

Appendix IV – exchange of emails between KSRA and KS

Y Alexandre

Sun, Dec 10, 2017 at 2:32 PM

Dear Michael

I wish to reinforce the points outlined by Mariela in her note. We have all worked for months on the SPD and then with Auriens, keeping in mind the objectives of our mandate which are the protection of the historical nature and the integrity of the Square and the protection of the residents' amenity. We have also engaged in a constructive dialogue with the developer with a view to expanding the community use of the facility. Even though we acknowledge that we all have different personal opinions, we feel that our role is not to take any political or social stance, I believe there are other forums for this, shouldn't it be the same for the Kensington Society?

The project as it stands presently has the support from the Kensington Residents Association. It is a vast improvement from what was Heythrop college on many points including community use and refurbishment of heritage assets and also from the initial project presented by the developer. It is in line with the SPD, our reference for our discussion, and is broadly in line with the strict objectives of Kensington Square residents.

We have not discussed any matters related to the development and construction period, which will be crucial to all of us. A very coordinated approach with VRARA will be important, and I hope it will be possible.

But frankly, I am hard pressed to see why we should comment on the marketing strategy of the developer, even though like you, I would have preferred the former owner to consult more with us before the sale process, but it did not happen, optimizing valuation was their only motive, so be it.

I am available to discuss it at your convenience

Kind regards

Yves Alexandre

Sent from my iPad

On 10 Dec 2017, at 13:43, M Pissioti wrote:

Dear Michael,

given the vast majority of the residents and immediate neighbours are highly supportive of this project and use, the members of the Kensington Square Residents Association are surprised to hear your comments below.

Frederique and I asked for a meeting with you and Amanda to discuss our views and a coordinated approach for Kensington Society together with the residents association, during which Amanda insisted affordable housing was required as CK1 had to be applied given the change in use and where we explained there was no change of use happening. Amanda then sent me an apology after our meeting, as in reading the SPD she must have realised no change of use is proposed and she admitted that there was no requirement for affordable housing. The developer did not even have to put a GP facility onsite, but they are doing so.

Current use, which we have discussed at length and is also explained clearly in the SPD is **C2 Residential institutions**. There is a small D1 on the site ([24 Kensington Square](#)). For the avoidance of doubt schools/education would fall under D1 as per the classifications (**D1 Non-residential institutions** - Clinics, health centres, crèches, day nurseries, day centres, schools, art galleries (other than for sale or hire), museums, libraries, halls, places of worship, church halls,