

ENVIRONMENT (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL)  
SUB-COMMITTEE

DATE 28TH OCTOBER.....

WRITTEN  
SUBMISSION

APPLICATION No. 8 (7)



**KINGS CROSS ACTION GROUP**

26 Oct., 1999

To: The Chair and Members of the Env.(Dev. Control) Sub-Committee  
28 October, 1999

Re: South Area - Application No. 6 - pages 8/38 to 8/46  
PS 980463I/R6

17-35 William Rd., NW1

Dear Councillor,

1. The reference to the Kings Cross Conservation Area Advisory Committee in Para 5.5 of the Report should have been the Kings Cross Action Group. Members of the KXAG were active in 1985/86 advocating the designation of the KXCA. This was designated in March 1986 and subsequently extended in 1991 and 1994.

2. As the longer-serving Members may know the interest of the KXAG for many years has been Borough-wide and also London-wide as regards planning.

Inter alia, in 1988 and 1989 the KXAG attended the 3 LPAC Conferences concerned with the Strategic Planning Advice to be submitted to the then DoE in connection with the implementation of the UDP system. It also submitted to the then DoE its comments and criticisms of the Draft Strategic Planning Guidance issued subsequently to the receipt of the LPAC Strategic Planning Advice. The sole 1994 LPAC conference concerned with the Revised Strategic Planning Advice to be submitted to the then DoE was also attended.

In 1985/86 the KXAG also attended the Public Inquiry hearing objections into the proposed alterations to the then LBC 1979 District Plan, the outcome of which was the adoption of the current LBC statutory development plan The Borough Plan 1987.

Submissions etc. were also made as regards the LB Islington UDP and its current First Review Revised UDP.

Submissions etc. have also been made as regards the proposed LBC UDP. The Council's response to KXAG support for resisting any further changes to UDP Policy EC 25 is "Support welcomed."

3. For a number of years in making submissions on individual planning applications relating to a proposed change of use the KXAG has expressed its anxiety as regards the cumulative effect of the loss of employment/industrial sites, not only because of the loss of local employment but in particular as regards local employment for LBC residents with educational disadvantages. Once an employment site is lost it is highly unlikely that it would revert to employment user for at least a generation, if ever.

4. The mention in the Report of Borough Plan Policy EM 25 and UDP Policy EC 5 has been noted.

In a number of recent planning appeals won by the LBC both of these policies were cited by Inspectors in support of decisions.

Per LBC Proposals for the alteration of the District Plan - Explanation of Alterations, June 1985:

"Policy EM25 is new and is the strongest affirmation of the Council's priority to resist the loss of industrial floor space, existing or potential."

5. The application premises and the locality have been known for many years, including road traffic conditions in the locality.

As regards road traffic conditions, at sundry times during normal working hours, the current commercial uses in William Rd. have not been observed to have generated a significant amount of traffic.

There is probably a greater amount of traffic using using Park Village East and Stanhope St. as a "cut-through" twist Camden Town and the Gt. Portland St. locality. However, road humps have been installed in these streets, including a humped pedestrian crossing to what is or appears to be the main entrance to the School. Also traffic lights have been installed at the junction of Stanhope St. and Robert St.

6. In conclusion, the KXAG supports the Officers' recommendation to refuse planning permission, and, in the event of any appeal, [redacted] would appear at this in support of the LBC.

[redacted]