

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/1617/P	batuk gathani	37 Buckland Crescent	14/04/2014 13:12:37	OBJ	I object to this planning. the building is too big and tall, creating shadow over our gardens, over development, infringes the rules of conservation area
2014/1617/P	Teofilo Lasarte	123 King Henry's Road Flat 5 NW3 3RB	15/04/2014 10:00:51	OBJNOT	<p>I am strongly against the building of a high rise at 100 Avenue Road. I recently acquired and moved into a property in 123 King Henry's Road. One of the reasons for moving to Swiss Cottage was the perception that Camden is a council that protects neighbourhoods at the expense of real estate development. While conducting research before going ahead with a property purchase, I saw the numerous planning applications that were submitted to the council, which was rigorous in their assessment of whether to approve or not. That perception, of a neighbourhood where development is regulated to the benefit of local residents, would completely change if this tower went ahead. A high rise is completely inappropriate; it alters the landscape and character of the area. Although I recognize that there are high rise towers from the Chalcot estate, the understanding is that those were from a previous era (with looser planning regulations) and that the rest of the neighbourhood was protected from further high rises. Any further high rises would alter the balance of what is primarily a residential area.</p> <p>Other objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *A 24-story building completely harms the character of the Swiss Cottage complex, a public area composed of the theatre, health club and children's park. *The high rise blocks out the sun to a significant part of the neighborhood. *This project goes completely against the wishes of local residents. In my conversations with neighbourhood residents, there are overwhelming objections to the tower. *The building of a 24 story building will affect property prices in the area negatively. *The high rise belongs in another part of London, not in a primarily residential neighbourhood such as Swiss Cottage. Any new building at 100 Avenue Road should be of the same height as the existing one. Finally, having done some research on the subject, I refer to the 'Camden Site Allocations – Local Development Document', dated September 2013. The document specifically states that, regarding 100 Avenue Road, "any increase in height above the existing building area would need to address the context of the nearby Belsize Conservation Area, townscape issues and assess the full impacts and effects of sunlight, daylight and microclimate". A proposal for a 24-story building completely ignores such concerns. An approval of the project would directly go against the recommendation of this report.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/1617/P	Madhvi Chanrai	12 ADAMSON ROAD LONDON	14/04/2014 23:47:43	OBJ	

Dear Conor McDonagh

Proposed development at 100 Avenue Road (2014/1617/P)

I would like to object to the proposed development for the reasons laid out below.

1. Height and bulk

At 24 stories and 81 metres high, the tower part of the development is simply much too high. It would be significantly higher than Taplow (67 metres), a building that is entirely different in character and that dates from a very different era, long before the Conservation Areas came into being. No other building in the area comes even close to the proposed height, with the next highest being the Visage at 48 metres.

The claims by Essential Living that the proposed height responds to "opportunities" offered by the presence of other tall buildings in the area is I think meaningless, as is the notion that the tower would be "iconic" or a "landmark".

A tower of this height would be widely visible and imposing from across the local area and far beyond. It would also have significant negative side-effects such as over-shadowing, overlooking and wind down-draughts.

The proposal substantially expands the footprint of the current building and even the lower section is higher than the current structure. The overall bulk would dominate surrounding buildings and the very popular green space.

2. The Swiss Cottage green space, sunlight and wind

Essential Livings own Sunlight/Daylight studies, yet to be independently verified, show clear increases in the level of shadow cast by the new building compared to the current one. This shadowing would be

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

Comment: **Response:**

particularly noticeable by people using the popular green space to the east of the development, and also by residential properties in the immediate vicinity. This means there is an indisputable loss of amenity for large numbers of people.

The open space also provides a "safe haven" for families, particularly helpful for parents with small children. The proposed development envisages a significant change to what is currently the back of the building, changing it from a quiet, largely dead space to a much more open, commercial one.

Very tall buildings create turbulence around them through accelerated wind on the ground, which can be dangerous. This would have a negative impact on the amenity of people using the market space, causing difficulties for stall holders and pedestrians

3. Housing provision

Camden needs more housing, particularly "affordable housing" and there are few available sites. However developments need to be of an appropriate scale and design for any given area. This proposal fails on both these criteria and furthermore contains only a small percentage of affordable housing. The Local Development Framework (Policy DP3) calls for 50% of new housing of more than 10 units to be affordable, which would be 92 units in this case. The proposal includes only 36 units, which is 19.56%.

I am not convinced that a development of this kind would help with Camden's shortage of housing, apart from the modest number of affordable units. In my opinion it is likely to attract new people to move into the area, adding pressure to the local infrastructure.

4. Parking

While the development itself would be car-free, the assertion by Essential Living that parking is therefore not an issue is not accurate as it discounts visitors coming by car outside of regulated hours. Belsize ward is a very high-pressure area for parking already. The streets close to the development site, such as Winchester Road, Adamson Road, Eton Avenue and Fellows Road get overloaded on evenings and weekends already, due to the presence of Hampstead Theatre, the Odeon cinema and Swiss Cottage Station. This means that residents returning home outside of regulated hours often find it hard to find a parking space.

5. Conservation Area negative impact

The development would have a negative impact on neighbouring Conservation Areas, both because of its scale and its design. It certainly would not "preserve or enhance" these areas. Essential Living's own heritage report recognises that the tower would be visible from parts of Belsize Conservation Area, but its claim that existing trees would sufficiently cover the visibility is wishful thinking.

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

For such a huge and conspicuous building the architecture should be of a very high standard. LDF Policy DP24 Security High Quality Design should apply to this development. The proposed design falls well short of this standard.

6. Precedence

It is a great concern that if one very tall tower is permitted then others will follow. Planning applications always refer to similar permitted developments in the area and the Council's own reports do as well. If this application is approved then it will be impossible for permission to be refused for further applications of a similar scale on the basis that they are too tall. A "line in the sand" should be drawn. The alternative is the prospect of a cluster of very tall towers in the area.

7. Construction problems, including air quality

There are a series of concerns related to the construction of the building. For all of these it is worth noting that construction is proposed to take 27 months.

- The proposed route for construction traffic is to use Eton Avenue and Winchester Road to reach the Swiss Cottage market space and then to access the development site that way. These streets, and all other possible routes east of Finchley Road, are ill-suited to construction traffic. In the morning and late afternoon they are paralysed by the school run, due to the concentration of private schools in the area. The existence of the schools, as well as the Winchester Project on Winchester Road raises concerns about whether the construction traffic would pose a safety risk to the large number of children in the area.
- Air quality in the Swiss Cottage area is poor. The local monitoring site show particulate levels approaching "high" levels. The construction of such a large building, and its associated traffic will inevitably have a negative impact on air quality in the area, leading to greater health risks for susceptible groups such as children and the elderly.
- There are question marks over the impact the construction would have on the Swiss Cottage market space. Noise, dust, construction traffic and pollution all have the potential to undermine the amenity of this area, particularly on market days. For the same reasons the ability of people to enjoy using the green space could also be negatively affected.
- It is likely that construction would involve restricted access to entrances to Swiss Cottage tube stations on Avenue Road and the market site. It is also possible that the station itself would have to be closed for a period of time. Both of these would be very inconvenient for the large numbers of users of the station at peak times.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Construction of the building will overlap with the projected construction timescales for HS2 in the area. The cumulative impact must be taken into account. The Council has outlined in considerable detail the impact on Belsize of HS2's construction in terms of traffic, congestion, noise and pollution. This proposed development is of such a scale that the cumulative impact would probably be considerable. In other words, the very significant negative impact of HS2's construction would be seriously exacerbated.</p> <p>For all of these reasons I urge Camden Council to reject the planning application.</p> <p>Best regards</p> <p>Madhvi Chanrai</p>
2014/1617/P	Simon Marcus	12 Windsor Court Platts Lane NW3 7NR	16/04/2014 09:41:09	OBJ	<p>I oppose the redevelopment of 100 Avenue Road.</p> <p>The proposed new building is out of scale with the area and will change the whole sky line in contravention of CPG1.</p> <p>At 80 metres it is too tall and will overshadow a conservation area, open spaces, block the light of many surrounding properties and cause loss of amenity through this and prolonged building works and HGV movements.</p> <p>With 184 units, housing up to 400 new residents there will be significant further pressure on school places, GP surgeries and many more local services such as rubbish clearance.</p> <p>This redevelopment will therefore conflict with planning guidance on sustainability (CS11), Conserving Heritage (CS14), sustainable design and construction (DP22) and impact of development on occupiers and neighbours (DP26).</p> <p>There will not be enough affordable accommodation, local people will in no way benefit from these proposals, profit is being placed above all else with this development and I call on Camden Council to reject it wholly.</p>

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

2014/1617/P Jim Ashton 38 Lambolle Road
LONDON

NW3 4HR

Dear Conor McDonagh

Proposed development at 100 Avenue Road (2014/1617/P)

I would like to object to the proposed development for the reasons laid out below.

1. Height and bulk

At 24 stories and 81 metres high, the tower part of the development is simply much too high. It would be significantly higher than Taplow (67 metres), a building that is entirely different in character and that dates from a very different era, long before the Conservation Areas came into being. No other building in the area comes even close to the proposed height, with the next highest being the Visage at 48 metres.

The claims by Essential Living that the proposed height responds to "opportunities" offered by the presence of other tall buildings in the area is I think meaningless, as is the notion that the tower would be "iconic" or a "landmark".

A tower of this height would be widely visible and imposing from across the local area and far beyond. It would also have significant negative side-effects such as over-shadowing, overlooking and wind down-draughts.

The proposal substantially expands the footprint of the current building and even the lower section is higher than the current structure. The overall bulk would dominate surrounding buildings and the very popular green space.

2. The Swiss Cottage green space, sunlight and wind

Essential Livings own Sunlight/Daylight studies, yet to be independently verified, show clear increases in the level of shadow cast by the new building compared to the current one. This shadowing would be particularly noticeable by people using the popular green space to the east of the development, and also by residential properties in the immediate vicinity. This means there is an indisputable loss of amenity for large numbers of people.

The open space also provides a "safe haven" for families, particularly helpful for parents with small children. The proposed development envisages a significant change to what is currently the back of the building, changing it from a quiet, largely dead space to a much more open, commercial one.

Very tall buildings create turbulence around them through accelerated wind on the ground, which can be dangerous. This would have a negative impact on the amenity of people using the market space, causing difficulties for stall holders and pedestrians

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

3. Housing provision

Camden needs more housing, particularly "affordable housing" and there are few available sites. However developments need to be of an appropriate scale and design for any given area. This proposal fails on both these criteria and furthermore contains only a small percentage of affordable housing. The Local Development Framework (Policy DP3) calls for 50% of new housing of more than 10 units to be affordable, which would be 92 units in this case. The proposal includes only 36 units, which is 19.56%.

I am not convinced that a development of this kind would help with Camden's shortage of housing, apart from the modest number of affordable units. In my opinion it is likely to attract new people to move into the area, adding pressure to the local infrastructure.

4. Parking

While the development itself would be car-free, the assertion by Essential Living that parking is therefore not an issue is not accurate as it discounts visitors coming by car outside of regulated hours. Belsize ward is a very high-pressure area for parking already. The streets close to the development site, such as Winchester Road, Adamson Road, Eton Avenue and Fellows Road get overloaded on evenings and weekends already, due to the presence of Hampstead Theatre, the Odeon cinema and Swiss Cottage Station. This means that residents returning home outside of regulated hours often find it hard to find a parking space.

5. Conservation Area negative impact

The development would have a negative impact on neighbouring Conservation Areas, both because of its scale and its design. It certainly would not "preserve or enhance" these areas. Essential Living's own heritage report recognises that the tower would be visible from parts of Belsize Conservation Area, but its claim that existing trees would sufficiently cover the visibility is wishful thinking.

For such a huge and conspicuous building the architecture should be of a very high standard. LDF Policy DP24 Security High Quality Design should apply to this development. The proposed design falls well short of this standard.

6. Precedence

It is a great concern that if one very tall tower is permitted then others will follow. Planning applications always refer to similar permitted developments in the area and the Council's own reports do as well. If this application is approved then it will be impossible for permission to be refused for

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

Comment: **Response:**

further applications of a similar scale on the basis that they are too tall. A "line in the sand" should be drawn. The alternative is the prospect of a cluster of very tall towers in the area.

7. Construction problems, including air quality

There are a series of concerns related to the construction of the building. For all of these it is worth noting that construction is proposed to take 27 months.

- The proposed route for construction traffic is to use Eton Avenue and Winchester Road to reach the Swiss Cottage market space and then to access the development site that way. These streets, and all other possible routes east of Finchley Road, are ill-suited to construction traffic. In the morning and late afternoon they are paralysed by the school run, due to the concentration of private schools in the area. The existence of the schools, as well as the Winchester Project on Winchester Road raises concerns about whether the construction traffic would pose a safety risk to the large number of children in the area.
- Air quality in the Swiss Cottage area is poor. The local monitoring site show particulate levels approaching "high" levels. The construction of such a large building, and its associated traffic will inevitably have a negative impact on air quality in the area, leading to greater health risks for susceptible groups such as children and the elderly.
- There are question marks over the impact the construction would have on the Swiss Cottage market space. Noise, dust, construction traffic and pollution all have the potential to undermine the amenity of this area, particularly on market days. For the same reasons the ability of people to enjoy using the green space could also be negatively affected.
- It is likely that construction would involve restricted access to entrances to Swiss Cottage tube stations on Avenue Road and the market site. It is also possible that the station itself would have to be closed for a period of time. Both of these would be very inconvenient for the large numbers of users of the station at peak times.

Construction of the building will overlap with the projected construction timescales for HS2 in the area. The cumulative impact must be taken into account. The Council has outlined in considerable detail the impact on Belsize of HS2's construction in terms of traffic, congestion, noise and pollution. This proposed development is of such a scale that the cumulative impact would probably be considerable. In other words, the very significant negative impact of HS2's construction would be seriously exacerbated.

For all of these reasons I urge Camden Council to reject the planning application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/1617/P	Maureen Dreyfus-Terrett	27A Buckland Crescent	14/04/2014 13:35:14	OBJ	Best regards I object to the proposed planning application to re-develop 100 Avenue Road on the following grounds:- It is a huge building – higher than the present tower blocks and will dominate the area. It will overshadow the local open green space and community area as well as the surrounding houses which are in a conservation area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/1617/P	Michael Gingold	24A Primrose Gardens	14/04/2014 20:49:53	OBJ	

Dear Conor McDonagh

Proposed development at 100 Avenue Road (2014/1617/P)

I would like to object to the proposed development for the reasons laid out below.

1. Height and bulk

At 24 stories and 81 metres high, the tower part of the development is simply much too high. It would be significantly higher than Taplow (67 metres), a building that is entirely different in character and that dates from a very different era, long before the Conservation Areas came into being. No other building in the area comes even close to the proposed height, with the next highest being the Visage at 48 metres.

The claims by Essential Living that the proposed height responds to "opportunities" offered by the presence of other tall buildings in the area is I think meaningless, as is the notion that the tower would be "iconic" or a "landmark".

A tower of this height would be widely visible and imposing from across the local area and far beyond. It would also have significant negative side-effects such as over-shadowing, overlooking and wind down-draughts.

The proposal substantially expands the footprint of the current building and even the lower section is higher than the current structure. The overall bulk would dominate surrounding buildings and the very popular green space.

2. The Swiss Cottage green space, sunlight and wind

Essential Livings own Sunlight/Daylight studies, yet to be independently verified, show clear increases in the level of shadow cast by the new building compared to the current one. This shadowing would be particularly noticeable by people using the popular green space to the east of the development, and also by residential properties in the immediate vicinity. This means there is an indisputable loss of amenity for large numbers of people.

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

The open space also provides a "safe haven" for families, particularly helpful for parents with small children. The proposed development envisages a significant change to what is currently the back of the building, changing it from a quiet, largely dead space to a much more open, commercial one.

Very tall buildings create turbulence around them through accelerated wind on the ground, which can be dangerous. This would have a negative impact on the amenity of people using the market space, causing difficulties for stall holders and pedestrians

3. Housing provision

Camden needs more housing, particularly "affordable housing" and there are few available sites. However developments need to be of an appropriate scale and design for any given area. This proposal fails on both these criteria and furthermore contains only a small percentage of affordable housing. The Local Development Framework (Policy DP3) calls for 50% of new housing of more than 10 units to be affordable, which would be 92 units in this case. The proposal includes only 36 units, which is 19.56%.

I am not convinced that a development of this kind would help with Camden's shortage of housing, apart from the modest number of affordable units. In my opinion it is likely to attract new people to move into the area, adding pressure to the local infrastructure.

4. Parking

While the development itself would be car-free, the assertion by Essential Living that parking is therefore not an issue is not accurate as it discounts visitors coming by car outside of regulated hours. Belsize ward is a very high-pressure area for parking already. The streets close to the development site, such as Winchester Road, Adamson Road, Eton Avenue and Fellows Road get overloaded on evenings and weekends already, due to the presence of Hampstead Theatre, the Odeon cinema and Swiss Cottage Station. This means that residents returning home outside of regulated hours often find it hard to find a parking space.

5. Conservation Area negative impact

The development would have a negative impact on neighbouring Conservation Areas, both because of its scale and its design. It certainly would not "preserve or enhance" these areas. Essential Living's own heritage report recognises that the tower would be visible from parts of Belsize Conservation Area, but its claim that existing trees would sufficiently cover the visibility is wishful thinking.

For such a huge and conspicuous building the architecture should be of a very high standard. LDF Policy DP24 Security High Quality Design should apply to this development. The proposed design

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

Comment: **Response:**

falls well short of this standard.

6. Precedence

It is a great concern that if one very tall tower is permitted then others will follow. Planning applications always refer to similar permitted developments in the area and the Council's own reports do as well. If this application is approved then it will be impossible for permission to be refused for further applications of a similar scale on the basis that they are too tall. A "line in the sand" should be drawn. The alternative is the prospect of a cluster of very tall towers in the area.

7. Construction problems, including air quality

There are a series of concerns related to the construction of the building. For all of these it is worth noting that construction is proposed to take 27 months.

- The proposed route for construction traffic is to use Eton Avenue and Winchester Road to reach the Swiss Cottage market space and then to access the development site that way. These streets, and all other possible routes east of Finchley Road, are ill-suited to construction traffic. In the morning and late afternoon they are paralysed by the school run, due to the concentration of private schools in the area. The existence of the schools, as well as the Winchester Project on Winchester Road raises concerns about whether the construction traffic would pose a safety risk to the large number of children in the area.
- Air quality in the Swiss Cottage area is poor. The local monitoring site show particulate levels approaching "high" levels. The construction of such a large building, and its associated traffic will inevitably have a negative impact on air quality in the area, leading to greater health risks for susceptible groups such as children and the elderly.
- There are question marks over the impact the construction would have on the Swiss Cottage market space. Noise, dust, construction traffic and pollution all have the potential to undermine the amenity of this area, particularly on market days. For the same reasons the ability of people to enjoy using the green space could also be negatively affected.
- It is likely that construction would involve restricted access to entrances to Swiss Cottage tube stations on Avenue Road and the market site. It is also possible that the station itself would have to be closed for a period of time. Both of these would be very inconvenient for the large numbers of users of the station at peak times.

Construction of the building will overlap with the projected construction timescales for HS2 in the area. The cumulative impact must be taken into account. The Council has outlined in considerable detail the impact on Belsize of HS2's construction in terms of traffic, congestion, noise and pollution. This

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>proposed development is of such a scale that the cumulative impact would probably be considerable. In other words, the very significant negative impact of HS2's construction would be seriously exacerbated.</p> <p>For all of these reasons I urge Camden Council to reject the planning application.</p>
2014/1617/P	A Lavingia	2 Winchester Road NW3 3NT	16/04/2014 23:37:44	COMMNT	<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>Subject – Concerns and issues regarding a planning application - 2014/1617/P</p> <p>In regards to the planning application stated in the above subject, I would like to express few concerns which I wish you will take into consideration before granting the approval.</p> <p>It has been mentioned in the application that the proposed development, on 100 Avenue Road, contains numerous apartments and commercial units. I am particularly concerned with the usage agreed for the commercial unit in the proposal.</p> <p>From the plans it is evident, given the retail space around 1000 square meters, that there is high possibility of a mini – supermarket occupying the retail space. If any supermarket or a retail operator with massive deliveries occupies this retail space, the deliveries will hamper the ambience of the entire area. I am particularly concerned regarding the deliveries and the mess it will create around it. With any sizeable players like Tesco, Sainsbury's, Argos or ASDA, if they occupy the site, we can easily expect more 500-600 cages of deliveries a week.</p> <p>Now, if the deliveries are from the Avenue road itself, it might create less hassle. But, outside the proposed development, the road (A41) is marked as a red route with double red lines. Hence, the deliveries of 500 to 600 cages will be from either Eton Avenue or Winchester Road. This will mean that the deliveries will have to be rolled in cages near Hampstead theatre. This is around 100 meters. Hand handling 500 roller cages for 100 meters will cause a lot of disruption in the area where there are market stalls and also around the existing playground and the water fountain. This area is used as a community ground where people gather and children play. Also, typical of any big store, a lot packaging material, refuse and cages will be left or stocked outside the premises which will further deteriorate the local ambience and the fountain area.</p> <p>If any operator with sizable deliveries occupies this site, the area will be totally disrupted. Hence, I would urge you to reconsider the usage granted to the retail space proposed.</p> <p>Regards,</p>
2014/1617/P	Anne Charvet	60 Compayne Gardens NW6 3RY	15/04/2014 17:45:11	OBJ	<p>This development with a proposed 24-storey building and a part 7-storey, part 5-storey building is far too tall and bulky for the position at Swiss Cottage and I sincerely hope the proposal will not go ahead. Even a 10-storey building would be inappropriate. Please have some concern for our environment.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/1617/P	Luke Collins	5 Hutchinson House Adelaide Road London	14/04/2014 12:34:32	OBJ	<p>I object to the development plans for 100 Avenue Pad.</p> <p>The proposed tower is out of proportion with its surroundings, will cause reflected noise blight to the surrounding residences and amenities, and will overshadow a much loved social space between the theatre and the library.</p> <p>The Council should reject this application and insist on a green alternative, such as repurposing the existing buildings on the site.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>Luke Collins</p>
2014/1617/P	Luke Collins	5 Hutchinson House Adelaide Road London	14/04/2014 12:34:08	OBJ	
2014/1617/P	Danielle Peck	42 Belsize Square	14/04/2014 23:04:39	COMMNT	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed development of the above site. It will be an oppressive presence, looming over even the tallest buildings in the area and be an unavoidable but inappropriate backdrop to a conservation area. The suggestion by Essential Living that it will be a iconic is pure marketing semantics. Just because a building has bulk and height does not make it iconic. It makes it dominating. It will over-shadow the public park area which is an essential breathing space and materially change the atmosphere away from a family-oriented haven.</p> <p>The proposed construction will potentially conflict with HS2 works in the area. Singly both these projects would put immense stress on traffic flow and negative environmental impact around an already severely congested junction and one of the major exits point out of North London. Together the chaos caused by two projects of such magnitude is unimaginable. If built, the increased population density will put a massive strain on parking in the area which is already significantly challenged.</p> <p>I have tried to be succinct here as there are so many objections to the development. To summarise I primarily object to the development on the basis of disproportional size and deleterious environmental impact during and after construction.</p>
2014/1617/P	batuk gathani	37 Buckland Crescent	14/04/2014 13:13:43	OBJ	<p>I object to this planning. the building is too big and tall, creating shadow over our gardens, over development, infringes the rules of conservation area</p>
2014/1617/P	batuk gathani	37 Buckland Crescent	14/04/2014 13:13:40	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/1617/P	batuk gathani	37 Buckland Crescent	14/04/2014 13:13:37	OBJ	I object to this planning. the building is too big and tall, creating shadow over our gardens, over development, infringes the rules of conservation area
2014/1617/P	batuk gathani	37 Buckland Crescent	14/04/2014 13:13:32	OBJ	
2014/1617/P	bonnie alter	61 Eton Avenue	14/04/2014 11:55:49	INT	<p>I am writing in opposition to the proposed development at 100 avenue road.</p> <p>The building is too dense and out of scale with the surrounding area: there are no 24 storey buildings in the immediate vicinity. Contrary to the developer's claims, the Adelaide road new developments are not of the same height.</p> <p>There is no green space in the area, save the small park behind the Hampstead theatre. This is already used to the maximum: take a look on a sunny day any time of the year. The new building will put it in shadow even more than it already is.</p> <p>There is already NO parking in the area thanks to the Hampstead theatre audience, the public school yummy mummies driving in twice a day and commuters who leave their car on the street by day. Visitors driving to the building will create havoc looking for spots.</p> <p>There is no need for tons of retail in the building: there are already enough floundering businesses on Finchley Road.</p> <p>As for providing yet another community centre: how many patrons are there and how many small community centres does one little area need?</p> <p>Construction of the building will be conducted via Eton Avenue. There are no words to describe the ensuing chaos: it will be a potential best selling horror film: public school mothers' 4X4's vying for room with the concrete mixers.</p> <p>Please preserve this lovely residential area. It is transient but it is still manageable and retains its village atmosphere.</p> <p>This building is an unsightly and unwelcome imposition.</p> <p>Cut it down to half the height and make it architecturally interesting.</p> <p>Yours truly, Bonnie Alter</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/1617/P	batuk gathani	37 Buckland Crescent	14/04/2014 13:13:35	OBJ	I object to this planning. the building is too big and tall, creating shadow over our gardens, over development, infringes the rules of conservation area
2014/1617/P	batuk gathani	37 Buckland Crescent	14/04/2014 13:13:29	OBJ	
2014/1617/P	batuk gathani	37 Buckland Crescent	14/04/2014 13:13:05	OBJ	
2014/1617/P	batuk gathani	37 Buckland Crescent	14/04/2014 13:13:01	OBJ	