

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5549/P	William Hawkins	5 Ingestre Road London NW5 1UX	21/04/2025 11:34:18	OBJNOT	<p>I write to object to the proposed variation of condition 11, which would effectively remove the obligation to provide on-site affordable housing at the Former Railway Club Development Site, College Lane, NW5 1BJ.</p> <p>The original planning permission clearly secured on-site affordable housing provision, particularly through Block 3. It is unacceptable that the applicant - having failed to deliver this affordable housing for over two decades - now seeks to absolve themselves of this obligation by offering a payment in lieu. Affordable housing is urgently needed in Camden and must be delivered on-site as originally intended.</p> <p>The viability arguments now advanced by the applicant are not compelling. Cost pressures, building regulation changes, and market fluctuations are normal risks in development, not exceptional circumstances. Permitting a financial contribution instead of real affordable homes would seriously undermine Camden's housing policies and the public interest.</p> <p>I also strongly object to the way that "green" measures - specifically, the introduction of air source heat pumps (ASHPs) - are being used to justify further physical alterations to the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These proposals will increase the height and massing of the buildings, particularly impacting neighbouring properties such as the council-owned social housing at Hambrook and Calver Courts. - The new plant structures will reduce residential amenity by adding visual bulk, overshadowing, and noise potential. - Retrofitting new environmental measures at this late stage does not justify worsening the amenity for existing residents, nor does it rectify the long-standing failure to complete the development properly. <p>We are concerned that these sustainability measures are being used as a form of "greenwashing" to mask or excuse other detrimental impacts, rather than genuinely improving the scheme as a whole.</p> <p>Finally, we urge both Camden Council and the developer to prioritise completing the project swiftly - in accordance with the original consent and commitments -without further delay or dilution of the planning obligations. The community has waited long enough for this development to be completed properly and responsibly.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affordable housing must be delivered on-site, not replaced with a payment. - No further harm should be caused to neighbours under the pretext of "environmental upgrades." - The project should be completed urgently and in line with the original spirit and intent of the planning permission. <p>Yours sincerely, William Hawkins</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5549/P	Peter W Thomas	124 Highgate Road [Entrance on Little Green Street] NW5 1PB NW5 1PB	21/04/2025 08:22:16	COMMNT	<p>This is a really shocking submission.</p> <p>These people have left much-needed affordable housing criminally unfinished since the rest of the properties were sold, and inhabited. These are now proposed to be converted and to have a massive plant area.</p> <p>Has the affordable housing need reduced in the period since completion - No! If this goes through, it makes a mockery of planning and local engagement, it greenlights non-completion as a means of breaking a section 106 agreement and the original permission.</p> <p>I object so completely I am at a loss for further words to describe.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5549/P	Maria Ingold	23 College Lane London NW5 1BJ	21/04/2025 10:53:30	OBJ	<p>The developers have consistently shown themselves to be unfair (e.g. in their varying treatment of individuals and communities), untrustworthy (e.g. they had up a considerate developers sign when it had lapsed and they were not compliant), and unable to follow rules (e.g. the site elevation is significantly higher than planned, causing lack of light to College Lane).</p> <p>The developers caused structural and sonic damage to all surrounding areas during development—cracks ranged from hairline to wider than fingers. While apparently a couple were able to get compensation, most of us have had to pay out of our own pockets for their ineptitude, inconsideration, incompetence, and outright attitude of prioritising their financial interests over everything and everyone, and continually being allowed to get away with it by a weak Camden. Disgraceful.</p> <p>Issues with this raised so far:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All affected parties should have been clearly notified (e.g. Hambrook Court has said it was not). 2. Loss of affordable housing. This was the entire premise. This was the one condition. They don't care about promises, only money (greed and sloth). 3. Access issues: Prior damage to Little Green Street properties which lack foundations. Unsafe use of a single lane trapping cars and people, similar for Ingestre access. 4. Noise pollution from heat pumps. We relish the quiet here. Any additional noise would be disruptive to mental health and may adversely affect property values. Properties here are too close to each other for this to be viable. 5. Elevation. The site is already built on land built up significantly higher than the approved elevation. This has led to more loss of light than the original planning application. This new application proposes to add even more height above the original proposal. This appears to equate to closing in on an extra storey in height above original plans which is unacceptable. <p>The developers need to learn respect, responsibility, and accountability. Honour affordable housing, do not add noise to the community, stop adding height and creating loss of light. I object to all planning changes and reject this entire submission.</p> <p>Regards.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5549/P	Mary Dickins	70B Lady Somerset Road Kentish Town London	19/04/2025 13:01:33	COMMNT	<p>We are residents whose garden back on to this development. Our concerns relate to the overlooking of our gardens in relation to modifications and adjustments of the blocks concerned and noise that might be generated by the heat pumps. It is very difficult for the lay person to ascertain exactly what is proposed as the application is couched in such obfuscating terms. Neighbours have been given assurances by John Nichols that we will not be further overlooked and the impact of heat pumps will be minimal but it is worth reiterating these concerns here as this particular developer has proved so slippery in the past.</p> <p>Another concern relates to the removal of the Affordable Housing quota in order to update the blocks to market rent. These blocks were supposed to be affordable housing but have been deliberately left idle and unfinished since the estate was completed in 2017. One has to ask why in a time of great housing need this developer is being allowed to wriggle out of its social/affordable housing requirement and we object most strongly to this proposal on that basis.</p>
2024/5549/P	Alison Duker	16 College Lane	21/04/2025 14:28:02	OBJ	<p>I object wholly to this application.</p> <p>I am a resident of College Lane & have witnessed how poorly this development company has behaved over the last decade. It is criminal that the building works have been left without completion for nearly a decade. And to be requesting a negotiation on the terms of the social housing requirement, is unacceptable.</p> <p>Permitting a financial contribution instead of real affordable homes would seriously undermine Camden's housing policies and the public interest.</p> <p>This development should be completed immediately without renegotiation that will only benefit the developer. Camden should put the legal measures in place to ensure that the development is completed in line with the previously agreed planning, and this needs to be actioned this year.</p> <p>The owners / leaseholders have been put through enough. It is absolutely outrageous that this has been allowed to drift & remain incomplete.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5549/P	Matthew Gibson	7 Little Green Street	18/04/2025 13:39:31	COMMNT	<p>As a long-term resident of Little Green Street I am one of many in the area whose lives have been severely disrupted by the debacle of the Wiblin development. This has been going on since at least 2003 and I object in the strongest possible terms to this fresh application. How much longer are we supposed to upend our lives to maximise profits for these developers? The years of building work were intolerable - LGS was used as the primary access route and every premises suffered (the majority are Grade II listed). Promises to make good on the houses (even to the level of a basic cleaning of doors and windows) were never fulfilled. We suffered from years of heavy industrial traffic along a tiny listed road that is used daily by pedestrians including schoolchildren - the plan was so perilous banksmen were required on a permanent basis. Ingestre residents were similarly affected by noise and, albeit on a smaller scale, industrial machinery, while those in College Lane endured living face on to the construction site itself. It is not our fault that, for whatever reason, the developers planned to build on land they did not own. Nor is the 'financial viability' of the project of any concern to any disinterested party. These are surely matters to be taken into account before extending an already highly controversial and, in my opinion, ill-managed, project. Suggestions of further large scale works are absurd. They have had 22 years to get this right and, given how fiercely this was contested throughout those two and a half decades, they ought to have some awareness of local sensibilities, not to mention specific pitfalls which were repeatedly raised and which they are now falling foul of (the fact they did not own the land they wished to partially build on has been known for at least a decade). I find the suggestion of 'flipping the affordable housing to market rate housing' not only glib in tone but offensive in its nature. It appears to run counter to all planning stipulations and yet is being presented as an altruistic move on the developers' part. I do not believe that the installation of heat pumps is a primary concern; if environmental concerns had played a part in the developers' thinking at any time they would have abandoned the underground car park. It was one of the most controversial parts of the scheme, for obvious reasons, and would not have been permitted had the application been made at the time construction began. They went ahead with it anyway - profit came first. Because of this disregard for the climate I find it hard to believe that the installation of heat pumps is a key driver behind the current application, however convenient it may be to portray it as such). Incidentally, if a site has room for an underground car park with space for at least two vehicles per household, it has room for affordable housing. Financial viability and profit for a private company should not be a consideration for the council when it pertains to such a long running and controversial scheme which has already caused so much misery to so many Camden residents. Enough is enough.</p>