

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2013/8232/P | Dr Simon Lappin | 84 flat A West End Lane | 28/01/2014 20:48:15 | OBJ | <p>The construction of this extension would severely affect the peaceful nature of the back garden in flat A of 84 west end lane (next door).</p> <p>The purpose of this proposed construction is not clear, there seems to be no need to add this building when they already have a patio that they they use. The adjacent properties are all domestic use so further disruptive work would impede on all the local neighbours.</p> <p>I object to this construction on the grounds of noise pollution and probable damage to the property of number 84 west end lane as has happened recently.</p> <p>The owners of 86 west end lane have recently completed construction work which took several years to finish. The building work did not match the planning application and the work impeded party wall agreements as the building work was built directly on to the wall belonging to my property. Because of the previous work done by number 86 west end lane there was significant decorative damage to my property which cost me a large sum of money.</p> <p>I strongly appeal that this planning permission is rejected.</p> |
| 2013/8232/P | Ms Gauri Kasbekar | 84 West End Lane | 05/02/2014 22:57:47 | OBJ | <p>I would like to strongly object to the planning application based on the information provided as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. lack of consultation from the applicant with adjacent property. 2. We have recently moved to the area because of its quiet residential feel and private garden. It appears that the terrace will allow patrons of the bridge club to look into our private space with loss of privacy for us as a young family with children. Our ageing parents/ grandparents also stay with us often and would be disturbed by the additional external noise. We are also concerned about the potential of alcohol being permitted on the terrace due to the bar at the premises and the likely unsavoury behaviour that can follow. The Bridge Club can be very busy at times and we would not want our peace and quiet enjoyment to be breached through use of this raised outside space. In short it will fundamentally change the quiet residential aspect of this neighbourhood which is so strongly valued. 3. Our two car drive has been blocked by patrons of the Bridge Club on numerous occasions which has greatly inconvenienced us with a young child and our senior citizen parents who visit us often. There has been no attempt to move the respective cars despite announcements. 2 weeks ago we had to call Camden Council to assist us which has resulted in them putting an enforcement order on the car and disrupting our entire evening. <p>There are no details as to how the Bridge Club plan to deal with the increase of patrons and lack of parking in the area?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. We understand that from former residents that they have encountered great distress and inconvenience caused during the previous expansion of the Bridge Club, which went on over a prolonged period. This includes breaches of the previous planning permission with retrospective approval , debris and rubbish on the outside. What controls can the Council place to prevent this happening again? <p>Notification of committee date requested.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|--|--|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2013/8232/P | Mihir Shah 84 West End Lane Management | 84 West End Lane London NW6 2LX | 28/01/2014 23:18:09 | COMMNT | <p>The Secretary on behalf of the management company of 84 West End Lane- Due to the lack of information in the application we object to the current planning application based on the following points and would request more information as set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Historic issues with previous extension which demonstrated very clearly a lack of adherence to planning resulting in retrospective planning at the site. The previous works took 5 years to complete and for the majority of this time the front area was covered in rubble and rubbish, including old bathrooms etc. with our requests being ignored and carrying out works to 84 West End Lane without permission. - The applicant had failed to write to or engage with each of the neighbouring properties. - We request further information be provided supporting the application including survey results as to impact upon traffic and parking in the area, potential noise and smells, proposals for works to benefit the area (such as road/parking improvements), how contractors will obtain access, park and load or store materials and waste. - We would also ask for proposals as to landscaping now that the applicant has concreted the whole of their garden; details of how the works comply with the Conservation Area requirements; loss of green space and an acknowledgement that no further development is intended, given the proposed density of development. - Given the roof terrace proposed is elevated and for commercial use. This would mean an increased number of people with noise carrying more easily into the back gardens and flats at 84 with loss of privacy. It is unclear what the use of the terrace is and there is the potential in the evenings and weekends in particular that the noise levels can increase substantially. This exacerbated by the bar/ licence to serve alcohol and create a nuisance in what is a quiet residential area. No information has been provided on the proposed used, limitation of hours etc. |
| 2013/8232/P | James Teare | Flat D 84 West End Lane NW6 2LX | 21/01/2014 16:22:51 | COMMNT | <p>Flat D did not receive a copy of application.</p> <p>Increased traffic associated with the increased numbers of visitors to be accommodated.</p> <p>No noise assessment or proposals on limitation of hours or type of usage.</p> <p>No benefit to the surrounding area and no proposal for road and/or parking improvements.</p> <p>No proposals access, parking, loading or storage of materials and waste during works.</p> <p>Ongoing building creep at No 86 - loss of green space.</p> <p>The historic planning permission referred to related to a development that substantially differed to that built – referring to it in this application serves to highlight this failure to follow planning permission.</p> <p>The applicant obtained retrospective planning permission but did not have permission when undertaking the works.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the works include bar and kitchen areas that may lead to noise and or smells.</p> <p>The proposed density of the building on No 86 would be even more inconsistent with the surrounding properties than the already very different density, including the area paved and apparently already prepared as foundations for further development towards the East at a future date.</p> |