



West Kentish Town Estate planning application

ref. 2025/2667/P

DEPUTATION from Queens Crescent Neighbourhood Forum

We are very disappointed that neither the applicant nor the planners have responded to our feedback given on this planning application. There has been no attempt to engage with people who live in the area who are worried about the impact of this massive over-development. We were promised by members and officers that the scheme would only get permission if it met planning policy. The fact that officers are recommending approval for this proposal shows that this is not the case.

The development will recreate the slum conditions that existed before the estate was built, by building on the very footprint of the original Victorian street pattern that had caused these, ie. homes built too close together with not enough natural light. However it will be worse, as instead of the original 3 storey houses the same footprint has courtyard blocks up to 10 storeys high and towers up to 16 storeys (see image at the end of this document).

We would like to highlight ways in which the scheme is not compliant with planning policy:

Context: It does not meet the requirements of Local Plan policy D1, which requires respect of the surrounding context. The applicant has concealed the impact of the proposals on the surrounding homes by failing to produce truthful images and drawings. QCNF has made a complaint to RIBA about the professional conduct of the architect.

Daylight: 544 existing windows overlooking the development (27% of the total) will have daylight reduced below the minimum acceptable level, ie. below 15% Vertical Sky Component. This is about not meeting BRE best practice; we are talking about not meeting the bare minimum as established through planning appeal precedent.

Number of affordable homes: The total number of homes to be built is 856. Currently there are 316. 263 council homes will be replaced. 63 of the 593 additional homes will be for social rent (10.6%). There are no homes for intermediate rent.

Affordable housing mix: Only 6% of affordable homes are 4-bed; it should be 20%.

Public open space: The provision of POS is 2,317m² under what it should be. The applicant tried to fudge the figures by including the area of the pavements around the estate, but we called them out.

Play Space: There is inadequate play space on-site. Yet again Talacre is being used as an alternative for what should be provided as part of the development.

Height: The proposal is 12m higher than the Camden Building Heights Study permits.

In addition, we are also very concerned about the following:

Number of unaffordable homes and effect on cost of housing:

530 of the non-replacement homes will be unaffordable. This, combined with similar unaffordable homes that the Council plans to build at Bacton and Wendling Estates will drive up the average cost of housing in the area.

Community facilities: The proposal does not provide any community space or affordable workspace. The area has been stripped of both over the last 25 years, including the sale of Lyndhurst Hall, which was meant to be safeguarded for community use. Only 0.3% of the floor space is non-residential.

Cumulative impact: The impact of this scheme alongside developments planned at Wendling, Bacton, Regis Road and the Murphy site has not been considered. It will put additional strain on public services including roads, public transport and health services. But school populations will continue to decline owing to lack of provision for families.

After Phase 1 of the development is delivered, the Council will probably look for a private developer to deliver the rest of the scheme. It looks like this is already being prepared as since the application was submitted in July, the parameter plans showing the height of the outline masterplan scheme has been increased by up to 3m.

We call on the Planning Committee to refuse this application.

