



Jenna Litherland,  
Regeneration and planning  
Development Management  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London  
WC1H 8HD

23<sup>rd</sup> May 2013

Dear Jenna Litherland,

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/1924/P 187 to 199 WEST END LANE NW6  
2LJ**

I write in opposition to this application. I ask Camden Council to either refuse it or postpone it until a fully public consultation is held with local residents and businesses.

The original application by Ballymore was at least subject to consultation and local residents had the opportunity to see by models and computer generated images what they were going to get, and in fairness the developer was open to concerns about softening the effect of the 7 blocks.

The new proposals do nothing to meet concerns of local residents, over height scale, and bulk, and in fact make the development even worse. West Hampstead is being subjected to a massive amount of actual and proposed developments, most of which are out of character to the area.

Many local forums, including the local NDF which has just been given approval by Camden council have been struggling to establish a policy to get proper balance between development and preserving the best aspects of the West Hampstead and Fortune Green land and cityscape. They look to a partnership with Camden over planning matters in the future. Many local residents felt the original proposal, because of its scale, drove a "coach and horse" through that concept. Proposal 2013/1924/P, if agreed, follows that up with a "herd of Elephants."

The approval of the original 187 to 199 West End Lane Proposal tested this concept to the limit. To allow the new changes to be approved without wider public consultation would show complete disregard to any concept of "localism" and even worse local democracy.

Indeed it would be difficult for an observer to tell how Camdens planning procedures differ from those that have operated on Spains Costa del Sol over the last 30 years. The

effect is the same, ugly buildings without due regard to the landscape, or in this case cityscape.

My specific objections to application 2013/1924/P can be summarised as

1. They make an ugly development even uglier and more brutal. More detailing is required not less.
2. No opportunity has been taken to mitigate residents concerns about scale, loss of light and views for surrounding residents properties.
3. If the colour scheme is to be brown, particularly on large surfaces, it should be revised.
4. 12 stories anywhere in the development is too high and not in keeping with the thinking in "localism" forums, let alone local residents.

I ask Camden Council to reject this further application, and only accept modifications to the original plan that are the result to local public consultation and represent improvements from the point of view of local residents and local businesses.

Yours sincerely

**John Eastwood**  
**Local Resident of 30 years**

1.