

Adoption Statement for the Neighbourhood Framework Document

This adoption statement gives notice that the council adopted the Neighbourhood Framework Document as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on 14 July 2005. This SPD will form part of the emerging Local Development Framework.

Under regulation 16 (2) b 'any person aggrieved by the SPD may apply to the High Court for permission to apply for a judicial review of the decision to adopt the SPD; and

[16 (2) c] that any such application for leave must be made promptly and in any event not later than 3 months after the date on which the SPD was adopted;'

Any queries about this adoption statement should be directed to

Alan Mace
Planner, Policy Team
Environment and Regeneration
Tel: 020 7527 2619
Email: alan.mace@islington.gov.uk
Website: www.islington.gov.uk

Statement of representations for the Neighbourhood Framework Document

The Neighbourhood Framework Document (NFD) seeks to further the strategic aims of regeneration and sustainable communities set out in the council's One Islington and the Community and Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy. The document sets out a series of projects that anticipate change in the area and attempt to maximise the benefits for local people.

This document sets out details of the consultation process undertaken during the production of the Neighbourhood Framework Document. It specifies:

- who was consulted during the preparation of the document;
- how they were consulted;
- the issues raised, and;
- how these issues were addressed.

The Neighbourhood Framework Document was produced under the previous planning system as Supplementary Planning Guidance and currently has status as such. The document was produced with funding from the Local Strategic Partnership and had the express purpose of furthering the council's regeneration aims in the King's Cross area. Given this focus, a commitment was made to ensure that a high level of consultation was carried out with local communities.

The details of the consultation events that were held for the original document are summarised below. In addition to this the team producing the Neighbourhood Framework Document distributed a series of newsletters (Exchange) that publicised the development of the document and related consultation events. This was distributed to over seven thousand addresses in the King's Cross area (private and businesses). The King's Cross Team, who produced the NFD, compiled a database of 116 individuals and groups who were included in mail-outs about the Neighbourhood Framework Document.

All consultation events were announced with local leafleting. Events took place at different times including evenings and weekends and were in wheelchair accessible locations. These events took the form of staffed displays that set out proposed projects and invited feedback on these. Specific groups were targeted and consultation included work with young people, black and minority ethnic, and faith groups. Events were held in youth clubs, churches, local leisure centres and other venues where people would be passing and so could be reached even if they had not seen the publicity material beforehand. In total 189 visits were made to these events. Some of these would have been repeat visits by the same person for different Area Action Plans. A full breakdown by age, racial origin and gender is available from the King's Cross Team (contact details below).

Feedback was reported back to a series of local committee meetings. These are also available in full from the contact details below. In general the biggest concerns were as follows;

- Proposals to open up neighbourhoods to greater access. The locality experiences relatively high levels of anti social behaviour. As a result, many local residents are concerned that any increase in access will worsen the problem. A number of projects were dropped or moderated as a result of this concern.
- Play areas were also controversial. Some residents welcomed the upgrading of play areas, others were concerned that this would bring more noisy activity into their neighbourhood and – in some cases – would lead to more antisocial activity on the part of older youth. These issues were tackled on a site by site basis. In some cases it was accepted that redundant play spaces could probably never be brought back into productive use because of severe site restrictions (no overlooking of sunken playgrounds). In other cases play spaces have been identified as suitable for upgrading.
- Proposals to plant more trees and greenery. These were strongly supported and requests were made for additional reference to this in a number of the neighbourhoods. There are considerable difficulties in planting in the south of the area as the pavements have high levels of services running under them and other demands – such as CCTV – limit the siting of larger trees. However, greater reference has been made to planting in the individual action plans.

The possible development of the neighbouring King's Cross Central site acts as a backdrop to the Neighbourhood Framework Document and the projects often anticipated change that would flow from this. Where consultees raised issues related to this and other matters beyond the remit of the document they were referred to the correct bodies (for example, issues relating to roads managed by Transport for London). In other cases it was necessary to explain that certain requests were beyond the scope – in legal terms – of the Neighbourhood Framework Document.

Following changes in the planning system in 2004, there was a further period of consultation on the NFD, this allowed it to be recognised under the new system. The period of statutory consultation was between 9 May 2005 and 3 June 2005. This final consultation has been notified through a press notice, through the council website and in copies of a newsletter (Exchange) sent to all addresses in the King's Cross area. The Neighbourhood Framework Document was made available on the council's website and at the main council offices (222 Upper Street).

Representations and our responses are set out in the table below.

	Comments	Response
Government Office for London	Minor editorial matters	All addressed
Government Office for London	Suggested change of name for Area Action Plans as these could be confused with the Area Action Plans introduced by the new planning system	Name changed to Neighbourhood Action Plans
Government Office for London	Suggested need for map to illustrate plan nine (which covers routes through the area)	Detailed map covering the whole regeneration area now included
Environment Agency	Proposed development must take into account surface water management and flood risk issues at an early stage.	Any development would be subject to normal development control (DC) procedures and policies. The NFD does not make specific reference to any DC procedures as these are assumed to apply. Further, the NFG conforms to the existing UDP policies. We will carry the Agency's comment over into the Local Development Framework so that Sustainable Drainage Systems(SUDS) are promoted at the strategic level.
London Borough of Camden	Camden encourages Islington to reconsider the decision to remove a project that sought to encourage a bus route along Copenhagen Street.	There are potential benefits to having a bus route along Copenhagen Street. There was a mixture of support and opposition for a bus route. However, this is already a heavily trafficked route along a road that contains mainly residential, education and other community uses. Therefore, on balance, we have decided not to include the project but would be prepared to reconsider this in the light of future development in the area

		(especially if this were linked to highway improvements along Copenhagen Street).
London Borough of Camden	For clarity, each AAP (neighbouring Camden) should carry a disclaimer that that it does not apply to land in Camden.	Added.
London Borough of Camden	Islington must recognise that that any funding sought to be secured through s106 negotiations should be in accordance with that allowed under Circular 1/97 (or its equivalent) and other relevant Government guidance	LBI would seek to secure Section 106 benefits within the legal framework that applies at the time.