



Dear Tania

Objection to Application 2014/2651/P - Acol Bridge Club, 86 West End Lane.

I have submitted this via the website but wanted to ensure in case of any technical issues that you receive my strong objection to this planning application.

I am a resident of 84b West End Lane - the property next to the Acol Bridge Club.

I would like to strongly object to this planning application on the following grounds below.

I would also like to be notified of committee date.

1. The new extension proposed will further impact on the external facade of the building which has already been dramatically altered (including complete loss of green outdoor space at 88 West End Lane) and looks out of place with the other buildings and character and appearance of the area. This will be especially true with respect to the rear view of the building. This is in contravention of DP 25 which states it is important to preserve the local character of the area. DP 24 is also breached as the extension will not be in line with local character.

2. The bulk of the extension with respect to the two large double bedroom flats at 86 west end lane goes beyond the boundary of the adjacent properties on West End Lane which goes against DP 25.2 which requires developments to be in keeping or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.

None of these elements have been addressed in the designs put forward as required by DP 25.2 and DP 24.14 (incorrectly referenced as 24.13).

3. The new flats proposed could also potentially lead to 86 West End Lane being higher than the adjacent buildings which will disfigure a building and upset the proportions spoiling the character of the street which is contravention of DP24.13.

4. It is strongly contended that the extension proposed with 2 further extensive flats (which will go beyond the boundary of 84 West End Lane) will result in loss of privacy for the two gardens at 84 West End Lane. The gardens are used by our young children and for family use and the extension will clearly be able to overlook the gardens. The extension will also result in lack of privacy for the nursery children whose outdoor space is within full and direct view of the two proposed flats. Given the proximity of the neighbouring properties to 84 West End lane and the nursery this is of violation of DP26.3.

These objections were raised against the previous planning application 2014/0645/P and none of them have been addressed in the resubmitted application. These frivolous applications should be rejected at the outset. Also we think this and the previous application [2013/8232/P](#) which relates to an elevated terrace extension which was approved should be viewed together in terms of its impact on this conservation area contravening DP24 and 25.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely

Gauri Kasbekar

84b West End Lane

West Hampstead

London

NW6 2LX



Dear Tanya

Objection to Application 2014/2651/P - Acol Bridge Club, 86 West End Lane, West Hampstead

Further to the below, please see my submitted objections to the latest planning application submitted for the Acol Bridge Club.

I send this just for your attention to ensure that it is logged properly in case we face a similar technical issue as last month with the Camden website. Please log this, as required.

I spoke with Alex about this matter last week – thank you again, Alex.

I note that with my objection below, you now have 4 objections recorded. I note though that you have still not uploaded Cllr Risso-Gill's objections raised 2-3 weeks ago. Any reason why?

I was also very impressed at hearing Francis Wheat (Head of Development Control) present at the "The Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead" (CRASH), AGM meeting last night. I was very interested to hear her describe the planning application process which I believe should also include a site visit for an application. Thus, could I again invite you to visit the site of the Acol Bridge Club to properly evaluate the works that have been on-going since 2003 and which we have questioned the validity of for some time now. Alex has kindly agreed to meet with me to this end, but I would also urge you to do the same as the case officer – I would be delighted to meet with you at the site at your convenience.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email and I look forward to your comments.

Regards
Mihir

Mihir Shah
Secretary
84 West End Lane Management Company



Planning Application No. 2014/2651/P

Dear Sirs

Objection to Application 2014/2651/P - Acol Bridge Club, 86 West End Lane, West Hampstead

As Secretary for 84 West End Lane Management Company, as well as a resident of 84 West End Lane, I would like to "object" to the above Application on behalf of my fellow Directors and Shareholders of the company.

I raise objections on the following grounds:

1. The development will result in a loss of privacy to the residents of No 84. This includes direct visibility into the adjacent flats to the bridge Club. This will also include the loss of dedicated use of our garden area for our children as this private area will now be affected from the premises next door which will allow views directly into the garden – a garden which already includes an outside drinking area from which patrons of the Bridge Club can look directly down into our children's play areas already!

This is in contradiction to DP5.

2. This is now one of "numerous" extensions that have been built at 86 and the excessive scale and density of these must now be brought into question, as per DP25.

It must be remembered that a previous planning application was granted in Jan/Feb of 2014 for the property, and the tactic of submitting numerous smaller applications in quick succession, (previous extensions were completed less than 3 years ago too), should be considered in light of the whole property.

Please remember that this is now the "second" application for such a roof extension in the last 2 months - and "third" development application in the past 5 months on an already unfinished development site since 2003!

A further extension must surely now also contravene your own "Conserving Camden's Heritage" policy, also as per DP25.

3. The development will cause harm to the amenity of the next door property with the proposed development impacting on the occupiers and neighbours, namely:

visual privacy and overlooking of the next door properties and gardens resulting, overshadowing and outlook being affected, sunlight and daylight levels being reduced, noise and vibration levels increasing, and odour fumes and dust increasing significantly while this, and the recently granted previous extension, are completed.

All are in contravention of DP26.

4. The development does not comment on how the movement of goods and materials will be managed and controlled, especially avoiding any detriment to neighbours, and in particular considering the development is proposed on a major main road, West End Lane, with already considerable traffic issues present on the road.

Previous experiences of developments on this site by the applicant have not been controlled well, with the applicant showing no regard for neighbours of the surrounding area, and now this is a third of three applications submitted within quick succession which will again cause considerable hardship to the immediate residents to the property.

This is in contravention of DP20.

5. The application will result in considerable noise and vibration to adjoining properties, similar to previous extensions at the same property, and for which the applicant had little regard towards his neighbours.

This is in contravention of DP28 and considering the applicant has already caused damage to a gable wall owned by No 84 without permission – for which a Planning Officer and local Councillor were informed and acted upon – it is highly likely that local residents will again be subjected to such issues.

All in all, we strongly "object" to "another" extension of the property, especially in light of a recently approved application already being granted and with the past experiences of neighbours and local residents with building works at the same property.

This is also the second application for this roof extension, and it conveniently omits to mention the on-going works which have never been completed, the need for retrospective permission for excessive works in the past, the recently granted further development in January 2014, and now the fact that this is the "third" application in the space of 5 months.

I would also very much like to know how this latest application could be granted considering the fact that the Planning Officer for the last application made it clear to the applicant that no further development on the site would be agreeable.

Currently, legal action is being considered against the applicant for flagrant breaches of planning permissions and criminal damage against the boundary and gable wall between No's 86 and 84 West End Lane – which we would strongly urge you to contact us about when considering this further application.

We "strongly objected" to the recently approved application in relation to another extension at the rear of the property which also contravened all of the above Development Policy considerations and this is now another attempt to extend a commercial entity within a residential area.

We sincerely hope that our objections will be considered fairly and objectively and are very happy to consult with you as required and to provide further information to make an informed decision.

Additionally, I would also like to be notified of any future committee dates in relation to this application.

Regards
Mihir Shah

Mihir Shah
Secretary
84 West End Lane Management Company

Comments made by Mihir Shah of 84B West End Lane, West Hampstead, NW6 2LX

Comment Type is Object and Notify of Committee Date