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INITIAL PUBLIC MEETING AND CONSULTATION 4 APRIL 2011

Attendees
Caroline Hill
St Holmes Rd
Adam Leys
Alan Morris POWRA
Brian Evans
Conrad Ford
David Jockelson
David Prout
Elizabeth Woodeson
F.W. Thompson
Hil Barnes
Inkerman Area Residents Association
Sylvia Lynch
Sarah Galashan
Rod Harper
Robert Livock
Mike Newland
Lucrecia Gramer
Lindsey Purchall
Lesley Ross
Jon Hall
John Woodcock
John Nicholson
Conrad Ford
Adam Leys
Pat Gibson – Highgate Road Residents Association

The UDL is a voluntary non-profit organisation that is starting to work with the council on a number of projects. She explained that the council had run a series of public meetings which had been very well attended and a number of points had come out of them. She said that there was a need to have a forum which would be able to give the community a voice. She added that one of the main aims of the forum was to give people the opportunity to have a say in the decisions that were taken.

The forum would have the power to make Neighbourhood Development Orders which would grant outline planning permission. Initially it was suggested that three individuals could get together and declare themselves to be a Neighbourhood Forum. They could be people who lived in the area or even who wanted to live in the area or possibly have business interests in the area. That has increased now to 20 people.

One rule is that there cannot be overlapping areas and that means that if a street wished to become a local forum and a larger area did, there would be a conflict.

The Forum then drafts a Neighbourhood Plan. There will then be a referendum which the council will have to hold and there will be a 50% approval rate of those who vote it will be adopted and will be part of the statutory planning. Planning applications would then have to follow it.

Any plan drawn up needs to fit into the hierarchy of policies mentioned above “General conformity”.

There will be some control and there is to be an independent inspection of plans. It is not clear who it will be by.

She confirmed that the members of the Forum in need have no qualification.

Businesses can produce neighbourhood plans so Tesco’s could effectively influence or take over local planning and remove restrictions on development. Or they could stand behind, sponsor or influence local authorities to do so.

There is no set size or shape of the plans. There is a mechanism for siphoning off money for community use and a “home’s bonus” to councils.

There was discussion about what size of area should be the neighbourhood and the answer to that seemed to be that they could be any size so long as they do not overlap.

One model is that the local Forum gets together and discuss targets – what people would like to achieve although it is not clear how proactive the forum can be.

Many questions were asked that did not have very clear answers. A lot seemed extremely vague or left to chance. The answer to many questions is that the answers will be given at some stage in guidance notes or circulars issued by the government later.

One plan is that the Use Classes Order will be loosened up.

Her organisation, the UDL, offers training, courses and debates on planning and local issues. Other matters she told us about – are now taken from the Briefing paper on their website:

http://www.urbanbinedesignlondon.com/?p=5111

Community Right to Buy

Local authorities should maintain a list of private assets of ‘community value’ then if this asset comes up for disposal (freehold or long term leasehold) the community should be given time to develop a bid and raise capital to buy it. This may not crop up very often, but when it does presumably it could be important to local planning in terms of identifying and potentially retaining local facilities and services.

General Power of Competence

The Bill proposes allowing local authorities to do anything that is not specifically prohibited. As mentioned above this could mean local planning authorities think about taking on work in other geographical areas, or offering new services more along the lines of a consultant.

Predetermination

‘Councillors should be free to campaign, to express views on issues and to vote on those matters, without fear of being unjustly accused of having a closed mind on a particular issue because of it’. The Bill allows Councillors to campaign AND vote on a development issue. The Standards board would also be abolished.

Pre – application consultation

The Bill aims to introduce a new requirement for prospective developers to consult local communities before submitting applications for very large developments.

There is quite an interesting briefing from a developers perspective at:

http://www.cmgs.co.uk/blogpage/Decentralisation+and+Localism+Bill_159.html
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SECOND PUBLIC MEETING AND CONSULTATION 20 OCTOBER 2011

Minutes of Localism Meeting
Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum Thursday 20 October 2011 7.00pm
Room 8, Greenland Place Community Centre

NW5 1LB

Those attending
See Annex A for full list

Representatives from:
Kentish Town Action (KTRA)
Bartholomew Area Residents Association (BARA)
Bartholomew and Kentish Town Conservation Area Advisory Committee (KT & BE CAAC)
Prince of Wales Residents Association (POWRA)
Leighton Road Neighbourhood Association (LRNA)
Inkerman Area Residents Association (IARA)
Cllr Paul Braithwaite
Cllr Georgia Gould

Apologies
Brenda Gardner – Castle Road Residents Association
Mark McCarthy – South Kentish Town Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Rosemary Lewin – Kelly Street Residents Association
Jake Morgan – Kentish Town Business Association

Excused
Pat Gibson – Highgate Road Residents Association
Judy Love – Hadley Street Residents Association

Caroline Hill (KTRA) opened the meeting and welcomed all those attending this second meeting. Thanks were given to Kentish Town Community Centre for providing the venue for the meeting.

1. The Localism Bill and The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Caroline made a presentation to outline current
APPENDIX 2

understanding of the principles of localism, the current timetable for the Localism Bill and the potential differences of approach this has with the draft National Planning Policy Framework.

Timetable

• Third Reading 31 Oct 2011
• Enactment of Bill and Nov 2011 – early Dec 2011
• Target date for Localism Bill to take effect is April 2012

• NPPF consultation closed 17 Oct 2011.
• The Government has tabled a debate about NPPF for the 27th October.
• Final version end 2011 or early 2012
• Target date for NPPF to take effect is April 2012 but Planning Minister Greg Clark hinted on October 13th that there may be a second consultation after the proposed final version is published (this may be because of inconsistencies between NPPF and the Localism Bill)

Localism – Neighbourhood Forums

Caroline has pre-registered ‘Kensington Neighbourhood Forum’ with Camden Council.

From the draft Bill “The Localism Bill will devolve powers to councils and neighbourhoods and aims to give local communities more control over housing and planning decisions. It includes measures to reform the planning system, the provision of housing and a range of local authority powers. The Bill will establish neighbourhood plans and neighbourhood development orders, by which it is intended that communities will be able to influence council policies and development in their neighbourhoods.”

A Neighbourhood Forum

• Will consist of a minimum of 21 members made up of local residents, local business people and ward councillors drawn from different places in the Neighbourhood area.
• Must have a written constitution.
• The area of the Forum must not overlap with any other Forum area.
• A Neighbourhood Forum has to apply to the Council to be set up. The Bill will establish
• The designation ceases to have effect at the end of a period of 5 years or if the Neighbourhood Forum is no longer meeting the conditions and criteria set down by the Council.

This is a Lord's Amendment tabled 17 October 2011

“A Neighbourhood Forum is established expressly for the purpose of furthering the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of individuals living, or wanting to live, in an area that consists of or includes the Neighbourhood area concerned, and, if it is appropriate to the nature of the area, promoting the carrying on of trades, professions or other businesses in such an area.”

Localism – Neighbourhood Plan (NP)

• Any qualifying body is entitled to make an NP.
• An NP is a plan that sets out policies in relation to development and use of land in a Neighbourhood Forum area.

• If the local planning authority says that an area needs to grow, then communities cannot use Neighbourhood planning to block the building of new homes and businesses. They can, however, use Neighbourhood planning to influence the type, design, location and mix of new development.
• Only one NP may be made for each Neighbourhood Forum area.
• An NP must be assessed by an independent examiner appointed by the Council. The NP must have regard to the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (see below) and be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Local Plan (see below).
• An NP must then go for referendum (financed and organized by the Council) to all those living in the Neighbourhood Forum area who are registered to vote. If more than 50% of those voting are in favour the Council must adopt the NP as a statutory planning document and bring it into force.

In some special cases - where, for example, the proposals put forward in a plan for one neighbourhood have significant implications for other people nearby - people from other neighbourhoods may be allowed to vote too.

N. B. When Local Plan is mentioned that means the Council’s Local Development Framework Core Strategy. This is not to be confused with a Neighbourhood Plan.

Localism – Neighbourhood Development Order

• The community can grant planning permission for new buildings they want to see go ahead.
• Neighbourhood Development Orders will allow new homes and homes to be built without the developers having to apply for separate planning permission.
• A Neighbourhood Development Order will grant planning permission for development that complies with the order. Where communities have made clear that they want development of a particular type, it will be easier for that development to go ahead.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

It has 7 main features:
1. Fewer rules about what can be built, where and how
2. A presumption in favour of sustainable development
3. The Local Plan becomes even more important
4. Supports a growth agenda
5. Introduces a duty to cooperate
6. Replaces targets for development with incentives
7. Supports Neighbourhood planning and sets out expectations on consultation with communities by local authorities and developers.

‘A presumption in favour of sustainable development’ The presumption is that: “… individuals and businesses have the right to build homes and other local buildings provided that they conform to national environmental, architectural, economic and social standards, conform with the local plan, and pay a tariff that compensates the community for loss of amenity and costs of additional infrastructure.”

The phrase ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ does not feature in the draft Localism Bill. However, sustainable development has always been included in planning documents. The words ‘presumption’ and ‘in favour’ seem to be at odds with the main intention of Localism and Neighbourhood Plans: that local people can decide on a plan that sets out policies in relation to development and use of land in a Neighbourhood Forum area and that a Neighbourhood Forum is established expressly for the purpose of furthering the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of individuals living, or wanting to live, in an area, as I said before.

The NPPF has to be approved by the House of Commons only and many of those in the House of Lords are understandably concerned about that. When a final version of the NPPF is published, it will be a statutory document. This means that planning authorities and developers must take notice of it and both Local Plans and planning decisions by Councils can be challenged if they don’t adhere to it.

This is what was said in the House of Lords on 17 October 2011: “It will take time for all local authorities, even those with Core Strategies in place, to get Local Plans updated/adopted in light of the national planning policy framework – allowance for this should be included in the NPPF and the Localism Bill to avoid opportunistic and unplanned development coming forward during the transition period against local wishes, and to ensure development reflects locally-determined priorities rather than national ones”.

A discussion on the issues from the presentation took place.

It was felt that a real effort needed to be made to engage and work with local businesses even if efforts to do so by individual local organisations had not been successful in the past. Regis Road, Industrial Estate and Kentish Town Road Business Association should be approached again. It was also felt that new businesses could also be approached.

It was agreed that Tenants Associations also needed to be engaged and Councillor Paul Braithwaite agreed to provide some contacts. Hilary Barnes would provide a contact for Clarence Way EA.

Consideration should also be given to inviting a representative of Camden Council in respect of Regis Road Re-cycling Centre. A question arose about the future of this Centre and Councillor Paul Braithwaite would look into this (next full Council meeting on 7 November 2011).

Other concerns raised included the age profile of those represented on KTnF. Councillor Georgie Gould recommended approaching Kentish Town Youth Area Action Group.

Other groups suggested for possible involvement included, Transition Kentish Town, Safer Neighbours Team, local schools, churches/religious interests and interest groups representing disability groups.

Concerns about the NPPF were discussed and it was felt that the local MP Frank Dobson should be approached to get engaged in the debate in the House of Commons.

Caroline provided a map of Kentish Town outlining the proposed area to be covered by KTnF.

Suggestions were made to include the Leighton Grove triangle, Raveley Street triangle, Greenwood Place and Regis Road, Clarence Way Estate (using the railway line as the southern boundary).

Caroline would take these suggestions on board and circulate a revised map.

2. Constitution

David (IARA) presented a discussion paper about a possible constitution for KTnF outlining 4 main options. (Full paper is at Annex B to the minutes)

The 4 options discussed were:

Option A: Some constitutions create a very open forum with effectively General Meetings called a number of times a year. Meetings are open to everyone living in the neighbourhood. Provision can be made for calling for Special General Meetings.

The Annual General Meeting will elected chair, secretary and “street representatives” and will form a committee. “However the role of the committee will be solely to suggest items for discussion and
prepare the agenda the meetings of the forum and will not have authority to represent its views as that of the neighbourhood forum.”

Option B: Another constitution sets up a Representative Group Meeting made up of one member each from each properly constituted residents and business groups in the area and they elect the members of a Steering Group which will manage the forum. The Steering Group will meet as often as is necessary.

Option C: an Annual General Meeting elects a Committee Chair, Vice chair, secretary-treasurer and up to 8 other members which meets every month and runs the forum.

Option D: A further option would be that a committee made up of one representative from each of the local groups meets and runs the forum subject to basic principles and policies decided by an Annual General Meeting or general meetings held more frequently.

Option D was generally preferred by those attending the meeting with provision for 2 representatives from each local group to form a committee. Although there were issues to consider about local people who were not part of an organised local group, the position of open meeting and who may be entitled to vote.

David (IARA) offered to work on a more detailed version of a constitution based on the principles of option D and circulate it before a future meeting of the KTnF.

3. Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan

While it is not possible to progress plans yet it was agreed it would be worth having a preliminary discussion about what might be included in a Neighbourhood Plan.

Communities can:
• choose where they want new homes, shops and offices to be built
• have their say on what those new buildings should look like
• grant planning permission for the new buildings they want to see go ahead.

Ideas suggested for consideration in a local plan were listed on a flip chart and can be found at Annex C.

Communities and Local Government Consultation on Neighbourhood Planning
Responses by 5 January 2012.

This consultation is to consider whether the proposed approach to taking up the regulation-making powers in the Localism Bill, strikes the right balance between standardising the approach to neighbourhood planning across the country, and providing for sufficient local flexibility to reflect local circumstances. Responses are required by 5 January 2012. Caroline agreed to e-mail the document to any interested groups and individuals.

Caroline advised that there will be several sources of advice and support for communities who are interested in doing neighbourhood planning.

The local planning authority will be obliged by law to help people draw up their neighbourhood plans. Developers, parish and town councils, landowners and local businesses may all be interested in sponsoring and taking a leading role in neighbourhood planning. In fact, in some places, local businesses are already starting a debate with local residents and councils.

The Government has committed to providing £50m until March 2015 to support local councils in making neighbourhood planning a success. The Government has already provided £3m to four community support organisations, who already support communities in planning for their neighbourhood.

4. Frequency and timing of future meetings

It was agreed that meetings should be quarterly and that we should meet again in January 2012 as the 3rd reading of the Bill is due to take place on 31 November 2011. A representative from the Localism Team at Camden Council should be invited to the meeting. The following meeting could be scheduled for April 2012 after the Localism Bill has become law and taken effect.
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List of attendees
Richard Burton
Mireille Burton
Jenny Wright (LRNA)
John Woodcock (LRNA)
Mrs Woodcock (LRNA)
Hilary Barnes (IARA)
Debby Hyams (IARA)
David J (IARA & KTRA)
Caroline Hill (KTRA)
Paul Seviour (IARA)
John Nicholson (IARA & KTRA)
Rod Harper (KTRA)
Sara Feliden
Isky Gordon (BARA)

I have taken the elementary step of googling neighbourhood forum constitutions. There does not appear to be one approved model. The constitutions I have looked at are wildly different.

The one for Watford is half a page and says there are 12 neighbourhood forums within Watford, each one covering a ward and each forum comprises the three elected councillors for that ward! ‘That’s it. I.e. a sort of replica of the existing council arrangement. Slightly more democratic and in the spirit of localism are three other ones and it is clear that there is a range of possibilities regarding how democratic or what sort of democracy is agreed upon.
The Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum.

The area is subject to change by some specified process but at that outset effectively runs from Ospringe Road to the north, encompassing the area of Kentish Town as traditionally understood to the east of the high street across to Torriano Avenue to the east, down to Camden Road station at the South and on the west of the High Street from Castle Road up to Regis Road. A map of the area will be attached to the Constitution.

Perhaps we should explain that this area has been identified because representative Residents Associations covering the area have joined together to create this neighbourhood forum and accordingly have some sort of mandate. Perhaps we should name those Representative Associations.

It would be quite nice to state that Kentish Town is an identifiable area with a sense of community which we would like to foster.

The Purpose of the Neighbourhood Forum: there are a variety of purposes proposed in other forum constitutions I have looked at ranging from a "need to represent the interests of the people living in the area" to "promoting a discussion between local residents and the local council" through to the more specific "to produce a neighbourhood plan to further the social, economic and environmental well-being of individuals living, or wanting to live in the area".

The latter is in fact the real reason why Neighbourhood Forums have come into existence and would be one of the main purposes of the forum. We could amalgamate all those quite easily into one statement of purpose.

Obviously one of the first tasks of the forum in whatever shape it is will be to hammer out some General Policies and Objectives.

These come in various categories: It could be mainly about visual planning, for example preserving the existing buildings and having an influence over new developments and we could go into considerable detail about what we want and do not want.

We might indicate that we wish to generate greater employment in the area. We might emphasise green issues, sustainability etc. We may wish to emphasise social benefit, community links, services for young people from all people, the issue of reducing crime, generating neighbourliness and companionship additionally for older people or housebound people.

However those may or may not be matters that people wish to go into the Constitution rather than into a General Policy Statement.

Membership: some of this will be laid down in the Act possibly. At the present moment people can come forward and propose a neighbourhood forum who live or work in the area or would like to live in the area. Whether that binds the membership of an existing form is not clear to me.

One constitution simply says "all people living in the area outlined are automatically members ... plus councillors, the leader and deputy leader of the council, all of whom will be honorary members without voting rights." Another constitution said membership will be open to all who support the purposes of the forum and give their contact details.

So the choice again is whether everybody in the area is automatically a member which would give us quite an impressive membership albeit very uncertain in number or whether people need to take some positive action to become members.

With open membership again potentially a special interest group could swamp the Annual General Meeting and distort the purpose of the Forum.

Other matters:

We would need to make provision for notices about meetings and how these will be circulated or published. Minutes would need to be taken and then circulated.

There might be provision for consulting members through e-mail. This works well in our association, the Inkerman Area Residents Association. At one point it was seen as undemocratic and many people did not have access to a computer. It is now seen as being more democratic since it enables people to participate who could not necessarily come to public meetings because of disability, childcare needs or other problems.

We would need to make provision for a bank account, signatories etc. We need to consider whether any liability could attach to members or officers of the forum on whether insurance would be necessary or some sort of limited liability status.

We need to make arrangements for the winding up of the forum. We need to make provision for the Amendment of the Constitution. Plus lots more I haven't thought about. David J.

Annex C

Items for consideration for inclusion in a future Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan

• Green spaces
• Trees
• Protecting front gardens from use as car parking
• Playgrounds
• Local listing
• Business issues
• Presumption against basement development
• Education and schools
• Height of buildings – limits
• Transport
• Sports amenities
• Fascia on shops
• Existing buildings – protection
• High Street including mix of uses and 75% retail
• Independent shops
• Health centres
• Youth centres
• Empty sites

KENTISH TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING 19 JANUARY 2012

Minutes of AGM

Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum (KTNF)

Thursday 19 January 2012 at 7.00pm

Room 12, Greenwich Place Community Centre

NW1 1LB

Apologies

Adam Lewis (KTRA and IARA)
Brenda Gardner (Castle Road Residents Association)
Gillian Tindall (Bartholomew and Kentish Town Conservation Area) but Richard Lansdown is here to represent Gillian,
Raoul Bunschoten
Denise Mathew (Boma Garden Centre) but Sean
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Option A: Some constitutions create a very open forum with effectively General Meetings called a number of times a year. Meetings are open to everyone living in the neighbourhood. Provision can be made for calling for Special General Meetings.

The Annual General Meeting will elected chair, secretary and "street representatives" and will form a committee. "However the role of the committee will be solely to suggest items for discussion and prepare the agenda the meetings of the forum and will not have authority to represent its views as that of the neighbourhood forum."

Option B: Another constitution sets up a Representative Group Meeting made up of one member each from each properly constituted residents and business groups in the area and they elect the members of a Steering Group which will manage the forum. The Steering Group will meet as often as is necessary.

Option C: an Annual General Meeting elects a Committee Chair, Vice chair, secretary-treasurer and up to 8 other members which meets every month and runs the forum.

Option D: A further option would be that a committee made up of one representative from each of the local groups meets and runs the forum subject to basic principles and policies decided by an Annual General Meeting or general meetings held more frequently.

Option A is the most democratic with the power remaining with the general meetings and with the committee referring matters back to the general meetings.

Option B and Option C are more based on a committee running the forum but with different ways of arriving at that committee: should it be an open election at an Annual General Meeting or should it be through the representative groups?

Option D is proposed as a compromise with a larger, more representative committee.

Possible dangers: that one area or interest group could dominate an Annual General Meeting and vote on a very un-representative committee.

However the question could be asked about B and D – how representative or democratic are the Representative Associations that make up the forum?

The other issues in the Constitution are usually name and area, membership and provisions for Finance. My suggestion (no surprises here) is that we call it
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Dunn is here to represent Boma
Nick Mavrides (Kentish Town Business Association)
Cathy Crawford (Kentish Town Community Centre)
Councillor Patricia Callaghan
Jake Morgan
Jon March (Vicar of St Luke's Church, Osney Crescent) but David Watkinson is here to represent St Luke's.
Pat Gibson (Highgate Road Residents Association)
Henry Nakano (Kentish Town safer Neighbourhoods)
Councillor Angela Mason
Caroline Hill (KTRA) opened the meeting and welcomed all those groups and individuals attending the meeting. Thanks were given to Kentish Town Community Centre for once again providing the venue for the meeting.

APPENDIX 3
1. Introduction of our speaker Hari Phillips
Caroline Hill introduced Hari Phillips who is a Director of Bell Phillips Architects in Bermondsey. He set up the company with Tim Bell in June 2004 after they won an international design competition to carry out a major regeneration project in East London. Hari is significantly involved in all major projects especially the initial stages of projects including competition submissions, feasibility studies, strategic analysis and planning applications.

Hari sits on the Steering Group and is Vice-Chair of the Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum that was formed in February 2011 and was awarded vanguard status in April 2011. A copy of Hari’s presentation is at Annex B of the minutes.

Among the key messages based on lessons learned from Hari’s presentation were:
• Be careful not to make the area covered by the Neighbourhood Forum too large so as to make it unwieldy and create too much work for those involved, largely volunteers, that it becomes ineffective
• Don’t get bogged down in arguments over constitutions and boundaries as this will put people off and actually getting on with things that matter to the people who live and work within the area of the Neighbourhood Forum
• In the light of the above points remember that this is still new to everyone so things are likely to be fluid

Following questions of clarification from those attending Caroline thanked Hari for his excellent presentation and his willingness to share his experience with us.

2. Introduction and vote to approve the draft Constitution for the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum (KTNF)
David J (iARA) introduced the draft constitution, which had been circulated prior to the meeting, and was based on the work he had done following discussion on the constitution at the meeting of 20 October 2011.

Amendments were proposed to the Constitution as follows:
1.1 delete the words ‘as traditionally understood’ and introduce the word ‘central’ before ‘Kentish Town’ in lines 2 and 3
6.1 delete the words ‘of the Forum Committee ratified by a majority at a General meeting’ and replace with ‘the General Meeting with notice of the proposed amendment’ in lines 2 and 3.

Questions were raised about the boundaries of the KTNF and in particular about why the ‘triangle’ bounded by Highgate Road to the west, Fortress Road to the east and the Gospel Oak railway line to the north was not within the boundaries of KTNF.

Some residents of that area felt it should be within KTNF’s boundaries. This area had not been included in the map drawn up following discussions at the 20 October 2011 meeting and it was understood that a planned Neighbourhood Forum covering the area further north (Dartmouth Park and/or Highgate) had been advised of the boundaries of KTNF as drawn up after the last meeting. This map was also now lodged with Camden Council as part of our process to secure funding.

A vote was taken on the proposition to change the boundary of KTNF to include the ‘triangle’.

In favour of changing the boundary: 13
Against changing the boundary: 19

The proposal failed.

The constitution as a whole was put to the meeting for approval

The vote to accept the constitution was passed unanimously with no votes against and no abstentions.

3. Discussion and vote to approve the draft Statement of General Policies and Objectives
David J (iARA) introduced the draft Statement of General Policies and Objectives which had also been circulated prior to the meeting.

A discussion followed looking at each paragraph in turn.

An amendment was suggested to paragraph E to delete the words ‘support the efforts of Kentish Town Road Action in opposing the change of’ so that the first line would read ‘We will oppose the change of’. This was to maintain the line that KTNF did not identify as supporting any one particular local interest group or association.

The amendment was agreed by the meeting unanimously with no votes against and no abstentions.

The vote to accept the whole Statement of General Principles and Objectives, as amended, was passed unanimously with no votes against and no abstentions.

4. Election of Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum Committee
Caroline Hill explained that the KTNF Committee will consist of up to 15 members, elected from members of Representative Local Associations (Residents Associations, Tenants Associations, Business Associations, Conservation Advisory Committees), Local Organisations (Community Centres, Environmental Groups, Individual Businesses, Churches etc) and Individuals with the majority being from Representative Local Associations, i.e. 8 members from RLAs and 7 members from LOs and Individuals as mentioned in the Draft Constitution. Officers will be selected by members of the Committee at a later date.

Some nominations had been made prior to the meeting and nominations were invited from those attending the meeting.

Nominations for Representative Local Associations
1. Diana Baynes IARA
2. Hilary Barnes IARA
3. Christopher Cross B&KTCAC
4. Tony Marshall TTA
5. Isky Gordon B&K
6. Cella Goreham B&KTCAC
7. Caroline Hill KTRA
8. Derek Jarman DMHC & Kennison & Willingham TA
9. David J IARA
10. John Nicholson KTRA

Advisors? Because some architecture/planning specialists are a little short of time or are out of the country a lot, we are appointing a team of Advisors to the Committee. Advisors can be called upon, when necessary. They will not have voting rights within the Committee.

We already had some names for this team and those names will be listed on a flip chart and it was agreed to take more names, if they’re forthcoming, after the elections to the Committee. Advisors don’t have to be elected.

5. Agreement to list of Advisors

Some names had been put forward before the meeting and the offer of further nominations for advisors was put to the meeting.

The following list of advisors was agreed:

Beattie Blakemore
Alice Brown
Rauf Buncholten
Richard Burton
Clare Healy
Alan Morris
David Proud
Will Upton
David Watkinson

Additionally it was agreed that the local Councillors representing the current 3 Council wards that fell wholly or partly within the boundary of KTNF, Camden Town & Primrose Hill, Kentish Town, would act in an advisory capacity as appropriate and subject to any conflict of interest (for example those Councillors on the Planning Committee).

The meeting agreed to a group vote of the election of these nominations to the Committee.

The vote in favour was unanimous with no votes against and no abstentions.

Nominations for Local Organisations, Local Businesses and Individuals

Torn Allen Transition Kentish Town seconded by Cllr Jenny Headlam-Wells
John Grayson Earth Natural Foods seconded by Cllr Paul Braithwaite
Rev. Jon March St Luke’s Church seconded by Isky Gordon
Wendy Munro
Camden Older People seconded by Derek Jarman
Paul Seviour Individuals seconded by Debby Hyams
The meeting agreed to a group vote of the election of these nominations to the Committee.

The vote in favour was unanimous with no votes against and no abstentions.

The question of engaging local businesses more was discussed and the difficulties, to date, of generating interest from the local business community was mentioned. Kentish Town Action Scion appeared to be non-active. John Grayson was asked to consider if he might gain the interest of any other local businesses in working with KTNF.

The vote in favour was unanimous with no votes against and no abstentions.
6. Funding

Caroline Hill provided an update on the position regarding funding of KTnF.

On November 22 last year Caroline asked Camden to support our bid for up to £21K funding for our Neighbourhood Forum. The timing was very tight because the early November date, when the bids had to be in, had gone past and we only heard about this funding opportunity after this date. Caroline got in touch with Alison Cremin at the Department for Communities and Local Government and she gave an extra week but Camden had to approve our bid first and send it on to her. Caroline asked all of us to send her our support in a letter to the Statement of Support she had written. Many of us did this and she was sure this helped our bid. It was very tough and we also knew that the other groups that had applied.

These are the emails received:

Ed Watson 5 Dec 2011
Assistant Director Regeneration and Planning Culture and Environment
London Borough of Camden

“Following our various conversations I am pleased to say that Camden is able to support the bid on the following grounds:

• That Camden fulfil the ‘accountable body’ function for any grant money that might be allocated to KTnF by CLG (Communities and Local Government)
• That there is also a commitment from Camden to provide officer support to help KTnF understand the strategic planning context in which any emerging Neighbourhood Plan (NP) would be operating.
Camden may provide officer oversight at key stages of the process.
• In agreeing to support the bid Camden does not formally recognise KTnF as the Neighbourhood Forum for the area (although their interest has already been registered alongside other groups from across the Borough). Decisions on this will be taken through a separate process.”

Alison Cremin 6 Dec 2011
Department for Communities and Local Government

“I can confirm that we will now include your bid supported by Camden with the other bids we have received – we have not taken final decisions on which applications are successful and we will let you know about that in due course.”

Any funding we may receive will not stretch to paying for planning or architecture specialists. However, we will need funding to produce our Neighbourhood Plan in a presentable form and for marketing and publicity before the referendum. In addition we can’t go on asking for free rooms and halls for meetings and there will be many other expenses. Camden will hold the funds (should we get them) and they’ll dole them out to us in chunks for specific purposes.

There were no questions about the current position on funding and the meeting thanked Caroline for the update.

7. Website

Caroline asked if anyone could provide help in designing and putting together a website for KTnF. There were no immediate volunteers. Everyone attending, particularly those representing local associations, was asked to think of any volunteers who might help and let Caroline know. (It was suggested that there might be some help on model websites on the Camden Council website).

8. Any other business

‘Kentish Town: Shaping the Future’ Camden’s Plan
Caroline Hill mentioned this document and possible confusion with the KTnF. It was agreed that it was a useful document with some good suggestions and that it should be looked at by the newly elected Committee at its first meeting.

Date of first Committee meeting

A date was proposed for the first meeting of the Committee of Thursday 2 February 2012 at 7.00PM at the offices of Transition Kentish Town, Fortress Road. Caroline would circulate confirmation and details to those elected to the Committee in due course.

Caroline Hill asked the newly elected Committee for permission to continue performing the role of Chair of KTnF until the first meeting and the Committee agreed to that proposition unanimously and thanked Caroline for all her work to date.

To cover the concerns outlined in section 2 above about the ‘triangle’ area it was suggested that Mary Cane should be co-opted to the KTnF pending discussions with the other Neighbourhood Forums setting up in the area.
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List of attendees from signed attendance sheets

Patsy Ainger Torriano Cottages Association
Tom Allen Transition Kentish Town
Cllr Meric Apak Town Councillor
Patsy Ainger Torriano Cottages Association
Cllr Meric Apak Town Councillor

Mary Cane

Cllr Meric Apak Town Councillor

Cllr Meric Apak Town Councillor

Rosemary Lewin Kelly Street RA
Belinda Low Home Start
Alan Morris Prince of Wales Road RA
John Nicholson Inkerman Area RA & KTRA
Hari Phillips Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum
Zoe Polya-Vity
David Prout
Lindsey Purchall Kentish Town Road Action
Patrick Quinn
Paul Seviour Inkerman Area RA
William Upton

Gill Wat Bartholomew Area RA
David Watkinson St Luke’s
John Woodcock Leighton Road Neighbourhood Assoc
Jenny Wright Leighton Road Neighbourhood Assoc
Norma Wynter

THE DRAFT CONSTITUTION OF KENTISHTOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM
01.02.12

1. The Area of the Forum

1.1 The Area of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum is subject to change by the process outlined below but at the outset effectively encompasses the area of Kentish Town as traditionally understood—i.e. from the north it runs from the east of Highgate Road, the east of Fortess Road and the west of Brecknock Road. Then, to the east of Kentish Town Road, it runs along the west of Brecknock Road and the west of Camden Road to the bottom of the triangle below Camden Road Station in the south. It then runs up along the east of Camden Road, across Kentish Town Road and along the north of Hawley Road. On the west of Kentish Town Road it runs from Clarence Way up along the railway lines, encompassing Regis Road and Arctic Street to join Highgate Road in the north.

1.2 A map of the area showing the boundaries is attached to this Constitution.
3.12 In order to have and demonstrate authority to speak and vote for the area Representative Local Associations and Local Organisations will be required to submit to The Forum Committee, annually and in writing, proof that they are representative and have a mandate for the views of their members. This proof will consist of a description of their membership and in what way they have such a mandate or legitimacy to speak for their areas, whether by consulting their members or, for example Kentish Town Road Action or the Kentish Town Business Association, being demonstrably a voice for other organisations or businesses.

4. Notices

4.1 Notices about General Meetings will be circulated and published 14 days before the meeting by a posting on the Kentish Town Library notice board as well as by e-mail to all registered members. If we can afford it, or it can be run as editorial content, we will announce meetings in the local press.

5. Finance

5.1 The Forum Committee will open a bank account. Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Treasurer will all be signatories for cheques that will require two signatures.

5.2 If it is possible that any liability could attach to members or officers of The Forum Committee we will investigate and arrange insurance or some sort of limited liability status.

6. Amendment of the Constitution including the Area Representative Local Associations

6.1 Amendment of the Constitution will be by a majority of The Forum Committee ratified by a majority at a General Meeting. This also applies to any winding up of Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum. Any balance left in any account held by The Forum Committee will, subject to statutory regulations, be distributed equally to the constituent local organisations.

6.2 If local people or organisations wish to change the Constitution, or General Policies and Objectives they should give due notice of this to the Secretary 21 days before the General Meeting so this proposal can be circulated.

6.3 The law as drafted says that Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum will be valid for five years. We will take whatever steps are needed to renew our existence.

7. Register of Committee Members’ Interests

There will be a Register of Committee Members’ Interests kept by the Secretary and open to inspection detailing any financial involvement or interests paid or unpaid in the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum Area.
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Representative Local Associations as at 01.01.2012

(Description: Within the Neighbourhood Forum Area: Residents Associations, Tenants Associations, Business Associations, Conservation Area Advisory Committees)

- Kentish Town Road Action – KTRA
- Kentish Town Business Association – KTBA
- Highgate Road Residents Association
- Leighton Road Neighbourhood Association – LRNA
- Bartholomew Area Residents Association - BARA
- Bartholomew and Kentish Town CAAC (Conservation Area Advisory Committee)
- Invermay Area Residents Association – IRAA
- Prince of Wales Residents Association – POWRA
- Kelly Street Residents Association – KSRA
- Castle Road Residents Association
- South Kentish Town CAAC
- Hadley Street Residents Association
- Torriano Cottages Residents Association
- Kennistoun & Willingham Tenants and Residents Association
- Clarence Way Estate Tenants and Residents Association

Local Organisations as at 01.01.2012

(Description: Within the Neighbourhood Forum Area: Individual local residents, community centres, environmental groups, individual local businesses, schools, churches, GP surgeries, Police, Fire Services etc)

- St Luke’s Church, Osney Crescent
- Transition Kentish Town
- Kentish Town Community Centre
- 55 Holmes Road
- Boma Garden Centre
- Earth Natural Foods

Individuals as at 01.01.2012

- Richard Burton
- Mereille Burton
- Richard Lansdown
- Sara Feilden
C. Environmentally we will press for the council and others to improve the local street environment, to respect green issues, sustainability, the preservation and improvement of green open spaces and playgrounds.

D. Economically we wish the area and especially the High Street to flourish and maintain a good range of shops with the emphasis on smaller enterprises rather than branches of national or multinational firms.

E. We will support the efforts of Kentish Town Road Action in opposing change of planning use that will spoil Kentish Town Road within the Forum area and we will press for continuing environmental improvements to the High Street. We will support local groups in dealing with licensing applications.

F. We wish to maintain and generate greater employment in the area and will work with appropriate organisations to that end.

G. We wish to emphasise social benefit, community links, services for young people, reducing crime, generating neighbourliness and companionship especially for older people or housebound people.

APPENDIX B

Website: We aim to establish a website on which the Constitution, notices of meetings and Minutes will be posted and discussions can take place.

Footnote: Rationale for the Constitution of the Forum Committee. The Constitution has been drafted to ensure that control of the Forum cannot be taken over by unrepresentative groups: eg. one particular interest group.

KENTISH TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM
DRAFT STATEMENT OF GENERAL POLICIES
AND OBJECTIVES
01. 01. 2012
To be put up for formal adoption at a General Meeting.

A. The Neighbourhood Plan will specify the preservation of existing heritage buildings and will identify vacant and underused sites such as areas for possible sensitive development that will, within the Local Development Framework, include affordable housing.

B. We will go into considerable detail about what we want and do not want. We will press for the preservation of land used for public purposes and services

APPENDIX 4

An MoU was signed between Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum and Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum on 27 August 2013. A copy of the signed memorandum can be seen opposite and overleaf.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
between
Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum
and
Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum

Background

1. This Memorandum of Understanding is between Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum ("KTNF") and Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum ("DPNF"). Both KTNF and DPNF are set up under the provisions of the Localism Act 2011, and each is developing a Neighbourhood Plan setting out its aims in respect of the development of its Neighbourhood Area in accordance with the provisions of that Act.

Areas of mutual interest

1. We both recognise the effect that any development on or near the boundary between our Neighbourhood Areas could have on both areas. We recognise the benefits of working together to ensure that any such development area (an "area of mutual interest") meets the aims set out in both our respective Neighbourhood Plans.

3. Examples of such areas of mutual interest include the following:
   • the land owned by J Murphy & Sons (the "Murphy Land");
   • Kentish Town Industrial Estate (accessed through Regis Road);
   • our mutual borders in Highgate Road, Ingestre Road and Acton Burghley School and any matters relating to La Swarp.

Collaborative working

4. This Memorandum records our intention to work in a collaborative way in respect of any areas of mutual interest.

5. We will seek to agree how we will work with each other and other bodies in respect of each area of mutual interest.

6. In working collaboratively, we will:
   • exchange relevant information and data;
   • collaborate on research and development;
   • generally pool our expertise and resources to avoid duplication.

APPENDIX 4
This note is to provide an idea of things to look out for and make note of during the walkabouts. It is not intended to be an exhaustive list or guide as we will all think of things and see things during the walkabout that we probably haven’t thought about. However it will be useful to have some consistency of approach so that we can combine the information from all the walkabouts into a record or audit of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum Area. Ultimately it will also feed into our Neighbourhood Plan. It is not intended to re-invent Conservation Area Statements or nationally Listed Buildings but complement them.

Suggested headings for things to note

- Empty and derelict sites
  eg tower block Section House next to the Police Station in Holmes Road

- Potential development sites
  eg single story garage blocks, car parks, spaces above public buildings eg above the Fire Station which are capable of being developed or having permission applied for to develop, other large spaces which may be in current commercial use but could in the future become vacant and have planning permission applied for.

- Empty shops

- Empty houses

- Disused public conveniences

- Buildings etc to be protected and considered for local listing
  - Communal or public art, including sculpture, murals, ‘Banksy’ style art
    eg sculptural group between Alpha Court and Monmouth House, Raglan Street; ‘Kentish Town’ painted sign at Kentish Town Station
  - Historic street furniture
    eg The canopy outside Kentish Town Station, Crimea war cannon street bollards between Raglan and Inkerman Streets

- ‘Public Realm’ issues
  - improvements to public space
  - improvements to pavement space, eg. Holmes Road
  - opportunities for increasing biodiversity, eg. street planting

- Hubs

We would also like to identify possible ‘hubs’ which distinguish Kentish Town from elsewhere eg Arts, Industrial, Media concentrations

REPORTS ON WALKABOUTS BY PARTICIPANTS

All following four walks written by one participant:
Kentish Town Walkabouts
Walk 1
Notes for this fascinating walk were compiled by the walk leader following review with the group at the end of the walk. However some additional comments are:
A beautiful walk. This was definitely the most attractive of all the walks. There is lots that has been done in this area that could offer inspiration to enhance the attractiveness of other locations. For example, blocking off of Lupton Street to create a pedestrian area. Could something like this not be
APPENDIX 5

done with the horrid rat run of Anglers Lane? !!! This could eliminate the major arterial flow whilst allowing gentle access by residents.

Some lovely public gardens have been created at the church of Lambourn Close and in Montpelier Gardens. These gardens are attractive, mysterious/secluded and welcoming rather than being off-putting and intimidating (compare for example the harsh metal railings, concrete and acres of tarmac at the public garden in Clarence Way. Perhaps these could also be another example for what could be done on the Raglan Estate to make that green land more inclusive, attractive and useable rather than just eradicating all green space under bucket loads of 'residential units'. Raised herb planters – good for the elderly. Vegetable planters – create local involvement.

This walk really emphasised the beauty of Kentish Town’s heritage aspects. It was shocking to see how the oldest houses have been so badly treated (Village House and xxx, both on Fortress Road) and how much disrepair is paid to our vanishing cobblestoned streets. Can we preserve them PLEASE!!!

Walk 2
Street: Grafton Road
Number: 55 East Fleet House
Comment: Change of use application on street lamp post from B1 (office) to C3 (residential – 9 units). App no 2012/1535/P but no date appears. Do we really want to see the loss of this historic commercial venue?
Comment: Holmes/ Grafton Road
Comment: Comment: A pedestrian access to Regis Road – there always used to be one and we were told it was closed by the owner of Regis Road who put up the locked gate a few years ago after a row with the council
Street: Arctic
Number: 5
Comment: A resident (Colin Keerans) voiced interest in our work/group. He lives with his brother who has lived there 60 years, and their mother before that. He was interested in the work of the Forum and wanted to be a participant.
Street: Holmes Road
Number: 78
Comment: A useless unused space outside this council building looks like a couple of wide steps – waste of space and ugly

Comment: Following the Magnet development there will be too high a proportion of student accommodation in this area
Comment: Wall of garden to council flats (opposite number 57/57a). This would enable all to enjoy a view of the gardens
Comment: Spur off Holmes Road is horrid, most uninviting – it needs attention. It used to have a pedestrian access through the gate which was always open and would probably have been a right of way. As with Arctic Street this was also locked by the owner of Regis Road. It should be reinstated.
Street: Holmes Road
Number: 41-43
Comment: The homeless hostel is not believed to be listed – should the façade not be preserved?
Street: Holmes Road
Number: 28
Comment: An empty council building. Alan Morris said it was sold to a private investor some years ago but it seems to be empty/ unused – why?
Street: Holmes Road
Number: 20 and 21
Comment: Two very attractive residential homes which are not believed to be listed – they should be preserved
Street: Raglan
Number: Catholic Junior School
Comment: The grass area next to their new development is not attractive – looks like it’s becoming a dustbin for the street
Street: Raglan
Number: Raglan estate
Comment: It’s a good idea to make better use of the space of the garden behind. Hammersmith development, which could conceivably be integrated even with the Raglan Estate redevelopment as they are contiguous sites. What is to stop some unsavoury council/private buyer from landing a sea of disgusting concrete over the whole site?
Street: Regis Road/ Kentish Town Road
Comment: This is a horrid junction which spoils the gateway to Kentish Town. It needs improvement to make it more attractive and pedestrian friendly. What a pity that the view over Hampstead Heath cannot be seen across the bridge.
Street: Highgate Road/ Kentish Town junction
Number: Bus stop
Comment: The bus stop outside the car wash is horrid – crowded with nowhere for people to stand whilst pedestrians are passing. It is not easy to see how queues can stand – must be a nightmare for elderly people waiting for a bus, especially when it’s full and when it’s raining and vehicles splash up water
Street: Alleyway next to Bull and Gate pub
Comment: An evident redevelopment site. The street has much unloved cobbles – what can we do to help preserve them in the event of rebuilding?
Street: Fortress Road/ Highgate Road
Number: Tally Ho apartments
Comment: A complete disgrace. This unsavoury builder has thrown up a very nasty cheap block and having no takers for his retail units, has not even finished the building which is boarded up with no lintels and cladding falling out of the ceiling line. This horror, looking like a derelict site, really spoils Kentish Town.
Street: Highgate Road
Number: Murphy’s Yards
Comment: The view from Highgate Studios car park is stunning. I have never before realised the extent of these industrial lands. If put together with Regis Road, we have a site the size of a residential city. It’s interesting that the proposed Forum area seems to cut across the Murphy’s site. However some greedy transactor of the future may well see the potential in flogging off a lot. Do we need to consider the future of these industrial lands as a whole?

Walk 3
All comments and ideas were efficiently collected by the walk leader who will supply Caroline H with the consolidated list.

Walk 4
Street: Prince of Wales Road
Number: Just west of entrance to flats
Comment: Appears to be a lamp post with no top part – is it suitable for removal?
Street: Clarence Way
Number: 57/57A
Comment: This converted pub has lost all its charm – it looks disgusting with a type of boarding at the windows. It looks like a temporary encampment. The current owner on Hartford Road (Number 57 – 1949 Bar) will, apparently house a bar – licence being applied for.
Street: Clarence Way
Number: Council Estate
Comment: Many of the facilities appear to be unused and/or not useful (eg crazy golf). There is lots of space within the estate which is already concrete or tarmac which could be built upon without destroying green space
Street: Kentish Town Road
Number: Back of old tube station
Comment: There is an ugly old roof (looks like it’s made of asbestos) easily viewed from Clarence Estate. I have investigated and it appears that it is part of the Cash Converter facility used for storage of their resale/buy back stock. This could be a prime
private development site of the future.
Street: Kelly
Number: dead ending
Comment: An unattractive end to such a delightful street. Can this not be improved by planting trees along the ending?
Street: Rochester Place and Rochester Mews
Comment: A great expanse of cobbles which are uncared for and have been badly treated by utilities digging up and replacing with tarmac/concrete patches and strips. They need to be refurbished and preserved.
Comment: There is an unused (sign)post outside the side of 59 in Rochester Mews that should be removed.
Street: Rochester Road
Number: 59
Comment: This is a very large and attractive Victorian (7) semi that has been converted into flats (bedsits?). The eastern half appears to be empty (and no lights seen on at 8pm on 24th April). The property is badly in need of repair and some of the plasterwork appears to be detaching. The property has a large back yard and with 3 garages. This would be a very large development site if the house was allowed to fall down. Is action needed to preserve/protect it?
Street: Rochester Street
Number: West side of 58
Comment: Strip of 4 garages. Cor! What a prime development site.
Street: Camden Road
Number: 79
Comment: This large council complex is on the market. It is a very large site. Can we do anything to ensure we get something in keeping with the area and its use rather than a huge faceless, scruffy blot? Is it worth listing any of the façade? Too late?
Street: Camden Road
Number: Under the bridge, west side just past station
Comment: Old water fountain is uncared for and looks derelict, filthy and out of place. Let’s have it reinstated/cleaned or removed
Street: Bonny Street
Number: 17-19
Comment: Broken stump of old lamp post has not been removed – it’s next to the new one. Let’s have it out.
Comment: Someone in the group came up with idea that Camden should be made a World Heritage Site (!!!) for Railways.
Street: Castle Place
Comment: WHAT a dump!
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Street Name: Falkland Place
Comments: The play area is well intentioned and anticipated but the edges of this space are unresolved and the houses at the Falkland Road end are very exposed.
Street Name: Fortess Road – Gtthrief Mews
Comments: A block of garages up for sale and a derelict workshop at the Raveley Street end suggest possibilities. Whatever happens here a number of properties depend on the mews for access. The south end to Raveley Street is most potent.
Street Name: Lupton Street, back of flats on south side by Brecknock Road
Comments: Where the Victorian terrace was demolished to make way for the flats it has been suggested that accommodation could be built over the small parking area.
Street Name: Montpelier Gardens
Comments: This large open space is vaguely defined and threatening because it is not 'suspended' by buildings directly opening on to it. The situation could be helped by the new créche but more buildings could helpfully encroach on the space. The protection to the old house windows is very hostile.
Street Name: Leighton Crescent gardens
Comments: One of the best spaces in the area – properly guarded by buildings around it.
Street Name: Willingham Close, Leighton Road
Comments: The main space to the south side of the main block is one of the better spaces in the area, but there is a sense of wasted space at the east end with the large triangular site. Modern cars make garages less usable and this space could have another use and could certainly take more than single storey buildings. The space on the north side of the main block has been suggested as possible new accommodation with parking below.
Street Name: Falkland Road garage site to the rear of properties fronting Lady Margaret Road
Comments: The garages are to be auctioned in early July. The planning brief is for residential accommodation and the site is suitable. Affordable housing would be valuable.

KENTISH TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM – WALKABOUT AREA 2
Street Name: Kentish Town Road
Premises: No 310
Comment:The car wash between No 310 Kentish Town Road and the entrance to Regis Road Business Park is inappropriate. This could be developed with a tall building, a mixture of retail and accommodation (including social housing flats). This would create a more suitable view approaching Highgate Road. The exposed end wall of No 310 onto which an advertisement is possibly planned, would be obscured.
Street Name: Kentish Town Road
Premises: Entrance to Regis Road Business Park
Comment: The sign listing the businesses on Regis Road Business Park is unsightly and inappropriate as an approach to the main High Street. This could be more suitably placed lower down and further into the entrance or on the existing lower wall and still be visible. Also a sign announcing Kentish Town could replace the present sign or, if the present sign remains, placed on the top of the sign.
Street Name: Leighton Road
Premises: No 18 Meeres Engineering Site
Comment: Meeres Engineering has lorries parked alongside a new rear================================================================================================OGLE engineering building. These lorries can be seen from Kentish Town Road and look unsightly. Some form of screening would give a better view up Leighton Road from Kentish Town Road especially from the Canopy.

Walk 3 Saturday 21st April 10 – 12
a) Bartholomew Road: Post on right hand side near junction with B. Villas not used. Remove. b) Tree in front of No 12 Daed. Couyld be removed. c) BT junction box outside 35-37 no front. Dangerous wires exposed d) Self seeded sycamores in front gardens Nos. 50 and 52 need to be removed. e) Bolland on top corner of B. Rd could be replaced as smashed. f)碘 Sandall Road entrance to railway could be reinstated. We liked the fact that there was a working phone box next to the School. g) Paving at corner of Torrano Avenue and Camden Road needs repair. h) Torrano Avenue is One Way. All thought this should be 2 Way. i) Hampshire Street: keep small industrial units and repair buildings. Concern about proposal to build flats 7 storeys high at No 3.
a. Corner block of Longmeadow was a rent office and could be converted to a flat.
J) We all agreed that the tree planting in the whole area was excellent.
k) Leighton Road has a wonderful Victorian post box.
I) Parking is missing on the corner of Leighton Road and Bartholomew Road. This was a concern throughout. Tarmac instead of paving and in some places filling in patches where there had been cobbles (see y)
 m) Bartholomew Road: No 109 used to be a Community Centre (one of our walkers worked there). Now light industry but is a perfect place for a new centre/youth club etc.
 n) Entrance from Busby Place to play could be regenerated. Ugly and unused land (but may because of possibility of anti social behaviour o) Small businesses on corners of B. Road and Gaisford Street; keep as business but clear up and re-design site
 p) Who owns the lock up next to the railway line and could it be demolished? The whole of that corner could be regenerated/redesigned to provide a view of Heath and the Church, which could also do with a scrub
 q) Gaisford Street: The grey building belonging to the national grid is hideous. Mural? Ihy?
r) There is a prime development site in Gaisford Street near the junction with Hammond Street
s) The District Housing office at 55 is vacant
 t) Hammond Street: replace the York stone; rebuild the wall along the side of the road
 u) Hammond Street, on the left, between Caversham and Islip St, is a garage/garden site. Is it used or useable?
v) Is 21 Islip Street vacant? It is falling down as it is not a shop.
w) Could the route to the Station be re-opened, alongside a new regeneration/development plan for the utterly wasted area at the back of the shops in Frideswide Place.
x) Garages in Wolsey Mews look unused. Could they be demolished and site utilised for new build/other.
y) Replace cobbles where tarmac used as infill.
z) Shoe repair shop is very good but needs some repair to first floor.

WALKABOUT AREA 4
1. I applaud your brave, imaginative and successful work getting the KTF up and running, well done. I’ll try to get to your next meeting, please keep me posted.
2. The walkabout I joined was well organised, well attended and useful. I was impressed by the group you had brought together - a very good mix - and the discussions we had.
3. Three points then:
A. I thought it was very good to note and consider individual buildings of some value and quality, for the various reasons we discussed. It’s so important to
identify and record key local buildings. I think your NP will help with this, and too the Local List - particularly I guess the opportunity to record local residents subjective appreciation (maybe for reasons of local or personal experience) in addition to more objective architectural reasons.

However I became very strongly aware walking round the Clarence Way estate, Hawley Road, and Camden Road, that actually one of the big challenges we face is the planning values (or lack of) we are working to.

EG we noted the huge, unnecessary width of the Clarence Way road by St Silas church - as I remember 3 or 4 lanes wide in addition to parked cars either side. Justified I’m sure when Clarence Way was a main through route - but it hasn’t been for I guess 50 years or more. So we’ve been cleaning this expanse, resurfacing it, signing it for all that time - when it’s hardly used by cars at all. Surely everyone would prefer - at the very least imaginative - wider pavements and a line or two of trees, or possibly even an extension of the open space there by 4 or 5 metres.

And EG we noted the two close sets of high railings on the round space. On the whole area, one just inside round the pitch - and the high, stark, prison-like lights. From Clarence Way and Castlehaven Road the space looks unfriendly and hostile - no wonder it’s empty much of the time. Again this whole space which has a designated use, and is laid out and managed functionally to deliver that use - just like the road mentioned just above - but without real thought or imagination. For me, such a large space which appears to be a wasted resource, it’s a negative influence. The lack of thought about what local residents and passers by may think says to me ‘you don’t matter’ and ‘we know best’.

I could go on with many other depressing examples. Near the corner of Hartland Road round the whole area, one just inside round the pitch - and the high, stark, prison-like lights. From Clarence Way and Castlehaven Road the space looks unfriendly and hostile - no wonder it’s empty much of the time. Again this whole space which has a designated use, and is laid out and managed functionally to deliver that use - just like the road mentioned just above - but without real thought or imagination. For me, such a large space which appears to be a wasted resource, it’s a negative influence. The lack of thought about what local residents and passers by may think says to me ‘you don’t matter’ and ‘we know best’.

I could go on with many other depressing examples. Near the corner of Hartland Road round the whole area, one just inside round the pitch - and the high, stark, prison-like lights. From Clarence Way and Castlehaven Road the space looks unfriendly and hostile - no wonder it’s empty much of the time. Again this whole space which has a designated use, and is laid out and managed functionally to deliver that use - just like the road mentioned just above - but without real thought or imagination. For me, such a large space which appears to be a wasted resource, it’s a negative influence. The lack of thought about what local residents and passers by may think says to me ‘you don’t matter’ and ‘we know best’.

I could go on with many other depressing examples. Near the corner of Hartland Road round the whole area, one just inside round the pitch - and the high, stark, prison-like lights. From Clarence Way and Castlehaven Road the space looks unfriendly and hostile - no wonder it’s empty much of the time. Again this whole space which has a designated use, and is laid out and managed functionally to deliver that use - just like the road mentioned just above - but without real thought or imagination. For me, such a large space which appears to be a wasted resource, it’s a negative influence. The lack of thought about what local residents and passers by may think says to me ‘you don’t matter’ and ‘we know best’. I could go on with many other depressing examples.

So I would make a plea that in identifying opportunities in the NP for improvement or development you also consider - and I hope recommend - a more collaborative, ‘co-productive’ approach to agreeing what should be built where. If the residents who use the storage or the garages or the carparks are involved in developing the ideas for their replacements we all benefit from their local knowledge, from addressing what people say they want rather than some notion of what they need, and we are more likely to enhance the neighbourhood as a result.

C. Having written above about Clarence Way (tho I have to end, as mentioned, by saying I’m not entirely sure whether Clarence Way residents look to Kentish Town for the ‘community forum’ or ‘neighbourhood’, or whether they look more to Hawley Wharf and Camden Town. I honestly don’t know the answer to this, but I press the one caveat for my strong support for KTF is whether your area should include Clarence Way or not.

The above makes some sense. Obviously I hope your NP development sessions will look at these issues, not just the buildings we like and want to keep, important tho’ that is. It’s useful for me to discuss I’m happy to.

WALK 4 WITH ALAN MORRIS
Prince of Wales Road
Broken and disused Phone Box next to Chapel to be removed.
27 and 29 POW Rd. Neglected Council Property
Healy Street
Needs cycle track
Un-needed paint on road gate
Outside 39 POW Rd
Dangerous tree roots
Corner of Clarence Way ‘Tipping the Admiral’
Good pub.
Lewis St. Heybridge Estate
To be redeveloped 5 stores. Camden has a scheme. Residents are being consulted
Corner of Hartland Rd
Growing Project done by the Born Again Christian Church on the corner
Harwood Grove.
An example of infill. Mixed opinion as to how good it was.
Harwood street
Development site. Widford Estate
Clarence way
Imitation Gas lights. Worth the money
Clarence Way Estate
Garages at Falkland Road
Could the gardens around the flats be used for a community garden? An idea that has been discussed.
Garages at Alpha Court, Raglan Street
What are they used for? Seem not to be in use.
Garages at Heybridge garages, Hadley Street
Could there be infill housing at the end of Kelly Street?
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1. Repairs of fencing following the events on the group's visit. "Bear and Bear" 1st half of the week, 12th June, 23rd April 2012.

2. By-pass shops are run by Integrated Marketing Limited. The group had not been aware of this before.

3. Conservation area does not need enlarging. Fact found in new study.

4. Major development is not required. House in the area is still very small.

5. Some houses are required in certain key locations to enable the development of a by-pass and a station.

6. New scheme for the development of a by-pass and a station.

7. New scheme for the development of a by-pass and a station.

8. New scheme for the development of a by-pass and a station.
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by all members of the group, such spaces as Montpelier Gardens, Legden Grove, as
I was thrilled to know that it was agreed could
make a wonderful garden for accommodating the
inhabiting bees and butterflies all around the extensive
group of gardens.
The access to the garden should be controlled by
the owners.

The group was very impressed by the gardens of
Willingham Close which had been
developed to compliment the fine set of period buildings.

It was agreed that the Forum should
develop good relations with the existing organisations who have
possessed planting
in the various open spaces.

An ownership audit should be considered.

The relationship with Camden is crucial and
needs careful handling.

New groups:

Gillian Young, Michelle Burton
William Upton
Liz Hill
Jeanette Marlow
Oscar Adams
Janet West

encouraged to work with planners.

Caroline will email the chairman with reports etc.,
include reports etc.,

details of members of groups.

KENTISH TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM – WALKABOUT
AREA 4
SATURDAY 21 APRIL 2.00 – 4.00 P.M.

Street Name | Prince of Wales
Premises Number | Junction with Anglers Lane
Comments | Because there is no left-turn at the end of Prince of Wales Road, a disproportionate amount of traffic travels north up Anglers Lane. Suggest reinstating left-turn from Prince of Wales or reversing the one-way on Anglers – this is a longstanding issue.

Street Name | Prince of Wales
Premises Number | Kentish Town West rail bridge
Comments | Opportunity to paint the bridge and perhaps use it for an artwork like the “Camden Town” sign at Camden Lock.

Street Name | Castle Road
Premises Number | Rail arches opposite Nos. 115 – 137
Comments | Need to retain small businesses like those occupying the rail arches, but there is some dead space in front of one of them which could be better used.

Street Name | Hadley Street
Premises Number | Lewis Street junction
Comments | Top deck of car park adjacent to block of flats already identified by Camden as potential development opportunity. However, may be better to consider whole site, i.e. the block behind, which also connects to lower-rise blocks beyond, i.e. may not be as simple as building on the car park site.

Street Name | Harmood Grove (?)
Premises Number | New development including hairdressing school
Comments | We wanted to record this as an example of a good new development which is attractively designed and makes good use of the site, also including a modern sculpture at the front.

Street Name | Clarence Way
Premises Number | Railway bridge by pub

Lindsey's & Rosemary's Walkabout record Route 4.doc
Author: Lindsey Purchall
**KENTISH TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM – WALKABOUT AREA 4**

**SATURDAY 21 APRIL 2.00 – 4.00 P.M.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Premises Number</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Way</td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently looks ugly with graffiti could be re-painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Way park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Opportunity to make better use of space; reduce coverage of paths and paving; introduce community garden/vegetable plots; move current hard-surface play area further to one side. Currently viewed as a dangerous space so need to encourage more local people in to use it and take ownership of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Way</td>
<td>Side of church opposite park</td>
<td>Garages below housing block and parking space in front - space could be used for housing units, and garages could be incorporated into block to form duplex apartments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Way</td>
<td>No. 41</td>
<td>7 garages with space in front - could be developed into 2-3 storey building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space in front of Torbay Court Nos. 29 - 36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently occupied by a Crazy Golf play area. There is also a large green space and children's playground at the side, so suggest this central section could be used to build a 2-storey double mews-style housing development which could run all the way down to Kentish Town Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street Name: Clarence Way
Premises Number: No. 1
Comments: Lindsey's & Rosemary's Walkabout record Route 4.docx2
Author: Lindsey Purchall
## Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum – Walkabout Area 4

**Saturday 21 April 2.00 – 4.00 P.M.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Premises Number</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kentish Town Road</td>
<td>Southern stretch below Cash Converters (old KT South station)</td>
<td>This area looks scruffy and unappealing – could it be smartened up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Mews</td>
<td>Rochester Road junction</td>
<td>Empty plot with car standing could be used for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Road</td>
<td>Carpet Right at Camden Road end</td>
<td>Large open frontage unused; could extend commercial premises down to main road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Road</td>
<td>Corner with St Pancras Way</td>
<td>Large industrial unit up for sale by Camden – we could take the opportunity to suggest a use for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Road station</td>
<td>Rail bridge</td>
<td>Disused half on north side – we could take the opportunity to suggest a use for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonny Street</td>
<td>The Stables</td>
<td>Consider local listing for this building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prowse Place</td>
<td>Warren Evans showroom and courtyard</td>
<td>We wanted to record this as an example of a good development which is attractively designed and makes good use of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lindsey's & Rosemary's Walkabout record Route 4.docx4  Author: Lindsey Purchall

Lindsey's & Rosemary's Walkabout record Route 4.docx5  Author: Lindsey Purchall
The following are transcribed from sometimes scribbled observation sheets:

**WALKABOUT AREA 1**

Canopy KT  
Space – view – orientation  
20 mph  
Village House 1A Leveton Place  
326-328 KT Rd empty shops  
Bollards  
Major Travel 28-34 Fortress Road  
5-7a Fortress Road, garages and houses  
Railey Mews 6A empty  
back of houses interesting, to be kept.  
Railey Mews 17, modern building  
Levertton St, top 2 houses Home Zone opposite  
Eleanor Palmer.  
Gottfried Mews off Railey St  
for Auction. Garages, old stables at end.  
Countess Road balustrades on roofs pretty. York stone paving.  
Montpelier Garden – Transition KT group.. House for special needs. No lighting.  
Lutheran Church.  
Leighton Crescent, Key garden. Wild life centre. Needs benches  
Asher Fry Ct build.  
Charlton Kings Road.  
Apollo Studios – old piano factory  
Ugly council paint white 20-8.  
99 Leighton Road empty.  
Willingham Close – contaminated land  
Maude Wilkes Close. Large field. Not allowed to be built on?  

**WALKABOUT AREA 2**  

Falkland Place  
Charming playground and area.  
Falkland Road etc  
Pollard trees – council should explain activity  
Railey Mews 6 & 6A  
Planning permission for basement and extra floor:  
hoping it will fall down  
Fortress Rd 102  
was library before library in KT Rd.  
Eleanor Palmer was a terminal (central) school 1880-  

**WALKABOUT AREA 3**  

Camden depot ugly!  
Raigan St – Camden redevelopement. Use of space  
big garages for sale for housing, back og building.  
Crown Place – privately owned.  
Art work: ?  
Playground no seat.  
KT police station Norman Shaw. Attractive building.  
View of heath from canopy, sense of space.  
Grafton Rd  
Map Studio café  
Wilkin St LHS  
Shoe factory  
Ryland Rd Industrial + Housing  
East Fleet House redone, engineering partnership  
trade  
Holmes Rd – French School  
2 Brewery  
Opening in bridge for road never built  
Lost route to Regis Road via Arctic Rd.  
not worth saving dark unsafe.  

**WALKABOUT AREA 2**  

Prince of Wales Road, Grafton Arms  
Local listing  
Ryland St, bottom  
Research into Delbanco Meyer & Co Ltd, Portland House  
55 Grafton Road  
Waterboard Building – East Fleet House  
List it.  
next to 2 Wilkin St (primitive ex Methodist Chapel),  
MVF Global  
Web Marketing 1 1/2 years. Changes over the time.  
To Let  
Holmes Rd  
opposite Magnet 74A West of Simone House  
Green area could be used for development.  
Holmes Rd, 61-63  
Furniture restorer. Façade needs restoring.  
Holmes Rd, Holmes Rd hostel 43  
Local listing  
Holmes Rd, 28  
Was Camden print shop. Empty 10 years  
Holmes Rd, 18-20  
Local listing, 1820-30s? Small houses, only ones remaining.  
Holmes Rd, Section House  
Empty  
Raglan St Garages  
for development  
Raglan St  
Back of Monmouth House/Alpha Court  
Lanscaping and pond need caring for. Allotments.  
Raglan St Day Centre  
Will close? And be used for what?  
York Mews  
Section House. Water tank – remove?  
York Mews  
Next to no.24. Small derelict tiny area.  
Regis Rd  
Broken pavement near entry. Water tank.  
Next to Fairfield Meadow parking triangle – develop – small houses.  
Kensit Town Rd  
Next to bridge. Car Wash – potential  
Tally Ho building – empty shops  
Fortess Rd  
5-7 Spring Cafe / FBB. Derelict, dangerous.  

**WALKABOUT AREA 2**  

Wilkin Street corner of Grafton Road  
Historic: should be non-designated Heritage Asset,  
ex-Waterboard building  
Corner of Holmes Rd and Willies Rd  
And garden – Dilp’s garden (tell Transition Project)  
(Residents Assoc – David Jockelson).  
Holmes Rd  
1873 College neoictogic French School  
Listed  
43 Holmes Rd Hostel  
For local listing  
Holmes Rd  
Original 1830? cottages  
For local listing  

**WALKABOUT AREA 2**  

310 Kentish Town Road  
The car wash between No 310 Kentish Town Road and  
the entrance to Regis Road Business Park is  
inappropriate. This could be developed with a tall  
building, a mixture of retail and accommodation  
(including social housing flats). This would create a  
more suitable view approaching Highgate Road.  
The exposed end wall of No 310 onto which an  
advertisement is possibly planned, would be obscured.  
Kensit Town Road: Entrance to Regis Road  
Business Park  
The sign listing the businesses on Regis Road  
Business Park is unsightly and inappropriate as an  
approach to the main High Street. This could be  
more suitably placed lower down and further into the  
entrance or on the existing lower wall and still be  
visible. Also a sign announcing Kentish Town could  
replace the present sign or, if the present sign  
remains, placed on the top of the sign.  
18 Leighton Road: Meeres Engineering Site  
Comment:  
Meeres Engineering has lorries parked along the  
wall overlooking the railway. The tops of these lorries  
can be seen from Kentish Town Road and look  
unsightly. Some form of screening would give a  
better view up Leighton Road from Kentish Town  
Road especially from the Canopy.  

**WALKABOUT AREA 3**  

Bartholomew Rd Jewsons  
Housing, employment  

Hampshire St Cosprop etc  
Planning appl. for residential x 7 above. Business  
below.  
Torriano Estate  
Possibility of private development for Council to  
make money.  
Bartholomew Rd / Oseyen Crescent corner  
Greenwood sheltered accommodation  
Need more sheltered acc.  
Gaisford St / Bartholomew Rd corner  
Electricity substation / Network Rail. Boarded up.  
garden centre use?  
Oseyen Crescent / Bath Rd corner  
H&M Van Hire & opposite  
possibly will go. Housing?  
Frideswide Place  
Development opportunity  
Woolsey Mews  
Could be developed  

**WALKABOUT AREA 3**  

[Numbers relate to maps on pp.47-49]  
1. Bartholomew Rd Jewsons  
Liked employment at rear of High Street, is good use of  
space & employment opportunities.  
2. St Andrew’s Greek Orthodox Church  
Beautiful building – it would be good to capitalise on  
the cultural heritage & open up the church to the  
community.  
Bartholomew Health Centre  
Great community asset but question (?) over opening  
hours  
4. Bartholomew Rd – transport  
Transport layout – 2 way traffic on narrow road.  
Good example for elsewhere.  
5. Bartholomew Rd – school at end (terminating vista)  
Low rise building at end of street – unpleasant view  
& poor use of land, also out of character.  
Unpleasant view – out of character.  
7. Camden Rd – garage  
New building a missed opportunity – poor use &  
appearance – leassons to be learnt  
10. Bartholomew Rd  
Infit housing – lessons to be learnt e.g. balconies,  
rubish.  
8. Camden Road – Park / skate park  
Good community asset.  
9. Pandlian Way – new housing development  
Helped to finance skate park but is a gated  
community and not in character with area.  
10. Torriano Estate  
Well kept & well designed buildings.  
10a. Torriano Estate  
Lots of car parking space & concrete. Opportunity for  
a community garden / green space?
17. Leighton Road – motorway barriers
Out of keeping with area, unnecessary?

18. Torriano Avenue – building
Shop / building frontage is very poor – steel front. Perhaps poor enforcement of conservation area requirements?

19. Torriano Cottages
Very attractive – village / rural feel.

20. Torriano Cottages
Story of residents who worked together to buy property – good neighbourhood & community spirit. Good example of collaborative working.

21. Isip Street – estate
How to engage people who live here in the process?

22. Frideswide Place – back exit from KT Station.
Late night exit from National Rail – very dangerous late at night. Possible to exit via bridge on Leighton Rd.

Hampshire Studio – Torriano Estate
What do they do? An interesting partner?

12. Peace Passage & shop on Brecknock Road
Where does Peace Passage go? Is it an opportunity for linkage?

13. Brecknock Rd – shutters
The shop has solid shutters. Is this permitted?

14. Brecknock Rd – mobile plant & cycle rack
Great feature, locally produced – attractive & functional.

15. Brecknock Rd shops
Nice selection of shops e.g. clothes & shoes – good compliment to Kentish Town High St. Opportunity for cross marketing?

16. Island in middle of road – junction of Brecknock / Leighton Rd
Dead space, could be better utilised? Perhaps cycle parking?

23-24. Rear of station
Needs improvement scheme – poor lighting, unattractive.

25-26. Rear of High Street
Solutions for a back street – had a few active frontages & visible signage from Isip Street. Good lighting at night.

27 Kentish Town High Street
Physical constraints on outside of station – is it appropriate place for vegetable stall? Better placed in square?

28. Kentish Town High Street – Square
Missed opportunity – cold, badly designed space. Possibility to create small marketplace?

29. Kentish Town Station
Great space – garden centre working together with station staff to have flowers in station improves station feel.

30 & 31. Kentish Town High Street

32. Kentish Town High Street
Cycling & traffic along High Street is unpleasant. Heavy traffic & road narrows in places which is dangerous for cyclists. Is there an alternative route for cyclists?

34-35. Back of Kentish Town Road
Back street project potential.

33. Bottom of Kentish Town Road
Improvements of all types needed – poor shop frontage, some vacant. Public space available for restaurants, use for meanwhile space?
APPENDIX 5

WALKABOUT AREA 3
Lower Kentish Town Rd
Get rid of all the commercial and residential to let signs.
Hammond St
?? also garden infill sites??
10 Gaisford St
Potential for 2 storey infill for huge unused garage.
and national grid building, build here?
Wolsey Mews – west side
2 story mews opportunity
Frideswide Place – west side
also possible 2 storey mews on garage sites.
Hampshire St – east side
Studies etc. Some potential for mixed use development.
Torriano Estate
Hampshire St frontage
?? potential for new social housing
Torriano Estate
back of estate
also development potential
Charlton King’s Rd
also development potential
Hargrave Place
Foamtec building – potential for reinstating a terrace of houses
Leighton Rd
south side east of Torriano Avenue
Very small house plot
Bartholomew Rd – Jewson’s builders merchant
?? housing
?? employment & housing
Bartholomew Rd – St Andrew’s Church Hall
keep in community use
Bartholomew Rd – between nos.2 and 4
Gap between houses? New house site?
Bartholomew Rd – Health Centre
keep in community use
12 Bartholomew Rd
example of modern development
Bartholomew Rd – 9-11 gap
possible small, low house.
Bartholomew Rd – 17-19-gap
possible house site
Bartholomew Rd – Camden School for Girls
could be new school building
Bartholomew Rd
?? could you fit houses between the e-w street terraces.
and railway corner sites – could you build here?
and “garden sites” of Russel Motor Co.
Lawford Rd – Village Store
keep in retail use
Junction of Sandall Rd and Bartholomew Rd
concrete roof tiles – good example of why we should insist on slate.
Sandall Rd
railway lines – opportunity to build raft over railway
lines for housing.
Bartholomew Rd – 17-19-gap
possible house site
Bartholomew Rd – Camden School for Girls
could be new school building
Bartholomew Rd
?? could you fit houses between the e-w street terraces.
and railway corner sites – could you build here?
and “garden sites” of Russel Motor Co.
Lawford Rd – Village Store
keep in retail use
Junction of Sandall Rd and Bartholomew Rd
concrete roof tiles – good example of why we should insist on slate.
Sandall Rd
railway lines – opportunity to build raft over railway

Hartland Rd
St Silas / Holy Trinity
suggested gates to keep passing children safe – with cycle path.
Clarence Way
Gap – who owns it?
Clarence Way – Garages
retain charcter of garages for an [?] street or workshops of cafes like an artisan’s street.
Farrier St, Clarence Way Estate
Open space is good. Please leave alone... or housing!
But if it’s private it probably won’t be affordable for people like me & if council can’t
expect to benefit.
Lewis St? Lorraine Court
Lock-ups at back of L Ct: I don’t feel we have any idea how people feel about having housing here.
Personally I feel it would become too cramped. I would rather see a community garden.
College Gardens
Needs some green fingers [?]?
Bonny St
Garages – workshop space / [?]?
Camden Rd
Public toilets
Cameron Bway [?]?
Tree-lined, market stalls
Rochester Mews next to Carpet Right
Business, low value. Functional building

WALKABOUT AREA 4
Castle Rd
Battles? Storage. Industrial Units.
Heybridge space
Car park and above – development for social housing
Clarence Way Playground
Possible allotment space & increase adult activity.
Close off Hartland Rd by Holy Trinity.
Clarence Way
Parking space next to church – make green & housing unit?
Clarence Way Estate
Change garages to residential + green. Full survey of all council properties to consider adding flats on top of building.
Clarence Hall
Redevelop + housing
Lewis St [Lorraine Court]
Lock-up + garage site. Redesign with lock-ups and housing.
24-28 Castlehaven
Lock-ups in pillared area
Camden Road station
Repair water fountain under station.
Jeffrey’s St
Garages – who owns them?
13-19 Bonny St
Who owns – possible development?
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SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING 23 APRIL 2012
Kentish Town Community Centre, Busby Place

Those attending
See Annex A for full list of those who signed the attendance sheets. The meeting room was full.

Apologies
See Annex B for a list of those who sent apologies

1. Welcome
Caroline Hill, Chair of KTnF, opened the meeting and welcomed all those groups and individuals attending the meeting. Thanks were given to Kentish Town Community Centre for providing the venue for the meeting in their newly renovated premises in Busby Place.

2. Vote to include North Kentish Town Association in the KTnF
The Chair explained the request made by the area represented by the North Kentish Town Association to be included within the boundaries of the KTnF. Following an open public meeting of local residents within the area covered by the North Kentish Town Association on 29 February 2012 which voted unanimously in favour of joining in with KTnF, a formal request was received on 14 March 2012 to join KTnF.

The KTnF Committee were recommending to the meeting that this request be supported.

In favour: 26 votes
Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 0 votes

It was therefore unanimously agreed that the North Kentish Town Association is included within the KTnF and the area covered by the KTnF included within the boundaries of the KTnF.

The Chair updated the meeting on the production of a map of the area which was generally endorsed by the meeting.

A lot of positive feedback had been received already and many at the meeting endorsed the success and thanked the Chair and others involved in organising and leading the walks. One member described the walkabouts as “incredibly enlightening” which was generally endorsed by the members.

A vote was taken to approve the amended Constitution. It was passed overwhelmingly with no (0) votes against and one (1) abstention.

In November 2011 the Chair had asked Camden to support our bid to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) for up to £20,000 funding for our Neighbourhood Forum. The Trust was pleased to announce that the KTnF had been successful in its bid and under the fifth wave of funding had received £20,000 in funding which would be held by Camden and from which we would be able to draw down. This placed us as a ‘front runner’. The funding is primarily to enable us to draw up a Neighbourhood Plan with the possibility that the funding would have to pay for any local referendum that might be required.

6. Walkabouts
The Chair provided a brief update on the highly successful series of walkabouts that had been held over the weekend of 21/22 April. Around 80 people had participated.

A lot of positive feedback had been received already and many at the meeting endorsed the success and thanked the Chair and others involved in organising and leading the walks. One member described the walkabouts as “incredibly enlightening” which was generally endorsed by the members.

A vote was taken to approve the amended Constitution. It was passed overwhelmingly with no (0) votes against and one (1) abstention.

A question was raised about the provisions of 3.12 which required Representative Local Organisations to be able to demonstrate that they are representative and have a mandate for the views of their members. The Committee are required to monitor this and advised that while it was an important issue it would be applied with a light touch to avoid creating any unnecessary burdens for the organisations.

5. Treasurer’s Report
The Treasurer provided an update on the position regarding the funding of the KTnF.
**Annex A**

List of attendees from signed attendance sheets

- Patsy Ainger Torriano Cottages Ass.
- Tom Allen KTnF Committee
- Osman Amin Somali Youth Organisation
- Marion Andrew
- John Banks Bartholomew Area RA
- Hilary Barnes KTnF Advisor
- Jonathan Bowman
- Councillor Paul Braithwaite
- Cantelowes Councillor
- Alice Brown KTnF Advisor
- Mireille Burton
- Richard Burton KTnF Advisor
- Alan Cane BLOC
- Mary Cane KTnF Committee
- David Cook North Kentish Town Ass.
- Cathy Crawford Kentish Town Community Centre Trustee
- Peter Cuming Friends of Talacre Town Green
- Dr Karen Dorn College Lane
- Suman Fernando BLOC
- Frances Fernandez BLOC
- Isky Gordon KTnF Committee
- Celia Goreham KTnF Committee
- David Goreham Biscotswalk & Kentish Town CAAC
- John Grayson KTnF Committee
- John Hauxwell North Kentish

**Annex B**

List of apologies

- Councillor Meric Apak
- Councillor Pat Callaghan
- Sara Fielden
- Councillor Jenny Headlam-Wells

**FIRST PUBLIC SESSION**

- Date: 03 July 2012 (18:30 – 20:45)
- Venue: St. Luke’s, Osney Crescent, NW5 2AT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Led by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>Arrival, coffee and tea, exhibition viewing and completing interactive exercise facilitated by The Prince’s Foundation</td>
<td>KTnF / The Prince’s Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aspirations – what are we working towards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ideas gathering – achieve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ving the aspirations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19:15</td>
<td>Welcome and introduction by Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum (KTnF)</td>
<td>C Hill, KTnF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KTnF’s objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work to date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why The Prince’s Foundation was asked to help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19:20</td>
<td>Introduction by The Prince’s Foundation</td>
<td>B Bolgar, The Prince’s Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who we are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brief neighbourhood planning and CLG programme overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed event programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19:30</td>
<td>Q&amp;A</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>Informal discussion and completing interactive exercise facilitated by The Prince’s Foundation (for latecomers)</td>
<td>KTnF / The Prince’s Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20:45</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

Date: 04 July 2012 (08:45 - 17:00)
Venue: St. Luke’s, Osney Crescent, NW5 2AT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Led by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>08:45</td>
<td>Arrival, coffee and tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Welcome and introduction by KTNF - Objectives and issues</td>
<td>C Hill, KTNF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>09:05</td>
<td>Presentation from The Prince’s Foundation - Process and principles</td>
<td>B Bolgar, The Prince’s Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>09:20</td>
<td>Technical presentations - History of the area</td>
<td>T Allen, Camden Archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J Walsh &amp; K Christoforou, LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Camden [LBC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M Furness, LBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J Fitcher, LBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I Iseie, SYDRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Q &amp; A - The Prince’s Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10:50</td>
<td>Coffee / tea break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Group workshop (themed groups) - Identify strategies that can make the most impact</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How can strategies together contribute to collective identity of KT?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Groups facilitated by The Prince’s Foundation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>J Dales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment (other than High Street)</td>
<td>J Anstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing and community facilities incl young and elderly people</td>
<td>B Savic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>B Bolgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental sustainability / green space / public realm (other than High Street)</td>
<td>C Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>Group feedback</td>
<td>A Koch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>Group workshop (themed groups) - Translating strategies into projects and initiatives</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Generating spatial options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group facilitated by The Prince’s Foundation, as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Coffee / tea break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>Group workshop continues (theme-based groups) As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Group work feedback and plenary discussion As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16:50</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Close of day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERNAL DESIGN WORKSHOP
(attended by a number of KTNF Steering Group members)

Date: 05 July 2012 (09:00 – 18:00)
Venue: St. Luke’s, Osney Crescent, NW5 2AT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Led by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Team debrief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Feedback collation and design session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Lunch and review with KTNF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Feedback collation and design session continues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Finalising presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>Presentation set up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECOND PUBLIC SESSION

Date: 05 July 2012 (18:45 - 20:30)
Venue: St. Luke’s, Osney Crescent, NW5 2AT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Led by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18:45</td>
<td>Arrival, coffee and tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>Welcome and introduction by KTNF</td>
<td>John Nicholson, KTNF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19:10</td>
<td>Presentation from The Prince’s Foundation including Q&amp;As</td>
<td>The Prince’s Foundation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outputs of the neighbourhood engagement process to date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Next steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20:30</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>