

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5372/P	Evangelist Road Residents' Association	15 Evangelist road London NW5 1UA	06/06/2017 19:10:26	OBJNOT	Having seen the minor amendments to the application we do not see that they have gone any way to address the objections raised in our original objection so therefore our comments still stand and we trust they will be taken into account.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5372/P	Roger Winfield	Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum 24 Patshull Road London NW5 2JY	06/06/2017 16:42:56	INT	<p>KTNF Comments on Revised Planning Application 2016/5372/P</p> <p>We, the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum, (KTNF), wish to comment on the Revised Planning Application The comments we made on 4 November 2016 relating to the original application still apply and should be read in conjunction with the objections contained in the present comments.</p> <p>We are pleased to note that in compliance with the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) the scheme provides for increased employment space and more housing. However, we do have objections as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The residential element still does not assist the vision of the Neighbourhood Plan for a "diverse but balanced population... in a mix of housing ranging from private to affordable (p.12 of the Plan).</li> <li>2. The scheme does not sufficiently increase "the availability of affordable housing" (p.12).</li> <li>3. Only 13% of the residential element in the scheme is social rented/affordable, substantially below the policies of Camden and the Mayor of London for 35-50%.</li> <li>4. The residential element in the scheme is substantially higher than in an earlier application, 42 units, but is still without any increase in the number of social rented/affordable units despite an increase in the height of the buildings.</li> <li>5. We object to the reduction of office space while the the self-storage space is increased, so reducing the opportunity to increase employment.</li> <li>6. We welcome the reference to a community cafe but we understood this to have been included in the original application, although not specifically mentioned in the description of the scheme. We do not accept that the provision of a community cafe is an adequate justification for the limited affordable housing proposed.</li> <li>7. The design of the scheme does not comply with the Plan's design policies (D3).</li> <li>8. The height, shape and massing of the proposed buildings do not contain the 'appropriate design cues' (D3). The buildings are now more than two floors higher than the neighbouring Maple Building and overall the mass of the scheme is even greater than it was in the original scheme which we objected to as being too great for the site.</li> </ol> <p>We are disappointed that our request to the developer to be given the opportunity to comment on the design before the application was made was not granted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. We are also surprised that as statutory consultees we were not notified of the substantial</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					changes to the original planning application
					KTNF have no objection in principle to the redevelopment of this site, but have the objections stated or referred to above.
					Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum.

---