

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4642/P	Jeffrey Gold	24/11/2024 15:52:21	OBJ	<p>Further to the objection already lodged I wish to make some further points: -</p> <p>The first is that as with the planning application submitted for the hospital's Pears Building there is no basement impact assessment so there is no assessment of possible damage to neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>It is clear from the submission already lodged by Andrea Taylor, the head of the Hampstead Hill Nursery School, that the construction of the Pears Building has led to significant issues for the St. Stephens estate some of which are ongoing. This project is likely to worsen them.</p> <p>The hospital has submitted an application that involves significant foundation works including earthworks, piling, new foundations, erection of supporting pillars, etc. etc.. and that, once again, tries to ignore the potential for damage to neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>Neighbouring buildings must be safeguarded especially St Stephens and the Hampstead Hill Nursery School but also properties on the other side of Pond Street many of which are also listed and in a conservation area.</p> <p>A basement impact assessment should therefore be mandatory.</p> <p>Secondly, and as with the construction of the Pears Building, the impact on the neighbourhood will be huge over a sustained period of time. The application states that:</p> <p>“Because of the nature of the works and their location, it is our opinion that any logistical solution will undoubtedly severely disrupt the hospital's day to day activities whilst they are ongoing”</p> <p>The applicant omits that the same applies to Pond Street and those who use it and live there.</p> <p>The construction of the Pears Building has already led to significant traffic congestion and pollution issues that neither the hospital nor L B Camden have been able to solve.</p> <p>This project if it proceeds as planned will significantly magnify those problems. Entrance to the existing lower car park is to be blocked off thus losing approximately half of the existing on-site public parking provision. The lower car park cannot be accessed from the upper car park so where are these cars to park?</p> <p>The only possible site access is from the Pond Street entrance to the hospital which is small and tight for large vehicles, the knock-on effect on Pond Street and therefore on the wider area will be particularly significant.</p> <p>This will be much worse if cars are still allowed to access the hospital forecourt to drop off and collect those using the main entrance to the hospital as tailbacks already arise. If such access is not to be allowed how are visitors to access the main entrance? And a number of parking spaces at the front of the hospital will also be lost – these are currently devoted to the disabled and the particularly disadvantaged - what alternative provision will there be for these visitors?</p> <p>It is, therefore, submitted that these problems are of sufficient significance and magnitude that they must be addressed at this time i.e. at the planning stage and not “kicked down the road”.</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**                    **Comment:**    **Response:**

Thirdly, whilst there has been some limited public consultation we were not expecting the submission of this application so soon as there are still certain technical issues for which solutions are still sought. In addition, it appears that neither the Hampstead Hill Nursery School nor St. Stephens have been consulted. Neither are mentioned in the Statement of Community Involvement. This cannot be right. They are the nearest neighbours and those who will, once again be the badly effected. This cannot be right.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4642/P	Audrey Mandela	24/11/2024 16:52:45	OBJ	<p data-bbox="875 130 1809 153"><b>Objection to Royal Free Hospital Planning Application - 2024/4642/P, Vascular Theatres</b></p> <p data-bbox="875 164 2058 336">I write as the Chair of the Hampstead Hill Gardens Residents' Association. We have reviewed the planning application documents for the Royal Free Hospital's new vascular theatres and we have serious concerns regarding increased traffic congestion and the related effect of worsening air quality that will be caused by this project. We support the expansion of the hospital's facilities but believe the current plans will very likely have a negative impact on near neighbours, including our residents. We therefore object to the application in its current form.</p> <p data-bbox="875 347 2058 427">As you will know, Pond Street is frequently blocked with vehicles attempting to enter or leave the hospital entrance. Many vehicles use our road as a rat run to try to avoid waiting. This regularly brings the congestion and air pollution from vehicles that are stuck in traffic into our road.</p> <p data-bbox="875 469 2058 549">We are also plagued by Uber and other drivers who park in our road waiting to pick up patients using the hospital. Often these vehicles leave their engines running, even when asked politely to switch them off. They also frequently leave behind rubbish and other items.</p> <p data-bbox="875 590 2058 644">We are concerned that the proposed works will only add to this unacceptable situation. The application's transport report agrees: it anticipates that the development will result in additional car trips.</p> <p data-bbox="875 686 2058 798">You will be aware that the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum has conducted regular air quality surveys in our area. Although much of Hampstead has seen an improvement in air quality, air quality has actually deteriorated around the Hospital, Pond Street, and South End Green. We are extremely concerned that this project will make this situation even worse.</p> <p data-bbox="875 839 2058 1101">Along with other local residents' associations the Hampstead Hill Gardens Residents' Association has been in discussions with the Royal Free Hospital regarding traffic congestion problems caused by the lack of sufficient parking and inadequate traffic management at the Hospital. This issue has also been raised numerous times with Camden's traffic management team and with TfL. Although the RFH proposed several changes to traffic patterns and the use of wardens within the hospital grounds so far there has been little visible improvement. A recent study by Evoke Consultants proposed shifting the queue for the car park and creating a mini-roundabout to improve traffic flow. Unfortunately, the only viable space for this solution is the area that, under the proposed planning application, would be used for the supporting infrastructure for the vascular theatres.</p> <p data-bbox="875 1142 2058 1222">We ask that the Royal Free Hospital reconsider its plan for the siting of the vascular theatres and to use the proposed space as has been suggested in the Hospital's own traffic study: to attempt to improve the traffic situation. As it stands the plan is very likely to make the situation worse.</p> <p data-bbox="875 1264 994 1286">Thank you,</p> <p data-bbox="875 1327 1456 1375">Audrey Mandela Chair, Hampstead Hill Gardens Residents' Association</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4642/P	Tanya Rebuck	24/11/2024 23:12:42	COMMNT	<p>While it is encouraging to see the hospital expanding vascular services to help cut waiting lists, the proposed location for the two new vascular theatres on stilts above the access to the heart attack unit and lower car park is short sighted overdevelopment and should be re-thought.</p>

Our grounds for objecting to the current proposals are:

1. Overdevelopment, particularly while traffic congestion and poor air quality remain unresolved
2. Front entrance traffic congestion and car park access/ queueing
3. Restricted pedestrian access to and from the lower car park
4. Loss of light
5. Design appearance
6. Lack of consultation
7. Lack of safeguards for neighbouring properties

Below I outline each of these in turn:

1. Overdevelopment, particularly while traffic congestion and poor air quality remain unresolved  
For well over a decade, local residents have pressed the Hospital to publish its master plan for the Royal Free Hospital site, always being told that it was being worked on but there was a delay. The plan would enable everyone to see what the hospital might look like in the future. There has never been any indication that the hospital was considering filling in the gap between the main building and the Pears Building.

This new proposal will only add to and worsen the already existing serious traffic congestion and pollution. This is confirmed in the applicant's transport report which states "We anticipate that the proposed development will generate an average 32-way car trips in an hour. This equates to a demand of approximately two vehicles at any given time over and above the existing demand."

According to the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum's recent five yearly air quality survey, after the completion of Pears Building, Pond Street and South End Road are the only two locations in NW3 where air quality has deteriorated over the past five years. The applicant admits that air quality on the site and in Pond Street is far worse than it should be. Their air quality report concludes that the proposed development "... will not lead to further deterioration of existing poor air quality".

In their planning statement the applicant argues that "...there is a critical and fundamental need to deliver the proposed development ... ". But this is no justification at all for why the new theatres have to be in the location they propose.

This latest proposal constitutes overdevelopment, particularly because of the adverse effect it will have on the neighbourhood and while the existing traffic congestion and poor air quality remain un-addressed.

2. Front entrance traffic congestion and car park access (with the lost opportunity to implement the most promising solution identified by the hospital's own traffic consultants)  
Traffic congestion and pollution in Pond Street have undoubtedly worsened since the Pears Building was constructed. Traffic jams, congestion and cars honking their horns are now daily events in Pond Street. Prior to the Pears Building they were a rarity. Neighbours warned at the time that almost halving the number of parking spaces and the loss of the slip road beside the old car park which enabled traffic to exit via Rowland Hill Street would lead to congestion problems and we have been proved right.

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

There is no indication at present that the Hospital authorities or the London Borough of Camden have any idea how to solve the current problems.

The Hospital acknowledges that traffic congestion is a problem and recently commissioned Evoke Consultants to propose options for re-designing the Pond Street entrance road layout. Evoke reported in December 2023 and gave several options. The most promising solution for re-sighting the car park queue is where the hospital now proposes to put the support stilts for the new theatres. Re-siting the queue would then allow space for a new mini roundabout to facilitate faster entry and exit from the site.

Locating the new theatres as proposed would be a huge missed opportunity for what is likely to be the only way of alleviating traffic congestion and pollution. The hospital should properly resolve the existing traffic congestion and circulation difficulties before contemplating any further infill construction on the Pond Street side.

### 3. Restricted pedestrian access to and from the lower car park

Locating the support pillars in the middle of the pavement will unacceptably narrow pedestrian access to and from the lower car park and prevent wheelchair users from safely navigating their way to the main entrance.

### 4. Loss of light

Before the Pears Building, neighbours living on the other side of Pond Street had a view of the skyline above the old hospital car park and the gardens. Now the only light comes from the gap between the two buildings. The proposed new theatres will significantly narrow the gap and reduce available light. It will therefore result in considerable loss of light and amenity to the neighbours on the other side of Pond Street.

One thing which has emerged is that the proposed new structure is to have two floors one of which is to be unoccupied. There can be no justification for detrimentally affecting neighbours any more than is absolutely necessary, which would be less if the building was only one storey.

### 5. Design appearance

An eminent journalist once said that the Royal Free had the best views in Hampstead as it was the only building that did not have a view of the Royal Free. The proposed building would only extend and enlarge the current eyesore.

The buildings on the other side of Pond Street are within a conservation area and many are listed. This application is detrimental their setting.

### 6. Lack of consultation

There has been little consultation by the Hospital which has not really spelt out the plans and inconvenience to neighbours. There should be considerably more consultation before any planning application is submitted and/or considered by LB Camden.

### 7. Lack of safeguards for neighbouring properties

When the Pears building was constructed, there was a considerable period of disruption with noise and dust being created which greatly inconvenienced neighbouring properties not least Hampstead Hill Nursery School and St. Stephens (former) church. There were also very reasonable fears that there would be structural

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

damage not only to these buildings but also to the buildings on the other side of Pond Street.

The proposed new building will be on stilts which will entail extensive digging and piling and will cause considerable disturbance both inside the hospital and to all neighbouring properties. There does not appear to be any assessment indicating the likely impact on those properties. Adequate safeguards for these properties should be in place before any application is granted.

There is an additional important practical factor. When a crane is required to lift heavy equipment to and from the hospital roof, our understanding is that the only place where there is sufficient loadbearing capacity is the site of the proposed new building. Neighbouring properties are entitled to be concerned that future crane movements could give rise to damage to their properties. Adequate safeguards must be in place not only to protect neighbouring properties but also the hospital and its users.

Summary

While we welcome the Hospital's contribution to reducing waiting lists for essential surgery, this proposal is hasty and poorly thought through.

It constitutes overdevelopment, particularly because of the adverse effect it will have on the neighbourhood and while existing traffic congestion and poor air quality remain un-addressed.

The hospital should properly resolve the existing traffic congestion and circulation difficulties before contemplating any further infill construction on the Pond Street side.

Tanya Rebuck owner of Flat B 5 Pond St, and PoA of Maureen Rebuck Freeholder 5 Pond ST

---