

**DRAFT QUEENS PARK PLANNING BRIEF – ISSUES RAISED THROUGH CONSULTATION**  
**(Responses after 25 April 2003)**

	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>ADDRESSED?</b>	<b>IF SO – HOW? IF NOT, WHY NOT?</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
1	Design should be of London even national importance; imaginative, intelligent, putting the area on the map	Yes	The Brief stresses that any scheme should be of a high architectural quality and that any scheme be designed to be of London wide importance.	
2	Links between bus/tube/train should be seamless and weather proof	Yes	The brief is to be amended to specifically refer to the need to provide improved bus waiting areas with all weather protection.	
3	Concern that if station redevelopment happens as a later phase the interchange may not be integrated, but be a bolt on	Yes	The brief requires that a single application be submitted which addresses the whole area. This is to ensure that any scheme is designed as a whole with all sites within the area integrated.	
4	Lighting should encompass latest thinking	Yes	The Brief requires high quality design in terms of buildings, landscape and the public realm.	
5	Nothing in design of development or layout should generate more traffic, or make it easier for through traffic	Yes/No	Issues such as this will be considered as part of any application. The Brief requires that a Transport Impact Assessment is submitted as part of any application and this will need to examine traffic management options. However Salusbury Road/Carlton Vale is a local distributor route so it performs an existing function in carrying traffic through the area and this needs to be recognised.	
6	Priority should be given to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport	Yes	One of the key stated objectives of the Brief is the maximisation of alternative (non-car) transport use.	
7	Public car parking should be kept to a minimum	Yes	The Brief requires that the existing public car park (which is for short term car parking only) be re-provided. No other public car parking is required by the Brief.	
8	Will community spaces be provided in the development?	Yes	The Brief requires the re-provision of existing community facilities and for new facilities commensurate with the need created by any new development.	
9	Would be good to have a health club or sports centre	Yes	The brief would allow for the provision of a health or sports club.	
10	It would be good to have a small local cinema	Yes	The Brief would not preclude the provision of a small local cinema (subject to an assessment of the scale & impact). However, commercial operators are normally seeking for sites for multiplexes with significant parking and this would not be appropriate in this area.	

11	It would be good to have a larger post office	Yes	The brief does not preclude the provision of a larger post office but it can not ensure that one is provided as this is decision for the Postal Service.	
12	Premier Corner needs to be improved to help with traffic congestion	Yes	The brief requires that the current layout of the area be reviewed. It also requires that a Transport Impact Assessment is submitted as part of any application and this will need to examine traffic management options.	
13	Can affordable housing not be limited to 2 storeys high	No	National and Council policies support the provision of higher density development in areas such as this.	
14	The Brief should note links to Kilburn Lane – one cohesive business, service and facilities area	Yes	The brief does not currently specifically refer to links to Kilburn Lane and should be revised to do so.	
15	Could any development include a station hotel? This is a W9 site and with a good link to the docklands.	No	The Brief does not allow for the provision of a hotel in the Queens Park Station Area. Nor is it something I believe the brief should promote for the reason that any development should assist the regeneration objectives of the area and the uses currently set out in the brief (Housing, commercial, education, community facilities) would	
16	Low budget Crossrail – is there an opportunity for a QP shuttle bus to Kilburn tube and canary wharf.			This is beyond the remit of the Council and the Brief and is a decision fro public transport operators.
17	Disabled people may have no viable means of transport other than the car. Need to ensure there are spaces for blue badge holders available in any residential development – not just the public car park.	Yes	This is recognised. Spaces for possible occupants who are blue badge holders will be included as part of any parking provision for the redevelopment of the area. In the case of car free developments the only car parking spaces permitted are for blue badge holders.	
18	Support the provision of Life time Homes but this should be a requirement for private units as well as the affordable units.	Yes	Part M of the Building Regulations requires that all units are to a Life Times Homes standard.	
19	Any review of traffic and crossings should take into account reality – people cross at the shortest distance between two points.	Yes	The brief requires that the current layout of the area be reviewed. It also requires that a Transport Impact Assessment is submitted as part of any application and this will need to examine traffic management options.	
20	What methods are being used to include the users of the Day Centre in consultation and informing throughout the development? Is it possible to make this a condition for any developer?			Specific consultation sessions have been held for the parents, users and Staff of the Albert Road Day Centre. Social Services have formed a working party for staff, parents and users who have developed a specification fro any re-provision of the

				centre to ensure it meets the needs of all parties. Should an application be submitted these parties will be further consulted.
21	What constraints will there be to ensure that the area remains accessible throughout the development?	Yes/No	Any application will need to address the phasing of any redevelopment and accessibility through the phases, particularly given the requirement that the existing community facilities are operational throughout. However, it is not always feasible for all of an area to remain completely accessible through the actual construction phase.	
22	Concern about previous responses to issues 84 (need for an adventure play ground), 87 (need for a youth club), 90 (need for activities for young people)in that children are a very valuable asset and need a safe place to play.			Council Officers agree that there is a need for the provision of activities and play areas for children. However, any development is not being undertaken by the Council. A developer may choose to provide youth facilities or at least community facilities which can also be used for this purpose. Any developer will be expected to contribute to the provision of childrens play space and open space in the area. However, development economics and the need for such facilities to be in safe locations mean an adventure playground is unlikely to be provided within the Brief area. The provision of youth facilities is also being considered as part of the wider masterplan for the South Kilburn area.