reflected progress on the design development work for KXSE. Throughout the programme Network Rail strove to ensure that consultations involved sustained, iterative and interactive dialogue between consultees and the design team.
- 1.11 The three main consultation stages are summarised as follows:
- **Stage 1 Stakeholder Consultations** – commenced in April 2003 and were substantially completed by September 2003. These consultations provided an early opportunity to involve core stakeholders in the identification of key issues/concerns, the formulation and assessment of initial concourse options, the formulation and evaluation of western concourse options which led to the adoption of a preferred option. Following this, stakeholder input enabled design development to proceed rapidly, to the extent that fairly 'mature' designs were put to a wider range of stakeholders for comment. A core group comprising representatives of the London Borough of Camden (planning and highways) (LBC) and London Borough of Islington (LBI), Argent St George (AStG – now Argent King's Cross (AKC)), London and Continental Railways (LCR), English Heritage (EH) and Network Rail oversaw the option formulation and evaluation process and subsequent design development work. Also consulted were the Victorian Society, TfL and GLA.
  - **Stage 2 Stakeholder Consultations** – took place between May 2005 and March 2006 and were **focused on assisting the design team to develop its more detailed designs for KXSE**. The above-mentioned core group was at the heart of this process but consultation also included many sessions with the Train Operating Companies (TOCs), the GLA, Victorian Society, British Transport Police, Metropolitan



Police, CAGE, London TravelWatch, Railway Heritage Trust and The Mayor.

- **Stage 3 Public Consultations** – were conducted between late November 2005 and March 2006 with the purpose of consulting community groups through the King's Cross Development Forum, the Camden Conservation Area Advisory Committee and the general public. The purpose of this stage was to both **explain the KXSE proposals and to solicit feedback on the design so that Network Rail could understand and respond to concerns prior to submitting its planning application.**
- 1.12 It should be noted that external consultations were suspended in early 2004 pending the identification of suitable funding sources for the station works and in light of the then forthcoming LUL NTH Review. On February 15<sup>th</sup> 2005, DfT announced its support for LUL's Northern Ticket Hall (NTH) and also backed proposals for a new Western Concourse at King's Cross Station. This announcement effectively lifted the suspension of design and development work on the NTH and the new concourse.
- 1.13 The above approach meant that it was possible to achieve early and sustained engagement with key stakeholders to understand their concerns/views and to address these through the design development process. A considerable amount of success was achieved in this regard as staff of bodies such as LBC, LBI, English Heritage, Victorian Society, CAGE and TfL have expressed a large measure of support for the overall design of KXSE. More specifically, the benefits of early and sustained engagement with stakeholders were essentially twofold:
- it enabled Network Rail to obtain early feedback on key issues and possible options that needed to be pursued;
  - it provided the means for Network Rail to explain the problems, constraints and opportunities that had to be faced in deriving workable design solutions.
- 1.14 It is also important to recognise that, in light of LBC's desire to see a truly comprehensive approach to the overall development of the King's Cross Opportunity Area, the design development process has been undertaken in close consultation with adjoining developers and owners (AKC and LCR). This was of particular importance in the initial consultation period when key design decisions affecting *both* KXSE and KXC were being taken.
- 1.15 The consultation meetings/workshops which took place during the design development process enabled significant progress to be made in regard to stakeholder acceptance of the design proposals. In particular:
- the need for an expanded concourse;
  - recognition that a new concourse to the west of the station represents the only viable option;
  - the need for retention and possible arcading of the GNH as an integral part of the overall KXSE/KXC scheme;
  - the necessity of interventions into the Listed Building fabric of the station;
  - overall endorsement of the design of the western concourse;
  - widespread acceptance of the design of other elements such as arrangements for/linkages with other transport modes, OBS and servicing, taxi facilities arrangements, Platform Y and overall public realm treatment.
- 1.16 In light of the above it is clear that extensive consultation with key stakeholders has been most beneficial in both achieving support and in terms of making the design team aware of concerns/issues that need to be addressed. It can also be concluded that *early* involvement in the design development process (including the consideration of concourse options) led to the creation of a very positive environment for stakeholder input. This clearly paved the way for 'in principle' stakeholder agreement to the design proposals



embodied by the preferred option at an early stage.

## **Report Structure**

1.17 This Report is structured as follows:

- Section 1: Introduction and Background – as above.
- Section 2: Stakeholder Consultation – identifies how and when stakeholders were involved in formulating the KXSE proposals and highlights the results of this in terms of key issues raised and advice/guidance provided.
- Section 3: Public Consultation - Approach – explains the steps taken by Network Rail to inform the public and community groups about the KXSE proposals and to encourage comment thereon.
- Section 4: Public Consultation - Results – highlights the issues of greatest concern to the public and community groups in regard to the KXSE proposals.
- Section 5: Conclusions – summarises the main conclusions that can be reached in relation to the overall stakeholder and public consultation exercise.

## **Acknowledgements**

1.18 Network Rail would like to thank all those who participated in the consultation programme for KXSE by providing comments and views. These inputs have enabled Network Rail to prepare appropriate proposals for King's Cross Station that address the very wide variety of contextual and operational factors that need to be taken into account.

1.19 In particular, Network Rail greatly appreciates the valuable inputs provided by:

- The public – via e-mail, mail and discussions at King's Cross Station
- The community groups who attended the briefing sessions
- Staff of London Borough of Camden and London Borough of Islington
- Staff of English Heritage and LAC members
- Staff and Members of the Victorian Society
- Staff of Argent King's Cross and London & Continental Railways
- Staff of GLA, TfL, LDA and GoL
- Staff of WAGN, Hull Trains, GNER and EWS
- Staff and members of CABE
- London TravelWatch
- Railway Heritage Trust
- Staff of British Transport Police and the Metropolitan Police
- Staff of the HMRI

## 2.0 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

### Introduction

- 2.1 This Section describes stakeholder involvement in the formulation and assessment of concourse options and the subsequent design development process. As noted above (Section 1), stakeholder input provided invaluable guidance in shaping the content of the KXSE proposals that have now been submitted for planning and listed building consent approval.
- 2.2 In broad terms, the stakeholders consulted on KXSE can be categorised according to the nature and timing of their input, as follows:
- Implementation Partners: DfT and LUL – consulted in respect of detailed technical and integration matters (as noted in Section 1, these consultations are not covered by this Report).
  - Core Stakeholders: staff of LBC and LBI, AKC, LCR, English Heritage – frequently involved throughout the entire design development process.
  - Heritage Stakeholders: Victorian Society and London Advisory Committee – consulted at key points in the design development process.
  - Train Operating Companies: WAGN, Hull Trains, GNER, EWS – represent key Network Rail ‘clients’. The TOCs were consulted extensively during the design development process.
  - GLA and TfL – consulted in respect of the preferred concourse option (Stage 1 consultations – see below) and as Core Stakeholders in Stage 2 (members of the Station Masterplan Working Group – see below).
  - Other Stakeholders: British Transport Police, Metropolitan Police, CABE, Government Office for London, London Development Agency, London TravelWatch, Railway Heritage Trust, The Mayor, HMRI – consulted mainly during Stage 2 on the basis of relatively advanced station design proposals to solicit comment and to identify detailed concerns.
- 2.3 Irrespective of the category into which individual stakeholders fall, Network Rail has made every effort to ensure that all were engaged at the most critical points in the design of the KXSE proposals. In particular, it is important to acknowledge that the ‘core stakeholders’ provided valuable and sustained input to the design development work through participation in numerous workshops and meetings.
- 2.4 The principal ‘vehicles’ for stakeholder engagement took the form of:
- Workshop sessions and meetings – these were held throughout the consultation programme (see Appendix 1) as a forum for identifying issues/concerns and obtaining comments on the KXSE proposals from the *core stakeholders*. Feedback from these meetings enabled numerous important iterations in the design development process.
  - Briefing sessions – were provided for all *other identified stakeholders* as a means to present the preferred design for KXSE and to gather views/concerns that needed to be addressed in the design development process. In a number of cases these sessions also led to significant design iterations.
  - Station Masterplan Working Group – involving the core stakeholders identified above and also GLA and TfL, the Working Group was convened in the latter stages of design development to close-out any previously unresolved issues and to finalise the design for KXSE.
- 2.5 Records of the above meetings were prepared and feedback was circulated as appropriate to stakeholders and the design team by Network Rail. In many instances copies of the presentation material (powerpoint and plans) were also distributed to attendees.

## **Chronology of Stakeholder Involvement**

- 2.6 As explained above (paragraph 1.11), stakeholder involvement in the preparation of the current KXSE proposals occurred in two broad stages:
- Stage 1 – took place during 2003 and was principally concerned with identifying key issues and potential problems, formulating and assessing options and commenting on the subsequent design development work based on a preferred option.
  - Stage 2 – took place between May 2005 and March 2006. The principal focus of this stage was to both obtain detailed guidance on particular aspects of the KXSE design (e.g. heritage aspects) and also to expose the proposals to an increasingly wide range of stakeholders.

### *Stage 1 Stakeholder Consultations*

- 2.7 As shown by Appendix 1, twelve Stage 1 Consultation workshops/meetings took place between April and September 2003. These covered a wide variety of matters associated with KXSE which can be summarised as follows:
- Core Stakeholder Workshops/Meetings:
    - identified key issues/problems;
    - assessed the suitability of options for a new concourse location;
    - identified key passenger and pedestrian movement needs;
    - identified key transport issues;
    - identified option evaluation factors;
    - agreed a 'base case' alignment for Pancras Road;
    - assessed broad options for a new concourse location with/without the Great Northern Hotel;
    - agreed in principle to the western concourse option with the Great Northern Hotel retained;
    - examined and evaluated a series of concourse alignment options with the Great Northern Hotel retained;
    - agreed to the preferred arrangement of a new western concourse abutting the Great Northern Hotel but with a pedestrian arcade at its ground floor.
  - Briefing Sessions for Victorian Society, TfL and GLA:
    - examined and discussed the concourse location options;
    - identified and assessed movement issues associated with the Great Northern hotel-retained options (TfL);
    - examined and discussed the preferred design approach;
    - examined interventions into the Great Northern Hotel (Victorian Society).

### *Stage 2 Stakeholder Consultations*

- 2.8 Stage 2 stakeholder consultations involving nearly thirty separate meetings were undertaken between May 2005 and March 2006. These meetings covered numerous design, heritage and operational matters which can be summarised as follows:
- 6 Core Stakeholder meetings (including Station Masterplan Working Group meetings) covering such matters as:
    - KXSE design update and review;
    - review of transport matters;
    - detailed transport modelling;
    - public realm treatment;
    - servicing matters;
    - taxi arrangements;
    - Great Northern Hotel treatment;
    - scope and content of the Network Rail planning submission.
  - 6 Briefing Sessions for the TOCs covering:
    - KXSE design update and review;

- accommodation issues;
- passenger movement issues;
- proposed footbridge access to platforms;
- taxi and servicing arrangements;
- staging/phasing matters.
- 2 Briefing Sessions for British Transport Police and Metropolitan Police covering mainly:
  - KXSE design update and review;
  - security issues;
  - accommodation issues and implementation phasing.
- 2 Briefing Sessions for the London Advisory Committee covering mainly:
  - KXSE design update and review;
  - interventions into the listed building fabric;
  - the proposed passenger footbridge within the station;
  - need for/design of station and taxi canopies.
- 2 Briefing Sessions for the Victorian Society covering:
  - KXSE design update and review;
  - interventions into the listed building fabric;
  - the proposed passenger footbridge within the station;
  - need for/design of station and taxi canopies;
  - treatment of the Western Concourse relative to the adjacent heritage buildings.
- 9 Separate Briefing Sessions were held with CAGE, the King's Cross/St Pancras Strategic Forum, Government Office for London, London TravelWatch, AKC/LCR, Railway Heritage Trust, GLA/LDA/TfL, The Mayor and HMRI. In addition to providing a presentation on the design development work to date, these briefings variously covered such matters as public realm treatment, taxi and station servicing facilities, canopies, transport modelling impacts, integration and implementation matters, safety and evacuation aspects and passenger/pedestrian movement.

## Summary of Key Issues

### *Stage 1 Stakeholder Consultations*

- 2.9 Clearly, a wide range of issues, concerns and views arose as a result of discussions during the various workshops and meetings that took place during the Stage 1 stakeholder consultations. These discussions centred on identifying the fundamental principles that underpin the KXSE proposals and led to the formulation and evaluation of possible development options – and ultimately the adoption of a preferred option for further development. Particular attention was paid at this stage to ensuring that the KXSE proposals were compatible with those that were emerging in respect of KXC.
- 2.10 However, it is also clear that certain issues and concerns were of particular importance to stakeholders by reference to both the frequency with which they were raised and the amount of time that was taken-up in considering and addressing them. These issues and concerns are synthesised as follows:

#### *(a) Station Concourse Options*

- Achieving seamless compatibility between the KXSE and KXC proposals was established as an early and fundamental principle. Additionally, it was recognised by stakeholders that the two projects need to provide comprehensive coverage of the area.
- Given the need for a new concourse facility as a result of the inadequacy of the existing southern concourse (in terms of capacity, planning and heritage concerns), various locational options were considered. Stakeholders agreed that a new concourse:
  - within the main trainshed could not be supported on heritage and cost

- grounds;
- to the south of the station could not be supported in light of planning, public realm and heritage concerns;
- to the west of the main trainshed represented the only viable alternative.
- 'Sub-options' relating to the way in which the proposed western concourse engaged with the Great Northern Hotel were also considered by the stakeholders. In order to accommodate both concourse operability criteria and external pedestrian movement needs it was agreed that the concourse should abut the Great Northern Hotel and the ground floor of the hotel should be arcaded to enable adequate N-S pedestrian links to be maintained at all times. This arrangement essentially underpinned the preferred design which was supported by the core stakeholders (and subsequently supported by other stakeholders).
- Air rights development at the station would be strongly resisted on heritage grounds.
- The size and layout of the proposed new western concourse was extensively debated by stakeholders during the Stage 1 consultations and a basic footprint (essentially the same as that now included in Network Rail's current planning submission) and layout was agreed that met station operation needs as well as heritage and other planning requirements.

*(b) Public Realm*

- The need for high quality design and treatment of the public realm around KXSE. The Southern Square was seen as particularly important in the context of new proposals for the station – notably the need for this area to function as a civic square/plaza and also to handle substantial pedestrian footfalls.
- It was also considered that the Southern Square should not accommodate public transport facilities such as taxi facilities.
- Stakeholders considered that thought should be given to reducing the impact of the LUL vent structures in the Southern Square.

*(c) Heritage*

- There was a very strong desire amongst stakeholders to see the removal of the existing southern concourse at the station in order to reveal the original Cubitt façade.
- Considerable discussion surrounded the future of the Great Northern Hotel. During the course of these discussions it became clear that a defensible case for removing the hotel could not be established either singly or jointly in the context of KXSE and KXC.
- The need for careful consideration of the visual and functional relationship between the proposed western concourse and neighbouring heritage buildings (notably the Western Range of the Station and the Great Northern Hotel) was considered to be of critical importance. However, the proposed design of the Western Concourse was seen as being compatible in principle with adjacent heritage buildings and interventions into the Western Range were seen as broadly acceptable in the context of upgrading the station facilities.
- Treatment of the Great Northern Hotel interventions to secure a properly functioning pedestrian arcade were discussed at length with heritage bodies and core stakeholders. These led to 'in principle' agreement to a ground floor arcade solution.

*(d) Movement*

- Pedestrian movement and permeability was seen as being of high priority in the overall design of both KXSE and KXC. In particular, the need to accommodate high pedestrian volumes between the Southern Square and KXC and between King's Cross Station and St Pancras.
- A number of stakeholders considered that cycling should be accorded priority in

the design of KXSE and the surrounding area.

- The Pancras Road corridor was considered to be under considerable pressure in view of the requirement to accommodate the full range of transport modes and movements. The 'pinch-point' between the Great Northern Hotel and St Pancras Station was seen as being of particular concern since it restricts the ability to accommodate all modes on Pancras Road.
- Taxi facilities were considered to be critically important to station operations and should be conveniently located on Pancras Road. Such facilities should be weather protected.
- Stakeholders agreed that station servicing facilities should be off-street.

*(e) Other Matters*

- The possible upgrading of York Way via KXSE proposals was discussed on a number of occasions. However, whilst not ruling out such action, Network Rail made it clear that structural issues associated with the Eastern Range of the station would make interventions into the building fabric extremely difficult and costly and the company has no remit to undertake work of this nature at the present time.
- The introduction of a footbridge to the north of the station linking the KXC development and York Way (a proposal in the LBC/LBI King's Cross Planning and Development Brief) was also discussed. Network Rail undertook to ensure that its proposals for KXSE would not preclude the provision of this facility but had concerns about its implications in regard to safety/security and feasibility.

- 2.11 The above is by no means an exhaustive list of the issues and opinions that were raised by stakeholders in the Stage 1 consultations but does serve to highlight what are believed to be the most significant matters discussed and the agreements that were reached.

*Stage 2 Stakeholder Consultations*

- 2.12 Stage 2 stakeholder consultations were conducted via meetings and briefings throughout most of 2005 and early 2006 as a means to obtain stakeholder input to design development work on KXSE. A great deal of valuable advice and guidance was provided by stakeholders over this period which led to the increasing refinement of the proposals. Given the advances that were made in the design iterations for KXSE before and during Stage 2 consultations, it is inevitable that the key issues and concerns raised during this latter stage were concerned more with individual aspects of the scheme rather than the sort of broad matters of principle that emerged in Stage 1.

- 2.13 Against this background, the main issues and concerns that arose during Stage 2 stakeholder consultations are synthesised as follows:

*(a) Public Realm and Building Design Matters*

- The proposals relating to weather protection (canopies) on the southern façade of the station and in relation to taxi facilities were the subject of extensive debate during the Stage 2 stakeholder consultations. In regard to the proposed taxi canopies, the following views were expressed:
  - there was little dispute that weather protection for the taxi facilities is clearly needed;
  - however, concern was expressed that the proposed design of the taxi canopies neither complemented the public realm as a whole nor the adjacent heritage buildings and thought should be given to making them less intrusive.The proposed canopy on the south façade of the station proved to be perhaps the most controversial of all issues relating to KXSE. Broadly, the provision of this canopy was seen as an essential component of the station by the TOCs and was also supported by TfL (and Network Rail). However, a number of other

stakeholders were concerned that the inclusion of any canopy in this location would detract from the newly revealed Cubitt façade. It also became clear that LBC's forthcoming design study for the Euston Road corridor and including King's Cross Station area would likely have a significant impact on the design of the Southern Square, including any canopy treatment.

- The above-mentioned LBC design study was also seen as having a significant impact on the layout and treatment of the Southern Square. With that in mind, stakeholders generally agreed that Network Rail's proposals for a 'clean/simple' but high quality public realm which is free of clutter and able to accommodate high pedestrian volumes, represents an appropriate response at this stage.
- A number of stakeholders mentioned the need for more attention to be given to the treatment of the public realm around the station including the need to ensure a consistent approach to street furniture in Station Square and the Southern Square.
- The LUL vent structures in the Southern Square were again felt to be unfortunate and stakeholders wished to see their impact reduced.
- As in the Stage 1 consultations, the upgrading of York Way via KXSE proposals was raised and Network Rail reiterated its concerns about structural stability and lack of funding.
- The environmental performance of the KXSE proposals were considered against the background of The Mayor's renewable energy targets. Stakeholders generally recognised that the design for the new concourse adopts energy efficient principles but that its important heritage context precludes drastic action in this regard.
- Some stakeholders suggested that the main entrance to the new concourse in Southern Square should be made more prominent.
- In light of concerns expressed by CABE in regard to (particularly) station and taxi canopies and the physical connections between the Western Range and new Western Concourse, an additional session was held in February 2006 to 'fine-tune' design work. This enabled CABE to understand the rationale behind Network Rail's design approach for these components, though clearly some concerns remain.

#### *(b) Movement*

- Some stakeholders considered that more attention should be given to N-S pedestrian movement corridors around/through the Western Concourse and along Pancras Road. Others felt that more information was needed on pedestrian flows to fully justify arcading of the Great Northern Hotel.
- Concerns were raised by stakeholders in regard to the ability of the overall movement network (including surrounding roads, proposed public transport and taxi facilities and pedestrian movement environment) to work cohesively as a whole with both KXSE and KXC in place. Key stakeholders (notably TfL, AKC/LCR, LBC and Network Rail) consequently worked to produce detailed dynamic traffic modelling. This demonstrated that the overall transport system envisaged to serve KXSE and KXC is capable of accommodating forecast pedestrian and vehicular traffic flows – including the N-S pedestrian movement issue mentioned above.
- The need for adequate cycle parking at the station was raised by some stakeholders.

#### *(c) Station Design and Accommodation Issues*

- Since a number of the consultation sessions held in Stage 2 were with those parties who have a keen interest in the operational aspects of the future station, it is understandable that rather more detailed matters such as implementation phasing and the arrangement of floorspace allocations were the subject of much discussion. In particular, the amount and location of space for ticketing, numerous customer facilities, food & drink and retail facilities etc. and other 'back of house' activities were raised by the TOCs and Police representatives.
- The TOCs and Police representatives also raised concerns about how to maintain



normal operations during the implementation period for KXSE.

- Consultations with Police representatives addressed concerns relating to safety and security aspects of the station design including, the prevention of unauthorised vehicle access to the station curtilages (bomb threat), evacuation plans, use of materials, surveillance needs and control of access.
- Accessibility for the disabled was raised as a key issue in the design process by both 'core' and other stakeholders, as were matters relating to way-finding and signage within the station.
- The TOCs supported the proposal to connect the mezzanine level of the new concourse with the platforms in the main trainshed via a new internal footbridge (see also (d) below).

*(d) Heritage*

- Stakeholders with a design and/or heritage remit raised concerns about the way in which the proposed new Western Concourse physically connects with the existing Western Range and Great Northern Hotel. Separate briefings were arranged to address these very specific concerns.
- In regard to the above-mentioned internal footbridge connecting the mezzanine with the main trainshed platforms, heritage bodies noted the need to justify removal of the existing footbridge in terms of heritage gain, convenience to passengers and the impact on the existing station fabric. The detailed design of a replacement footbridge was also discussed with heritage bodies (a lightweight, 'transparent' structure represents the favoured approach in this context).
- Heritage bodies were also concerned about the degree of visibility of the existing Western Range once the new Western Concourse is in place. Again, separate briefings were held to address this matter.

## **Conclusions**

- 2.14 As is apparent from the above, there was a clear change in focus between the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations. In Stage 1, the main issues raised by stakeholders largely concerned matters of principle relating to building and public realm design, transport matters, operational and heritage aspects. With that in mind early stakeholder involvement proved crucial to Network Rail in enabling options to be generated, assessed, adjusted and fine-tuned.
- 2.15 By contrast, Stage 2 consultations produced advice and comment that was increasingly focused on more specific aspects of KXSE. The Stage 2 consultation process exposed the design development work to a large number of key stakeholders and frequent iterations and follow-up briefings enabled significant progress to be made in closing-out individual concerns. Indeed, towards the conclusion of the Stage 2 consultations it became clear that all of the significant stakeholder concerns had been identified and addressed (if not fully resolved) by Network Rail.

### 3.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION – APPROACH & METHODS

#### Introduction

- 3.1 This Section covers the methods that were used to engage the public and community groups during the period November 2005 – March 2006. The public consultation programme sought to reach as wide an audience as possible – including local community groups, residents, businesses, and station users (passengers in particular). Its main purposes were essentially twofold:
- to **inform** the public and community groups about the proposals for which Network Rail is seeking approval;
  - to encourage **comment** on those proposals.
- 3.2 In order to encourage the public and community groups to comment on Network Rail's proposals for the station a multi-faceted approach was adopted. This involved:
- the distribution of leaflets which provided an overview of the KXSE proposals and contained a pre-paid comment form;
  - the establishment of a 'KXSE section' on the Network Rail website which provided images of the leaflet and an e-mail address to which members of the public could send their comments;
  - a manned exhibition which was held over a two week period at two locations in King's Cross Station where leaflets were distributed and staff were on hand to receive comments and to explain the proposals;
  - briefings to community groups.
- The above vehicles were supplemented by poster displays at King's Cross Station and LBC and LBI premises which publicised the public consultation exercise.
- 3.3 Network Rail views public consultation on the KXSE proposals as an ongoing process and has consequently not sought to impose a specific deadline for responses to the public consultation exercise. Indeed, the above mentioned leaflet and website display were purposely designed to remain current for some time. Notwithstanding the non-imposition of a deadline, it is very likely that those members of the public wishing to make comment on the KXSE proposals will already have done so in the four-month period prior to Network Rail's planning submission when these consultation vehicles were available – it can be reported that very few responses were received in the four week period leading up to Network Rail's planning submission.
- 3.4 Each of the consultation methods mentioned above is explained in more detail in the following paragraphs (3.5 – 3.21).

#### KXSE Leaflet

- 3.5 The KXSE leaflet provided members of the public and community groups with information concerning the principal characteristics of the KXSE proposals – including the aims of the scheme, the overall design, a description of key features within and outside the station, the heritage response and an indication of the broad timetable of events from planning submission to project completion. A 'tear-off' pre-paid slip was included in the leaflet to enable members of the public to send their comments to Network Rail.
- 3.6 A total of some 10,000 copies of the leaflet were distributed to members of the public and community/interest groups between end-November 2005 and end-January 2006 – by mail, by hand at the manned station exhibition, via meetings and from distribution points at King's Cross station. The following paragraphs (3.7 – 3.11) explain the details of leaflet distribution during this period.

- 3.7 **Local Councils** (LBC and LBI) were each provided with 400 copies of the leaflet on 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> December 2005 for distribution via customer service counters.
- 3.8 **70 Community and other Interest Groups** were provided with copies of the leaflet during the period 28<sup>th</sup> November – 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2005 (by post). These groups were identified in a number of ways, including: lists culled from previous Network Rail consultation exercises on station improvements; advice from LBC staff, and; a trawl of websites (the LBC and LBI websites proved particularly useful in this respect). As shown by Appendices 2 and 3, the community groups identified by the above methods included the following broad categories:
- transport and environmental concern groups;
  - community affairs groups and residents associations;
  - groups representing those with disabilities, the disadvantaged and age-related bodies;
  - business-related groups;
  - local schools, colleges and other institutions.
- 3.9 Members of the **King's Cross Development Forum and Camden Conservation Area Advisory Group** were provided with a copy of the leaflet via an invitation to a briefing session on the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005 (copies of the leaflet were distributed to attendees at this meeting and at the subsequent meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006).
- 3.10 Leaflet distribution **to members of the public** (particularly the travelling public) took place in conjunction with the Manned Exhibition at King's Cross Station between 28<sup>th</sup> November and 8<sup>th</sup> December 2005. Approximately 6,000 leaflets were handed out during this period - an average of 600/day. The leaflet was also placed at key distribution points in the station during and after the Manned Exhibition – at the Travel Centre and in TOCs' lounges.
- 3.11 As shown by Appendix 2, copies of the leaflets were mailed to 18 **key stakeholders** between 29<sup>th</sup> November and 1<sup>st</sup> December 2005.

### **Network Rail Website**

- 3.12 On 29<sup>th</sup> November 2005 a new link was placed on the Network Rail website entitled 'King's Cross Station Redevelopment'. This link provided access to both a copy of the above-mentioned leaflet and an e-mail address to which comments on the KXSE proposals could be sent. The website address was publicised at the manned exhibition, via the leaflet and the poster.

### **Station Exhibition**

- 3.13 In order to provide the public with an opportunity to interact directly with Network Rail staff on the KXSE proposals, a manned exhibition was held over the period 28<sup>th</sup> November to 8<sup>th</sup> December 2005. The exhibition material was similar in content to the leaflet.
- 3.14 Details of the exhibition are as follows:
- the exhibition was assembled daily for a period of 3 hours – although in practice the opening period stretched to 3½ hours during busy periods. The afternoon and evening peak of 3:30pm-6:30pm was selected as the most appropriate since:
    - in morning peak periods few station users/passengers have the time or inclination to stop and view exhibition material. This was confirmed in practice by staging the exhibition between 8:00am and 11:00am on Wednesday, 30<sup>th</sup> November 2005 when passing traffic was substantial but very few members of the public stopped to ask questions, make comments or pick-up leaflets;
    - off-peak periods were similarly discounted on the grounds of exposure to fewer members of the travelling public.

- the exhibition was in place every day during the above period except Sunday, 4<sup>th</sup> December 2005 when passenger flow was expected to be small (the exhibition was mounted for a 3-hour period in the middle of the day on Saturday, 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2005 but attracted relatively little interest compared to weekdays).
  - between 28<sup>th</sup> November and 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2005 the exhibition was mounted in the main (southern) concourse at King's Cross Station close to the main ticket office, an LUL access and on a key passenger movement corridor to the main platforms. To widen exposure, in the remaining period to 8<sup>th</sup> December 2005 the exhibition was moved to a site at the entrance to Suburban Platforms 9-11.
  - manning was undertaken by Network Rail staff familiar with the KXSE proposals.
  - a record was kept of queries raised and comments made by members of the public.
- 3.15 A total of approximately 150 individual queries/comments were raised by members of the public at the exhibition, although there were many more visitors than this over the two-week period. In particular, the exhibition provided Network Rail staff with the opportunity to explain the KXSE proposals in some detail to a considerable number of passengers. The exhibition also enabled the distribution of a large number of KXSE leaflets (about 6,000) as mentioned above and generally provided a very useful means of making contact with the public.

### **Briefing and Q&A Sessions With Community Groups**

- 3.16 To enable face-to-face interaction between the community and Network Rail in respect of the KXSE proposals, a series of briefing sessions were arranged in December 2005 and January 2006. At this juncture it is important to note that, given the broadly based nature of its membership and close association with local 'grass roots' interests in the King's Cross area, the King's Cross Development Forum (in particular) was seen as being especially suitable to represent likely community concerns in regard to KXSE.
- 3.17 Each briefing took the form of a powerpoint presentation which covered the background to and need for the KXSE works, the principal constraints/opportunities and drivers affecting the project, the design response, the new station layout, transport connections, heritage and public realm treatment and broad implementation programme. Following the briefing, a Q&A session was held and attendees' queries and comments were recorded. The briefing and Q&A sessions were well received by attendees and Network Rail obtained many valuable comments on the scheme as shown in Section 4.
- 3.18 Members of the King's Cross Development Forum and Camden Conservation Area Advisory Committee were invited to a briefing and question & answer session on the evening of 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005 at the King's Cross Holiday Inn. Fourteen attendees, representing such groups as King's Cross and Camden Square CAAC, Camden Cycling Campaign, Cally Rail Group, York Central Resident's Association, Friends of the Earth and King's Cross Railway Lands Group came to the briefing session – see Appendix 6 for more details.
- 3.19 A follow-up meeting took place on the evening of 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006 in the German Gymnasium, King's Cross when Network Rail was invited to give another briefing to the King's Cross Development Forum. Network Rail's briefing covered essentially the same material as in the previous meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005 and a Q&A session was held. Nineteen members of the Forum attended – see Appendix 7 for more details.

### **Conclusion**

- 3.20 As is apparent from the above, Network Rail sought to use a broad spectrum of consultation media in order to engage and inform the public of its proposals for KXSE and to obtain comments thereon. It is considered that these consultation vehicles were both appropriate and user-friendly methods of engaging the public and community groups.

## 4.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION – RESULTS

### Introduction

- 4.1 This Section deals with the comments and queries that have been received in response to Network Rail's public consultation programme conducted between late November 2005 and March 2006. As explained in Section 3, the principal vehicles for public consultation were:
- public consultation leaflet – with pre-paid comment form;
  - Network Rail website – which provide an e-mail link to enable public comment;
  - the station exhibition – where a record was kept of verbal comments/queries made on the proposals;
  - meetings – a record was kept of comments/queries raised by community groups at meetings in December 2005/January 2006.
- 4.2 To facilitate interpretation of the responses to the above public consultation programme, a consistent classification of comments/queries by topic was established. These topics are:
- **The Overall Design** – reflects comments relating to the KXSE design proposals as a whole and/or particular aspects of the design.
  - **The 'New' Station** (facilities, platforms etc.) – includes comments made about the type of facilities that should/should not be included in KXSE.
  - **Movement & Linkages** – concerns comments that refer to ease of movement/linkages within and outside the station and other broad transport matters.
  - **Public Realm** – the design and treatment of areas outside the station.
  - **Heritage** – reflects comments about the heritage aspects of the KXSE proposals.
  - **The Existing Station and Services** – includes comments/complaints about the existing station facilities and train services.
  - **Cost, Funding & Delivery** – mainly covers implementation and cost matters.
  - **Other Matters** – covers those general comments and queries that do not readily fall into the above categories.

### Responses to KXSE Leaflet and Network Rail Website

- 4.3 In the period up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2006, 110 responses had been received (88 leaflet returns and 22 e-mails) containing some 205 comments. Given this relatively limited level of response it is clearly not possible to assume that the comments that have been submitted can be taken as representative of wider public opinion on the KXSE proposals. Nevertheless, the responses do provide some interesting insights into the way in which the proposals have been perceived – especially when combined with the verbal comments made at the station exhibition (see below).
- 4.4 Moreover, by mid-February 2006 the KXSE leaflet pdf file on the Network Rail website had been opened over **7,000** times. Whilst only 22 responses to the KXSE proposals were received via this medium it is heartening to note that the website clearly proved to be a valuable means of reaching the public.
- 4.5 The responses to the Network Rail leaflet received via mail and e-mail are shown in Appendix 4. In connection with the information presented therein it should be noted that many of the individual returns contained multiple comments, which have been recorded under the headings mentioned above. Consequently, the number of comments recorded exceeds the number of returns received.
- 4.6 In order to provide a geographical perspective for the comments received from the public, individual returns were classified by origin, as follows:

- Locations within 1 mile of King's Cross Station (taken as broadly representative of 'local' comment').
- Other Locations within London.
- Herts, Beds and Bucks – key rail user (mainly commuter) area. Only one return was received from Bucks and this was added to this category for convenience.
- Cambridge/Peterborough Area – key rail user (mainly commuter) area.
- Other UK – predominantly returns from locations served by long-distance mainline services operating out of King's Cross Station.
- Location Not Specified/E-Mail – category used for both returns with no address included and e-mails.

4.7 The following Tables provide an overview of the comments received by mail and e-mail.

**(a) Returns by Source Location**

Source Location	Number of Comment Forms Received
London – Within 1 mile of King's Cross Station	11
London – Other	14
Herts, Beds, Bucks	30
Cambridge/Peterborough	13
Other UK	18
Location Not Specified/E-Mail	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>110</b>

**(b) Comments Made – by Category and Source Location**

Topic	London – Within 1 mile of King's Cross Station	London - Other	Herts, Beds, Bucks	Cambridge, Peterborough	Other UK	Location Not Specified/E-Mail	Total	%
<b>Overall Design</b>	19	9	17	11	10	4	70	34
<b>The 'New' Station</b>								
(a) Platforms	0	3	6	0	1	1	11	
(b) Signage/Information	0	1	3	2	2	0	8	
(c) Retail, Food & Drink	0	2	0	3	2	1	8	
(d) Cycle Facilities	0	1	5	2	0	1	9	
(e) Other Matters	0	3	0	0	5	2	10	
<b>Sub-Total</b>	0	10	14	7	10	5	46	23
<b>Movement &amp; Linkages</b>								
(a) Links Within Station	0	1	5	1	0	1	8	
(b) Links to St Pancras	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	
(c) Links to Public Transport	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	
(d) Accessibility Issues	0	1	3	2	3	0	9	
(e) Other Movement Issues	0	0	1	2	1	2	6	
<b>Sub-Total</b>	1	2	10	6	7	3	29	14
<b>Public Realm</b>	2	1	2	1	1	0	7	3
<b>Heritage</b>	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	2
<b>Existing Station &amp; Services</b>	0	2	6	1	1	4	14	7
<b>Cost, Funding &amp; Delivery</b>	0	2	4	1	3	1	11	5
<b>Other Matters</b>	3	2	4	3	3	10	25	12
<b>Total</b>	25	28	59	30	36	27	205	100

- 4.8 As shown by the above Table (a), the number of responses received from locations served by rail services operating out of King's Cross dominate – over 50% of all responses were from commuter areas and long-distance destinations (mainly the East Midlands and North of England). Responses from within London accounted for 25% of the total and just 11 returns were from locations close to the station. Most of the remaining responses were received via e-mail (22). This pattern of response clearly reflects the fact that the bulk of leaflet distribution took place at the station (via the Station Exhibition and through other distribution points at the station).
- 4.9 In regard to comments by topic (Table (b)), it can be seen that 'Overall Design' received the most attention (70 comments), followed by 'The New Station' (46 comments) and 'Movement & Linkages' (29 comments). Of the remainder, there were 25 'miscellaneous' comments about a variety of matters, 14 comments/complaints about the 'Existing Station and Services' a small number of comments concerning 'Public Realm', 'Heritage' and 'Cost, Funding and Delivery'.
- 4.10 The more detailed comments shown in Appendix 4 can be summarised as follows (by topic and source location):
- Overall Design – the overwhelming majority of comments from both 'local' sources and rail passengers expressed positive support for the KXSE proposals, in particular the design of the western concourse and restoration of the original station façade through removal of the existing southern concourse. Moreover, it is noticeable that whilst only 19 comments in total were received from 'local' sources, 14 of these support the KXSE proposals. Other comments in this category represent individual views on a variety of design matters such as environmental performance.
  - The New Station – a similar number of comments (between 8 and 11) were made in relation to such matters as the need for more/better platforms, information systems, retail/food & drink and cycle storage facilities. Understandably, this topic was of most interest to passengers rather than those living locally.
  - Movement & Linkages – attracted only modest interest in terms of the number of comments made. The key concerns were convenient links within the station (especially to platforms) and disabled access. Again, this topic was of most concern to passengers.
  - Public Realm – this topic also attracted limited interest (only 7 comments). Support for more tree planting and the open piazza in front of station (Station Square) were the key concerns.
  - Heritage – perhaps surprisingly, heritage matters attracted just 3 comments (relating to the need to preserve heritage buildings).
  - Existing Station Facilities & Services – no dominant themes emerged in regard to this topic as a wide variety of comments/complaints were received about the perceived poor state of the existing station. It is noticeable that this topic appeared to attract no interest from local sources.
  - Cost, Funding & Delivery – only 11 comments were received (all from passengers) and the bulk of these called for the early completion of the KXSE scheme.
  - Other Matters – of the 25 comments received only 3 were from local sources. Whilst a variety of matters were covered by these comments the largest number referred to queries about further information on the scheme.

### **Comments Recorded at the Station Exhibition**

- 4.11 A total of 154 comments were recorded by Network Rail staff during the station exhibition which took place between 28<sup>th</sup> November and 8<sup>th</sup> December 2005. As shown by the following summary table, the bulk of these concerned the overall KXSE design (40%), while comments concerning the type and nature of facilities that should be provided in the 'new' station, movement & linkages and heritage matters accounted for (respectively) 14%,



16% and 12% of the total. Topics attracting less than 10% (each) of the total comprised the remainder of comments/queries received – cost/funding/delivery (8%), public realm and the existing station and services (4% each) and other matters (2%).

Topic	No. Comments/Queries	%
Overall Design	61	40.0
The 'New' Station (facilities, platforms etc.)	22	14.0
Movement and Linkages	25	16.0
Public Realm	6	4.0
Heritage Matters	19	12.0
The Existing Station and Services	6	4.0
Cost, Funding and Delivery	12	8.0
Other Matters	3	2.0
Total	154	100.0

4.12 Appendix 5 lists in full the comments recorded at the exhibition. To summarise, the principal views expressed in relation to each of the above topics were as follows:

- Overall Design – most of the recorded comments (56) expressed strong support for the design, removal of the existing southern concourse and the 'degree of fit' of the new concourse with neighbouring heritage buildings.
- The 'New' Station – a wide range of comments/queries were made about the type of facilities that should be provided in the 'new' station but no readily identifiable 'favourite' topics emerged. Comments covered everything from the need for more shops and good information displays to cycle parking, the provision of additional platforms and queries about the location of particular facilities.
- Movement and Linkages – of the 25 comments recorded on this topic, 9 mentioned interchange/links with LUL and St Pancras, 10 concerned the convenience of links to buses and taxis (including the need for weather protected routes) and the remainder covered such matters as accessibility for the disabled and the location of particular facilities.
- Public Realm – only six comments were recorded. Of these, most concerned the need for more tree planting in front of the station.
- Heritage Matters – under this topic there was a broadly even view about the future of the Great Northern Hotel (50% in favour of retention, 50% in favour of demolition), although this accounted for only 8 comments in total. Other views expressed support for the proposal to reveal the original station façade, minimising intervention into the fabric of the station and the need to retain the existing station clock.
- Existing Station/Services – six comments (principally complaints) were received about the existing station. These covered such matters as inadequate food and drink facilities and the amount of anti-social behaviour in and around the station.
- Cost, Funding & Delivery – twelve comments/queries were received. Of these, most concerned whether KXSE would be built on time. Other comments/queries were focused on cost and disruption.
- Other Matters – three comments were recorded - 2 about planning and consultation matters and 1 about keeping pigeons out of the new concourse.

### **Summary – Responses Via Leaflet/E-Mail and Comments Made at Station Exhibition**

4.13 It is helpful to examine the combined public view expressed via 'written returns' (leaflet and e-mail – Appendix 4) and 'verbal comments' given at the station exhibition (Appendix 5) to give a more comprehensive overview and also to assess whether consistent messages emerge. Again, given the paucity of responses it is not appropriate to draw hard and fast conclusions from such an analysis and the following paragraphs are therefore chiefly for information.

4.14 A summary comparison of the written returns and verbal comments by topic is given as

follows:

- Overall Design – in both cases this was the most ‘popular’ topic. It is pleasing to note that the majority of the written and verbal comments expressed strong support for the overall design.
- The ‘New’ Station – in both cases there was a fairly even spread of comments about facilities and platforms and key concerns were seen to be the need for more/better, platforms, shops/food & drink outlets, cycle storage facilities and information systems.
- Movement & Linkages – written and verbal comments on this topic attracted broadly similar levels of interest. However, it is noted that written comments mainly referred to movements/linkages within the station while verbal comments tended to comment on external links to St Pancras, buses and taxis.
- Public Realm – few verbal or written returns identified this as a major issue, however in both cases the need for more tree planting outside the station was mentioned.
- Heritage – this was seen to be of little interest to those who made written returns but accounted for more than 10% of all verbal comments.
- Existing Station /Services – both written and verbal comments on this topic mainly reflected various complaints about the perceived poor state of the existing station, the facilities available and the train services.
- Cost, Funding & Delivery – similar concerns were expressed in written and verbal form under this topic with the most ‘popular’ view being that KXSE should be finished as soon as possible and with minimum disruption.
- Other Matters – there was no real correlation between written and verbal comments in this regard.

- 4.15 Having regard to the above summary and contents of Appendices 4 & 5, it can be concluded that there were broad similarities in the range and type of views expressed in written and verbal form on the key topics associated with the KXSE proposals.

### **Issues Raised at Consultation Meetings**

- 4.16 A briefing was given to the King's Cross Development Forum and CCAC members on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005. Appendix 6 provides details of both attendees and the issues that were raised during the Q&A session.
- 4.17 The main issues that were raised can be summarised as follows:
- Overall Design - a broad spectrum of matters were discussed, including:
    - concerns about the overall design in terms of such matters as the inclusion of retail units in the concourse, treatment of the concourse roof and the need for more cycle facilities;
    - the treatment of the eastern side of the station;
    - the proposed layout of the station and its impact on passenger movement;
    - the proposed canopy at the front of the station
    - the legibility of the main entrance to the station;
  - The ‘New’ Station Facilities - the main concern was the provision of facilities for cyclists.
  - Movement & Linkages – the key issues were:
    - the design and function of Pancras Road – too many pedestrian crossings, need for dedicated cycle lane;
    - the need for convenient (weather protected) routes to bus stops and taxi facilities;
    - the need for weather protection at the front of the station;
    - the need for the passenger footbridge within the station.
  - Public Realm - concerns were raised about both the LUL vent structures in the Southern Square and taxi canopies.
  - Heritage – the main issues were seen to be:
    - whether the Western Range of the station will be obscured by the new

- concourse;
- the alignment of Pancras Road necessitates the removal of a heritage building;
- removal of Great Northern Hotel would enable a better design solution to be achieved.
- Existing Station & Services – the need to improve the existing southern concourse.
- Cost, Funding & Delivery – the need to remove southern concourse as soon as possible and concerns about disruption, were key concerns.
- Others Matters – noise/nuisance from construction traffic was seen as being of concern.

4.18 A further briefing was given to the Kings' Cross Development Forum on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006 which covered the background to the KXSE scheme, the design proposals and current issues (as listed in paragraph 3.19). By contrast with the earlier meeting with Forum members on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005, the dominant issue raised during the Q&A session in this subsequent meeting was that of access to the station from York Way. A full account of the issues raised is given in Appendix 7 and is summarised as follows:

- Overall Design – key issues discussed included the design of the new concourse (which some felt should be better), 'legibility' of the station for passengers and the proposed canopy on the southern façade of the station (which was felt not to be necessary and poorly designed).
- The 'New' Station (Facilities, Platforms etc.) – the need for weather-protected cycle parking.
- Movement & Linkages – the key issue raised at the meeting concerned the accessibility of the new station from the north and east. Most attendees suggested that further thought needs to be given to providing more convenient access to the station from the York Way area – including a passenger access point in the Eastern Range, construction of a tunnel or footbridge linking to the new concourse.
- Heritage Matters – members queried whether English Heritage had been involved in the design process.
- Cost, Funding & Delivery – key concerns were whether the station works would be completed in time for the Olympics and timing of demolition of the southern concourse.
- Other Matters – the need for consultation on the KXSE proposals.

## Conclusions

- 4.19 It is clear from the above that Network Rail has received a considerable amount of valuable comment from the public and local community groups helped to guide ongoing design work. Nevertheless, it has to be acknowledged that the generally limited response rate in respect of the leaflet means that any output from the public consultation programme has to be treated with great caution.
- 4.20 Notwithstanding the above, Network Rail is pleased to note that many of the public consultation responses expressed strong support for the overall design of the proposals – in particular for the new concourse and the fact that the existing concourse will be removed, thus revealing the original station façade. As a corollary, a number of respondents wished to see the new station delivered as soon as possible. Indeed, there were few negative comments about the proposals (except those relating to the existing station) and most were expressed in terms of a desire to see one sort of facility or other provided in the future ('there should be...', 'more thought to be give to .....') etc).
- 4.21 Feedback received from public consultation meetings covers a number of issues but it would seem that access to the new station from the York Way area, cycle parking facilities and the treatment of the 'front' of the station (the canopy on the southern facade) are of particular importance to local residents.

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 In light of the above (Sections 2-4), it is readily apparent that Network Rail has made a concerted effort to consult and inform stakeholders and the public about the current proposals for King's Cross Station. Consultations with stakeholders have been extensive and sustained, resulting in a very constructive dialogue which yielded valuable advice/guidance and considerable support for the fundamentals of the design. Network Rail's public consultation exercise also proved to be particularly valuable in that it both exposed a substantial number of people to the KXSE proposals and provided a series of opportunities for the public to make their views known.
- 5.2 In regard to *stakeholder* consultation conducted between April 2003 and March 2006, it is clear that core and non-core stakeholders were closely involved in the design development process leading up to the submission of the KXSE proposals for planning approval. In particular, early and sustained stakeholder engagement enabled good progress to be maintained throughout, especially in terms of:
- the identification of key issues likely to impact on the design development process;
  - achieving a joint working environment with neighbouring KXC developers so as to address the understandable requirement for a comprehensive/seamless approach to the planning of the area;
  - the formulation and assessment of options for the new concourse;
  - the adoption of a preferred concourse option as a basis for further design development and consultation;
  - refinement of the preferred design through an iterative stakeholder engagement process
  - agreement from stakeholders that the current KXSE proposals are, in principle, fundamentally sound.
- 5.3 Key stakeholder concerns identified and addressed by Network Rail are listed in Section 2. In this respect it is noted that Stage 1 stakeholder consultations focussed on a fairly wide spectrum of concerns which broadly represent key development principles – such as the location for the new concourse, need for compatibility with KXC, treatment of the Great Northern Hotel, traffic and pedestrian movement, interventions into the station's historic building fabric and other public realm factors. However, ongoing stakeholder engagement meant that, by mid-late 2003, there was broad consensus amongst stakeholders about these aspects of KXSE. Network Rail was consequently able to pursue more detailed design development with some confidence.
- 5.4 Stage 2 stakeholder consultations conducted in 2005/2006 centred increasingly on particular aspects of the KXSE design. Key issues were seen to be weather protection measures on the front of the station and at the proposed taxi facilities, treatment of the Southern Square, pedestrian movement, traffic arrangements for Pancras Road, cycle parking, passenger overbridge within the station and relationship between the new (western) concourse and neighbouring heritage buildings. These issues, together with the means to resolve them, were discussed at length with stakeholders so as to ensure mutual understanding (if not full agreement).
- 5.5 Against the above background it is believed that 'in principle' support for the KXSE proposals has been obtained from core and non-core stakeholders.
- 5.6 Network Rail's *Public Consultation* programme, conducted over the period November 2005-March 2006 and described in Sections 3 and 4, both informed members of the public and community groups about the KXSE proposals provided opportunities to comment on them.

- 5.7 A variety of methods were used to engage members of the public – leaflet with pre-paid comment slip, a manned exhibition at King's Cross Station, Network Rail website and meetings with community groups.
- 5.8 As noted in Section 4, in view of the limited number of responses obtained (via the leaflet comment slip, website returns and verbal comments made at the station exhibition), it would be dangerous to suggest that the comments made are wholly representative of wider public opinion. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that:
- there appears to be a large measure of support for the overall design of the station as embodied in the KXSE proposals;
  - facilities such as more/better platforms, shops/food&drink outlets, information systems and cycle storage are seen to be of significant importance;
  - issues associated with movement and linkages both within and outside the station were also perceived as important;
  - public realm and heritage concerns attracted only limited interest but there was clear support for proposals associated with revealing the southern façade of the station;
  - on programming and delivery matters, many respondents wished to see the KXSE proposals implemented as soon as possible.
- 5.9 Despite the admittedly limited response, it is considered that the Network Rail consultation programme exposed its proposals to a substantial number of members of the public and can be considered as success in terms of raising public awareness.
- 5.10 Community/interest groups were engaged in two ways:
- by leaflet drop;
  - via the King's Cross Development Forum – which comprises representatives of all key 'local' groups.
- 5.11 Issues raised by the King's Cross Development Forum at meetings on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005 and 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006 provided important guidance on 'local' feeling about the KXSE proposals. These key issues were seen to be:
- access to the station from the York Way area;
  - the need for weather protected cycle parking facilities;
  - the need for convenient, weather-protected routes to public transport;
  - the canopy on the southern façade was not seen as either essential or desirable;
  - the need for a more 'legible' station entrance;
  - completing the KXSE scheme as soon as possible.
- 5.12 To conclude, it is considered that Network Rail has conducted an inclusive and responsive consultation programme in respect of the KXSE proposals and this has led to substantive support for the bulk of them.

## APPENDIX 1: Chronology of Stakeholder Consultation Meetings

		Meeting	Present	Date	Main Purpose
STAGE 1 CONSULTATIONS	1.	Urban Framework Workshop I	London Borough of Camden (LBC) officers, AStG, LCS&P	9/4/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identification of key issues/problems</li> <li>• review possible concourse options</li> </ul>
	2.	Transport Workshop	LBC	15/4/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• discuss passenger/pedestrian movements</li> <li>• identify other key transport issues</li> </ul>
	3.	Transport Workshop	LBC	29/4/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify option evaluation issues</li> <li>• agree base case for Pancras Rd</li> </ul>
	4.	Urban Framework Workshop II	LBC, AStG, LCS&P	1/5/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assessment of broad concourse options</li> </ul>
	5.	English Heritage Workshop	English Heritage, AStG, LCS&P, DfT	14/5/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assessment of broad concourse options</li> </ul>
	6.	Victorian Society	Victorian Society, AStG, LCS&P	18/6/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assessment of broad concourse options</li> </ul>
	7.	English Heritage and LB Camden	English Heritage, LBC, AStG, LCS&P	19/6/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assessment of options with GNH retained</li> </ul>
	8.	TfL	TfL, AStG	1/7/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• further identification of transport issues relating to GNH-retained options</li> <li>• Pancras Road functionality</li> </ul>
	9.	English Heritage and LB Camden	LBC, English Heritage	4/8/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sizing and operability of western concourse (GNH-retained options)</li> </ul>
	10.	Urban Framework Workshop III	English Heritage, LBC, AStG, LCS&P	2/9/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assessment of options</li> <li>• preferred design – GNH-Retained, abutting concourse and with pedestrian arcade through hotel</li> <li>• discussion of GNH treatment</li> </ul>
	11.	Victorian Society	Victorian Society, AStG	4/9/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• discussion of preferred design</li> <li>• discussion of GNH treatment</li> </ul>
	12.	GLA	GLA, TfL, AStG	19/9/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• discussion of preferred design</li> </ul>
STAGE 2 CONSULTATIONS	13.	TOCs	GNER, Hull Trains	3/5/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	14.	LB Islington Officers	LB Islington (LBI)	16/5/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> <li>• York Way improvement</li> </ul>
	15.	TOCs	WAGN	17/5/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	16.	Police Briefing	British Transport Police, Metropolitan Police	22/6/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	17.	GLA	GLA, TfL, LB Camden	12/7/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	18.	TOCs	WAGN, GNER	18/7/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	19.	TOCs	WAGN	10/8/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	20.	LBC & EH	LBC, English Heritage	11/8/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	21.	LAC	London Advisory Committee, English Heritage	19/9/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	22.	Station Masterplan Working Group (SMWG)	LBC, LBI, TfL, AKC, LCR	4/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> <li>• transport issues</li> <li>• NR planning application</li> </ul>

		<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Main Purpose</b>
STAGE 2 CONSULTATIONS	23.	English Heritage	English Heritage	7/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• passenger footbridge</li> </ul>
	24.	CABE	CABE Design Review Committee	9/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	25.	TOCs	GNER, EWS, WAGN	10/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	26.	King's Cross/St Pancras Strategic Forum	GLA, LDA, TfL, DfT, LBC, LBI, AKC, LCR	15/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	27.	Police	British Transport Police and Metropolitan Police	18/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• security issues</li> <li>• accommodation issues</li> </ul>
	28.	SMWG	English Heritage, LBC, TfL	22/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> <li>• transport issues</li> <li>• Great Northern Hotel</li> <li>• NR planning application</li> </ul>
	29.	GoL	Government Office for London	23/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• background to design, design solutions and current issues</li> </ul>
	30.	London TravelWatch	Rail & Underground Sub-Committee	24/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• background to design, design solutions and current issues</li> </ul>
	31.	Victorian Society	Victorian Society	24/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> </ul>
	32.	Adjoining Developers/Landowners	AKC, EXL, LCR	25/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> <li>• current implementation and integration issues</li> </ul>
	33.	Railway Heritage Trust	Railway Heritage Trust	28/11/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• background to design, design solutions and current issues</li> </ul>
	34.	Office of the Rail Regulator	- presentation disc sent to ORR	2/12/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• background to design, design solutions and current issues</li> </ul>
	35.	LAC	LAC, English Heritage	5/12/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• heritage issues relating to external canopies and internal passenger footbridge</li> </ul>
	36.	GLA	GLA, TfL, LDA, English Heritage	6/12/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design update &amp; review</li> <li>• transport modelling output</li> </ul>
	37.	TOCs	TOCs Directors	6/12/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• background to design, design solutions and current issues</li> </ul>
	38.	Victorian Society	Victorian Society	14/12/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• detailed design issues – new concourse</li> </ul>
	39.	The Mayor	The Mayor, GLA, TfL, LDA	15/12/05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• background to design, design solutions and current issues</li> <li>• transport modelling output</li> </ul>
	40.	HMRI	HMRI	23/1/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• background to design, design solutions and current issues</li> </ul>
	41.	CABE	CABE	1/2/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design details (e.g. canopies and western concourse connections to main train shed)</li> </ul>



## APPENDIX 2: Leaflet Mailing List - Community-Related and Other Consultees

(Leaflets despatched between 28<sup>th</sup> November and 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2005)

### Community Affairs & Residents

1. Africa Advocacy Foundation
2. Camden Central Community
3. Camden Arts Centre
4. Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Centre
5. Kings Cross-Brunswick Neighbourhood Association
6. Camden Black Workers Group
7. Camden Play Service
8. Camden Square Play Centre
9. Camden Town Neighbourhood Advice Centre
10. Camden Under 25s Advice Centre
11. Care Alliance Refugee Community Access Centre
12. Children's Information Service
13. Citizen's Advice Bureau
14. Cypriot Community Centre Ltd
15. Camden Play Service
16. Hampden Youth Group
17. Fairfield Play Centre
18. London Irish Centre
19. Maiden Lane Play Project
20. New Horizon Youth Centre
21. Pan African Housing Co-op
22. Plot Ten Community Play Project
23. Primrose Hill Community Centre
24. St James's House
25. St Martin's Community Centre
26. St Pancras Community Centre
27. St Pancras & Humanist Housing Association
28. Theatre Technis Advisory Service
29. Somers Town Community Centre
30. Habari Outreach Programme

### Transport & Environment-Related

31. Camden Cycling Campaign
32. Living Streets
33. Camden Canals & Narrowboat Association
34. Camley Street Park
35. King's Cross Railway Lands Group
36. London Cycling Campaign
37. Friends of the Earth

### Disabilities, Disadvantaged & Age-Related

39. Help the Aged
40. InterChange Studios
41. Islington Mind Advocacy Project
42. Camden Society
43. Action for Blind People
44. British Deaf Association
45. Royal National Institute for the Deaf
46. Age Concern
47. Alone in London Advocacy Service
48. Mind in Camden Primary Care Advocacy Service
49. Well & Wise
50. Royal National Institute for the Blind

### Schools, Colleges and Institutions

51. Royal Veterinary College
52. University College Hospital
53. Camden Mews Day Hospital
54. St Pancras Hospital
55. Edith Neville Primary School
56. St Aloysius Roman Catholic Infant School
57. St Michael's CofE School
58. St Mary & St Pancras CofE Primary School
59. Our Lady Roman Catholic Primary School
60. Maria Fidelis Roman Catholic Convent School
61. South Camden Community School
62. St Andrew's CofE Primary School
63. Elizabeth Garrett Anderson Language College
64. Copenhagen St Primary School
65. Vittoria Primary School
66. Winton Primary School
67. Blessed Sacrament RC Primary School
68. British Library

### Business-Related

69. London Chamber of Commerce & Industry
70. CBI London Region
71. Camden Enterprise Agency Ltd

Leaflet Distribution to Key Stakeholders - 29<sup>th</sup> November–1<sup>st</sup> December 2005

English Heritage	Victorian Society
TfL	GLA
LDA	GoL
London TravelWatch	Argent King's Cross
LCR	London & Continental Railways
WAGN	Hull Trains
GNER	EWS
Metropolitan Police	British Transport Police
Railway Heritage Trust	HMRI

## **APPENDIX 3: King's Cross Consultee Groups Invited to Meetings on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005 and 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

### **1. KING'S CROSS CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE (12<sup>th</sup> December 2005 only)**

Rupert Perry (Chair), Jeannie Burnett, Anne Swain, Malcolm Tucker, Lisa Pontecorvo, Anthony Delarue, Phil James, Charles Norrie, Richard Kirby (Camden Council), Katharine Owen (Camden Council), Aileen Hammond, Tony Tugnutt, Bill Reed.

### **2. KING'S CROSS ACCESSIBILITY FORUM**

Eve Grace – DISC and CAF  
 Peter Laison – London Access Forum  
 Mary Hynes – Visually Impaired in Camden  
 Sally Dixon – Disability in Camden  
 Michelle Branon – Camden Access Officer  
 Jon Coleman – Equalities and Social Inclusion  
 Nicholas Russell – RNIB Campaigns Officer  
 Julie Fleck – GLA  
 Alan Desbrough – Disability Action

### **3. KING'S CROSS DEVELOPMENT FORUM**

Cally Traders Association	Kings Cross Railway Lands Group
Camden Central Older People's Steering Group	Camden Youth Service
Irish Centre	Camden Town Online/King's Cross Online
Copenhagen Youth project	Albert Dock Residents Group
Copenhagen Neighbourhood Forum	Turley & Associates
Friends of Regents Canal	Birkbeck University of London
St Pancras Community Centre	Camden Central Community Umbrella
Goodway Boat Users Association	Working Men's College
Camden Civic Society	Camden Cycling Campaign
Copenhagen Youth Project	SureStart
Camden Central Chinese Centre	Camden Primary Care Trust
Coopers Lane Tenants and Residents	King's Cross Healthy Families Partnership
Blessed Sacrament Parish	Camden Frankophone Women's Association
Sangjojan-Arts Culture & Literary Society	Camden Cycling Campaign
Islington Society	Coopers Lane Tenants and Residents
King's Cross Brunswick Neighbourhood	King's Cross Brunswick Neighbourhood
Brunswick Estate TRA	Lonsdale Square Society/Islington CAC
Camden Square Area TRA	Copenhagen Youth Project
Royal Veterinary College	Agar Grove TMC Ltd
St Pancras Cruising Club	Camden Networks of VAC
Camden Canals & Narrowboat Association	Islington Bangladesh Association
Trinity Court Residents Ass	St Pancras and Humanist Tenants
Local Agenda 21	Camden Square CAAC
JSRA	London Narrow Boat Association
British Somali Community	Regent Square United Reformed Church
KCBNA	Maiden Lane Tenants Association
Amwell Society	King's Cross Branch Camden Labour Party
Age Concern Camden	Estate Management Board
Camden Cycling Campaign	Architects Network
Cally Rail Group	Sudanese Children in Need
Maiden Lane Estate Residents and Tenants	Camden Forum of Elderly People
Camden Square Neighbourhood Association	King's Cross Community Development Trust

King's Cross Brunswick Neighbourhood	Camden Central Partnership- Churchway
Carol St Housing Co-op	Camden Chinese Community Centre
Somali Social Development Committee	Sudanese Women Against Violence
Somali Community Centre	Camden Centre Community Umbrella
All Saints, Barnsbury	Bayham Place RA
Islington Building and Preservation Society	Camden Central Community Umbrella
Camden Elderly Irish Network	S.T.A.R.T
Churchway Tenants Association	CRASH
Working Men's College	Camden Elderly Irish Network
Good's Way Canal Boat Association	Ethiopian Information & Advice Bureau
Regents Network	Centre for Filipinos (Camden)
KX Chinese Association	ICCIP

**Appendix 4: Detailed Comments/Queries Received Via Leaflet Returns (88 returns) and E-Mail (22 returns) as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2006.**

Topic	Comment	Source Location						No. of Comments
		London		Herts, Beds, Bucks	Cambridge/Peter borough Area	Other UK *	Location not specified/e-mail	
		Within 1 mile of KX Station	London - other					
Overall Design	Positive support for the station upgrade proposals/western concourse design	9	7	11	7	6	2	42
	Pleased to see restoration of the original station façade/removal of existing Southern Concourse.	5		4	3	3		15
	The new concourse should be at the end of the platforms, not at the side.		1					1
	York Way has been neglected by the scheme – some of the arches should be opened up and/or other improvements made.	2						2
	Restrict the flow of cold air into the north end of the main trainshed.						1	1
	Station should be environmentally friendly/energy efficient.		1					1
	Concerned about the apparent gap between the new concourse and Western Range – needs to be weather protected.			1				1
	Concerned that the development of KXSE and KXC will preclude the possibility of a high speed N-S line in the future (no space left).						1	1
	The western concourse could be enhanced by having the ‘golden ratio’ of curves like the Gateshead SAGE Concert Hall.					1		1
	Poor indication of townscape in front of the station – frontage to Euston Road.			1				1
	The space between the GNH and station entrance does look rather flimsy. The upturned entrance canopy is not dignified enough.	1						1
	The canopy on the southern façade of the station should use a combination of smoked glass and brown metal. The canopy should be wider.	1						1
	The Thameslink ‘box’ should be made into a connection station as soon as possible.				1			1
	The taxi canopies detract from the scheme.	1						1

Topic	Comment	Source Location						No. of Comments
		London		Herts, Beds, Bucks	Cambridge/Pete rborough Area	Other UK *	Location not specified/e-mail	
		Within 1 mile of KX Station	London - other					
The 'New' Station (facilities, platforms etc.)	(a) Comments about Platforms							
	• There should be more platforms.		3	2				5
	• Will Platforms 9-11 and associated facilities be improved?			2				2
	• Insufficient space provided at the end of the mainline platforms.					1		1
	• The proposed concourse area in front of Platforms 9-11 should be used to extend these platforms. This would enable 3 more 12-car platforms to be accommodated, thereby increasing station capacity.						1	1
	• Will WAGN's trains still run from Platforms 9-11?			1				1
	• Need for dedicated platform for WAGN trains rather than the present situation of switching between Platforms 1 and 9.			1				1
	(b) Signage and Information							
	• Need for more/better information systems/signage/seating with clear view of information boards		1	3	2	2		8
	(c) Retail, Food and Drink facilities							
	• Space should be available for small independent retailers.		1					1
	• Food and drink outlets are necessary but also dry cleaners, grocers, banking, post office.				1			1
	• Need for food and drink outlets close to the platforms.		1			2		3
	• Prefer traditional pubs to soulless bars.				1			1
	• Retail units should not be located where passengers queue or wait						1	1
	• Need for popular retail stores in the new concourse.				1			1
	(d) Cycle Facilities							
	• Need for improved cycle storage facilities (including secure storage).		1	5	2			8
	• Station should be bicycle-friendly – i.e. level access, minimal steps.						1	1
	(e) Other Matters							
• Need for improved ticket office for LUL.					1		1	

Topic	Comment	Source Location						No. of Comments
		London		Herts, Beds, Bucks	Cambridge/Peter borough Area	Other UK *	Location not specified/e-mail	
		Within 1 mile of KX Station	London - other					
The 'New' Station Cont'd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Need for more/better seating areas.</li></ul>		1			1		2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Consider the use of braziers in winter (like Gare du Nord)</li></ul>					1		1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Ensure there are convenient drop-off points for passengers.</li></ul>		1					1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Need for improved ticket office for LUL.</li></ul>					1		1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Need for good lighting.</li></ul>						1	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Need for short-term car park at the station.</li></ul>		1					1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A mezzanine level should be added to the existing main trainshed (for retail and other uses) with escalator links to the platforms – would make the whole project self-financing.</li></ul>					1		1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Catering stores trolleys should not operate on platforms or in the concourse as they cause congestion and are a hazard.</li></ul>						1	1
Movement & Linkages	(a) Links Within the Station							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Need for direct and convenient pedestrian routes to mainline and suburban platforms (especially for those with luggage).</li></ul>		1	5	1			7
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Support reinstatement of passenger overbridge in the main trainshed.</li></ul>						1	1
	(b) Links to St Pancras							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Need for covered passenger link (e.g. footbridge/subway) to St Pancras</li></ul>					2		2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Need for traveller links between the station, LUL, Thameslink and St Pancras</li></ul>	1						1
	(c) Links to Public Transport							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Need for better links to bus stops</li></ul>			1				1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Proposals appear to mean longer walking distances between LUL and mainline platforms</li></ul>					1		1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Where are the proposed taxi pick-up/drop-off facilities?</li></ul>				1			1
	(d) Accessibility Issues							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Need to ensure good/convenient step-free links to LUL</li></ul>			3		2		5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>New station must have good quality disabled access (including access to WCs).</li></ul>		1		2			3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Need for widespread provision of ramps and lifts – not just steps.</li></ul>					1		1

Topic	Comment	Source Location						No. of Comments
		London		Herts, Beds, Bucks	Cambridge/Peter borough Area	Other UK *	Location not specified/e-mail	
		Within 1 mile of KX Station	London - other					
Movement & Linkages cont'd	(e) Other Movement Issues							
	• Need for good links across Euston Road (inc. subway).				1	1		2
	• Need to improve cycle facilities on surrounding highways.				1		1	2
	• No mention of links to Thameslink.						1	1
	• Will the station be accessible from York Way?			1				1
Public Realm	Should be more trees near the station			2		1		3
	Like the proposed big open area in front of the station.	1	1		1			3
	Need for 'centrepiece' element in the Southern Square.	1						1
Heritage Aspects	Retain as many original features as possible.			1		1		2
	The Plan appears to do away with some historical buildings in the vicinity such as Clarence Passage near Platform 11.			1				1
The Existing Station/Services	Old rolling stock, overcrowding and high fares at present.			1				1
	Left luggage facility is poor.			1				1
	The existing concourse should be made lighter.				1			1
	Existing departure boards are inadequate and often turned off at rush hour.			1				1
	Drinkers should not be allowed to stand on Platform 8.						1	1
	Get rid of anti-social behaviour around the station.			1			1	2
	Existing train services are poor.		1					1
	Too much disruption with all the works going on in the area.		1					1
	Lack of decent facilities in early mornings.						1	1
	Nowhere to sit and have a hot drink.						1	1
	Will Thameslink and WAGN Services be combined in future?			1				1
	The existing piazza in front of the station looks very bare.					1		1
	Rubbish collection needs to be improved.			1				1
Cost, Funding and Delivery	Implementation programme should be speeded-up/completed as soon as possible.		2	3	1	2	1	9
	Money should be spent on improving train services rather than the station.			1				1
	Disruption must be kept to a minimum.					1		1



Topic	Comment	Source Location						No. of Comments
		London		Herts, Beds, Bucks	Cambridge/Peter borough Area	Other UK *	Location not specified/e-mail	
		Within 1 mile of KX Station	London - other					
Other Matters	Information Requests – where can I find out more, who are the designers, property ownership query etc.	2	1	1	1	1	7	13
	Where is King’s Cross signal box on the new plans?					1		1
	The station should be ‘no smoking’.			1	1		3	5
	The new St Pancras Thameslink should be opened as soon as possible.			1				1
	Commend NR for seeking comments.		1					1
	The abandoned building diagonally opposite the station should be redeveloped – it is not of any architectural merit and its removal would enable traffic congestion to be eased.	1						1
	Need for more caring station staff				1			1
	What will the Great Northern Hotel be used for?			1		1		2
	Total	25	28	59	30	36	27	205

\* NE England, W. Midlands, Lincolnshire, Suffolk, Norfolk, East Sussex, West Yorkshire

**APPENDIX 5: Detailed Comments and Queries Received at King's Cross Station Exhibition (28<sup>th</sup> November 2005 to 8<sup>th</sup> December 2005)**

**Comments/Queries by Topic and Frequency**

Topic	Comment/Query	No. of Responses
<b>Overall Design</b>	Very positive/positive comments on the overall design ("the design looks fantastic/beautiful/stunning....")	45
	Pleased that the Southern Concourse will be removed.	6
	New Concourse fits well with heritage buildings.	4
	Will the Southern Concourse be knocked down?	2
	The location of the new concourse to the west of the station is correct.	1
	Will the new concourse serve the suburban lines?	1
	Where will the new concourse be located?	1
	Will the new concourse be energy efficient?	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>The 'New' Station (facilities, platforms etc.)</b>	Will there be shops/more shops in the new concourse?	4
	Will there be more platforms/there should be more platforms.	3
	Must be good information displays.	3
	Where will cycle storage/parking be located?	2
	Cycle storage should accessible by Oyster card only – similar to Finsbury Park.	1
	Will NR be making use of disused rail tunnels beneath the station to create more lines/platforms?	1
	Where will Platforms 9-11 be located?	1
	Suburban platforms should be moved to the main trainshed to ease congestion on Platform 8.	1
	Where will the new ticket office be?	1
	Where will police accommodation be?	1
	Will there be automatic ticket gates in the new station – if so, they should be better than those in LUL.	1
	Support new footbridge link within the main trainshed.	1
	Will there be a pub in the new station?	1
	Will train services be improved?	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Movement and Linkages</b>	Will it be possible to interchange conveniently between King's Cross, St Pancras and LUL?	5
	There must be weather protected routes to public transport.	4
	Essential to have good physical links between King's Cross and St Pancras Station.	3
	Road system around the station needs to be changed – too congested at present.	2
	Bus stops on York Way are too far from the Western Concourse/need for convenient bus stops.	2
	Where is the main entrance/how do I get from the station entrance to the platforms?	2
	Need more taxis than at present.	2
	Where will the taxi facilities be located?	2
	The new station must be completely accessible for the disabled.	1
	Will it be possible to interchange with international services easily?	1
	Where will the tram stop be?	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>25</b>

<b>Public Realm</b>	Would like to see more trees/greenery planted at front of the station.	4
	Vent structures are ugly and should be removed/hidden.	1
	Need to improve York Way lighting and general environment	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Heritage Aspects</b>	Pleased to see that the GNH will be retained	4
	The GNH should be demolished	4
	Pleased to see the original station façade will be revealed.	3
	What will the GNH be used for?	2
	There should be minimal change to the suburban shed	2
	Will the existing clock on the footbridge be kept?	2
	Would like to see the 1960's sign at the front of the station re-installed.	1
	King's Cross is a lovely old station	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>The Existing Station and Services</b>	King's Cross Station is currently a poor introduction to UK/London	1
	Where is the high speed link?	1
	The existing burger bars should be removed.	1
	Need to get rid of the anti-social behaviour at the station (drug abusers and sex trade)	1
	There is nowhere to sit and have a meal at present	1
	Existing southern concourse has a horrible environment.	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Cost, Funding and Delivery</b>	Will it get built on time/when will it be finished/will it be finished in time for Olympics?	4
	Who is funding the development/ how much will it cost?	2
	Station upgrade is long overdue/ should be finished earlier	2
	Is the station upgrade a waste of public money?	1
	Will the station upgrade actually get built?	1
	Should spend more on the trains, not on the station.	1
	How much disruption will there be?	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Other Matters</b>	What happens if NR does not get planning permission?	1
	Does NR always consult the public before applying for planning permission?	1
	Need to keep pigeons out of the new concourse	1
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>154</b>

**APPENDIX 6: Issues Raised at Consultation Meeting With King's Cross Development Forum and Conservation Advisory Committee – 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005, King's Cross Holiday Inn, Farringdon Room, 7:00pm–9:30pm.**

**Attendees**

Representatives of Camden Square CAAC, Camden Cycling Campaign, Casuals, Cally Rail Group, King's Cross CAAC, KCCG, York Central Resident's Association, Friends of the Earth, Regents Quarter, King's Cross Railway Lands Group, Rasa Restaurants, LNBC.

**A. OVERALL DESIGN**

- The elegant and sympathetic design of the Western Concourse is adversely affected by:
  - having retail outlets on the ground floor;
  - insufficient integration between King's Cross and St Pancras taxi facilities.
- The scheme concentrates on the west side of the station and largely ignores the east side. York Way is blighted and the flank wall of the station presents a poor aspect. Introducing Platform Y will mean that this area will not be improved for the foreseeable future.
- The Eastern Range should be opened-up to allow views of activity within the station.
- Concern expressed that the south-western area of the new Western Concourse will not function properly as the geometry and layout of the whole area is counter-intuitive and difficult for passengers to understand.
- Most passengers will expect the main entrance to the station to be at the southern façade.
- The canopy on the front of the station should be curved to match the sweep of the Western concourse.
- The canopy on the front of the station should be more elegant/less fussy.
- Why is the finish of the Western Concourse roof mostly metal rather than glass?
- Provision for cyclists should be an integral part of the design process.
- Provision should be made to introduce a lightwell into the Western Concourse so that activity in the Northern Ticket hall would be visible – to add visual interest.

**B. THE 'NEW' STATION (FACILITIES, PLATFORMS ETC.)**

- The proposed new location for cycle parking is not as convenient as the existing provision on the east side of the station – cyclists will have to walk round the front of the station and into the Western Concourse to park their bike.
- King's Cross Station currently has only 80 bike stands for some 200 bikes. Future provision needs to be reviewed.
- How will people meet and greet incoming mainline passengers – too inconvenient if in Western Concourse?

**C. MOVEMENT & LINKAGES**

- Location and accessibility of bus stops on Pancras Road and Euston Road. Concern that bus facilities are not as conveniently located as those for taxis.
- Why is the new taxi pick up rank in Pancras Road not a shared facility with St Pancras International station?
- Will all bus stops have weather protection?
- Is the canopy at the front of the station big/wide enough to offer proper weather protection? How were its dimensions determined and will it ultimately have to be made bigger?
- Will the existing (eastern) entrance to the Station be kept as it provides convenient access from York Way?
- Will there be a dedicated cycle route in Pancras Road?
- Support expressed for the proposed footbridge over the tracks to the north of the station which is an aspiration of LB Camden and LB Islington.
- The proposed footbridge within the station should penetrate the Eastern Range and link with York Way to provide an alternative access for passengers. Thought should also be given to extending the footbridge to provide access to St Pancras station.
- What are the plans for the new Cross River Tram and where will it terminate relative to King's Cross/St Pancras?

- Concern expressed about the number and location of pedestrian crossings on Pancras Road – too few, too inconvenient.
- Concern expressed that Pancras Road will not be able to accommodate all bus, taxi, cycle and private car movements and that congestion levels will be high.

**D. PUBLIC REALM**

- Serious concern about the vent structures in the Southern Square – their location and appearance. Action needed to improve their appearance because they detract from the station façade.
- The proposed taxi canopies do not ‘fit’ visually with other elements of the scheme, they are ugly.

**E. HERITAGE MATTERS**

- The very fine Western Range will be somewhat obscured by the new Western Concourse.
- The new alignment of Pancras Road is unfortunate in that it necessitates the removal of a heritage building.
- A better station could be achieved if the Great Northern Hotel were to be demolished.
- What use will be made of the Great Northern Hotel?

**F. THE EXISTING STATION AND SERVICES**

- The existing Southern Concourse should be improved in terms of lighting, signage and use of colour as it presents a dismal environment at present.

**G. COST, FUNDING & DELIVERY**

- The Southern Concourse should be demolished as soon as possible – preferably earlier than 2013.
- When will Thameslink be implemented? If during the King’s Cross Station works there will be even more chaos.

**H. OTHER MATTERS**

- Concern expressed about noise/nuisance from construction traffic resulting from the station development works.
- Who owns the site for the Western Concourse?

## **APPENDIX 7: Issues Raised at Consultation Meeting With King's Cross Development Forum – 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006, German Gym, King's Cross, 7:00pm–9:00pm.**

Attendees:

Representatives of : King's Cross Development Forum, King's Cross Co-ordination Group (Friends of Regents Canal), Camden Civic Society, Cally Rail Group, Camden Square CAAC, King's Cross Development Trust, Copenhagen Play and Youth Partnership, King's Cross Railway Lands Group, Copenhagen Youth Project and seven Local Residents.

### **A. OVERALL DESIGN**

- How was the size of the new concourse determined and how much bigger is it than the existing concourse?
- Concern was expressed that the new station will not work properly in terms of pedestrian/passenger movement – there will be conflicts in the south-western area of the new concourse between passengers accessing the platforms and people entering the station from the south.
- People will expect to enter the new station from the south – i.e. the newly revealed southern façade of the station.
- From an aesthetic and functional perspective the proposed station design is very poor. Network Rail should not blame other parties for constraints on the design proposals.
- Why is it necessary to have a canopy on the front of the station?
- There was a general consensus that the canopy on the front of the station is of a poor design and means that the original façade of the station is not properly revealed.

### **B. THE 'NEW' STATION (FACILITIES, PLATFORMS ETC.)**

- Cycle parking should be indoor or weather protected – i.e. no open air cycle racks outside the station.
- Will the introduction of Platform Y require the provision of a new tunnel bore and track?

### **C. MOVEMENT & LINKAGES**

- Concern was expressed about whether access to the new station from the north and east will be sufficiently convenient for Islington residents, especially in comparison to current arrangements. A number of points were raised in this respect, as follows:
  - concern that the introduction of Platform Y will prevent any access to the eastern side of the station;
  - Wharfedale Road and Copenhagen Street are currently important pedestrian and vehicle routes to the station at present and this should be reflected in the new station proposals;
  - pedestrian access to the new station will be much longer and more circuitous than at present;
  - there should be a direct pedestrian access to the new station from York Way;
  - there should be a pedestrian footbridge linking York Way with KXC as proposed in the LBC/LBI Development Brief;
  - the current proposals will force people to use York Way, which has a very poor pedestrian environment, as a means to access the station;
  - there should be a footbridge within the station which links York Way with the new concourse to the west of the station. Consideration should be given to using the existing footbridge within the main trainshed for this purpose. This could be extended from the Eastern Range of the station and connect with the Travelodge;
  - consideration should be given to linking the western concourse with York Way via a tunnel – similar to Clapham Junction.
- Will it be possible for private cars to access the new station?
- Will the new western concourse be closed at night and at other times? If so, how do pedestrians move between the KXC development and Euston Road?

### **D. HERITAGE MATTERS**

- Have English Heritage been involved in the design process?

**E. COST, FUNDING & DELIVERY**

- When will implementation of the proposals be completed and how does it coincide with the construction programme for KXC?
- How confident are Network Rail that the project can be completed in time for the Olympics?
- The KXSE leaflet is misleading in that it does not explain that the existing Southern Concourse will not be demolished until 2013.

**F. OTHER MATTERS**

- Concern expressed about the need to fully consult local people before Network Rail submits its planning application.