

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Thuaire, Charles  
**Sent:** 08 December 2014 11:28  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Royal Free immunology centre - PLANNING APPLICATION 2014/6845/P – ROYAL FREE HOSPITAL - objections  
**Attachments:** Ham & High - JLC letter to editor - 4.12.14.jpg

Please register this on m3 as an objection to **2014/6845/P**  
thanks

Charles Thuaire  
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 5867

---

**From:** Jessica Learmond-Criqui [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 December 2014 20:33  
**To:** Thuaire, Charles  
**Subject:** Royal Free immunology centre - PLANNING APPLICATION 2014/6845/P – ROYAL FREE HOSPITAL - objections

Dear Mr Thuaire,

Please see below the grounds of objections to the Royal Free development. For your information, I attach also a letter I wrote to the Editor of the Ham & High on this subject. The letter to the editor forms part of my objections for the reasons contained in it.

**Grounds of objections:**

**The size is too big**

The building is far too big and far too tall for the proposed location. I had a meeting with the Royal Free when the earlier plans were being developed and was informed that the building would be 6 stories. There was no suggestion that the building would have an extra floor. I did not discover the extra floor until after the plans were submitted. The Royal Free is an elephant in a shoe box. This small area cannot take any further expansion on this scale.

I understand that there are spaces in the Royal Free that has been empty for some time and which could easily accommodate the new immunology unit. The Royal Free must look at its existing estate and build out its plans with the current estate rather than seeking to build an oversized building in an already over developed area.

**Negative impact on Hampstead Green (a conservation area) and St Stephens (Grade I-listed)**

The building would, if built, completely change the character of Hampstead Green. The Green is currently a pleasant meadow and natural habitat, with the cobbled walkway beside it down past St Stephens and Hampstead Hill School shielded from the 1970s Royal Free building by a high hedge, mature trees and the greenery of the Heath Strange Garden.

The new building, like a big foot in a Monty Python sketch, would trample on the tranquillity of this part of the world and destroy the ambiance and setting of the Grade I listed building which is St

Stephens. It will dwarf it and damage the image of St Stephens against the backdrop of green, forever.

#### **Impact on the landscape and loss of green space**

Building on the memorial garden and the removal of several significant well-established trees will result in an unacceptable loss of green space, and will block the green corridor between St Stephens and the existing 1970s hospital building. The garden is well used during the summer. Once green space goes, it is gone forever.

#### **Loss of parking**

The existing car park is already much too small to cater for the hospital's visitors and cannot cope with demand. The Royal Free's view of parking is that people would get to hospital by taxi or by foot.

Sick people don't take the train and if they have their own car, will drive. Or a relative will drive them. They need somewhere to park. There are very few spaces in the surrounding streets for non-residents to park. Those who come for the first time and don't know this will clutter the streets of Hampstead, driving round and round, increasing pollution and congestion.

The Royal Free is being very cavalier in their approach to parking. They have worked out a solution during the 2 year build programme of using the staff car park behind the hospital accessed by Roland Hill, but in the recent public meeting, they said that when the build is finished, they will then assess the need for patient parking. This is too late to assess it. They know the need now. They simply choose to ignore it and this will create chaos.

They should not be allowed to build without having thought through and put forward suitable proposals for the replacement of their current car park. Although they are building 1.25 floors for car parking, they intend to keep much of this for staff parking.

#### **Traffic**

Pond Street, Haverstock Hill and South End Green and surrounding streets are already highly congested during the day. During rush hour, traffic in Pond Street can be stationary from one end to the other, paralysing access in and out of the hospital. So too in Haverstock Hill from Belsize Park to the Pond Street traffic lights, paralysing access in and out of the hospital's Rowland Hill entrance.

The planned increase in A & E capacity (from 60,000 to 140,000) will add substantially to traffic congestion locally. So too will the closure of the link road to Rowland Hill Street, which will force all vehicles dropping off patients and visitors at the main entrance to use the Pond Street exit, significantly worsening congestion in Pond Street.

This is a ridiculous state of affairs. The Royal Free has 750,000 visitors a year (patients and out-patients). The failure of them to consider a suitable flow of traffic around their site and the provision of suitable avenues for that flow is negligent. They should not be allowed to build without properly addressing this problem.

#### **Loss of light and safety and privacy for Hampstead Hill School**

The school classrooms alongside Hampstead Green will be badly affected by loss of light. The children who go to Hampstead Hill School are 7 years old and under. They are the most vulnerable of our population as they are still infants. Why should they be expected to work in classrooms with artificial lights on all day when they enjoyed natural daylight previously?

The effect on the buildings of the school and lack of respect for the effect by the Royal Free displays a cavalier attitude by the Royal Free which is not in keeping with the responsible position which it holds in the community.

They need to curtail their plans and build a smaller building which will not block the light of the school. Their current plans should, therefore, be refused so that they are forced to rethink the impact they have on the local community and correct their error of judgement.

Children playing in the kindergarten playground will be overlooked by occupants and hotel residents. This is not a safe situation for the children.

#### **Disruption and damage during construction**

The deep excavations will endanger the stability of the adjoining St Stephens site and foundations. The 2000 tonnes tower of St Stephens is not underpinned and is on a hill above the site of the new building. It is likely that it will move as a result of the construction works for the new building and it may even topple over. That is an unacceptable state of affairs and risks lives.

The Royal Free has not taken this risk into account and has no provision for it. That is unacceptable and the application should be refused for this reason alone.

Construction works on a site with such restricted access and nowhere for lorries to park risks creating total gridlock for local traffic. Two years of noise, dust and general disturbance will badly affect residents living nearby. The dust, congestion and noise will affect the amenity of the local area and this loss of amenity far outweighs the gains to the area of the new building.

Permission should be refused on this ground of loss of amenity.

#### **Overdevelopment and lack of a master plan**

The Royal Free Hospital site is already grossly overdeveloped and this new proposal will make the situation even worse. Development since the 1970s has been incremental and piecemeal. It is irresponsible to propose what will be one of the largest new buildings in Hampstead for many years in the absence of a master plan for the site, or a plan for where clinical and operational services will go following the recent merger with Barnet and Chase Farm Hospitals.

The upscaling of the A&E department mentioned above will fuel further traffic to the area. At some point one simply has to say STOP. ENOUGH. Now is the time and the application should be refused on the grounds of over development.

#### **Impact of Bartram's and Lawn Road redevelopments**

Two other major developments are taking place at the same time close to the hospital site. The Council must take account of the cumulative impact of all these proposals and not look at each in isolation.

Best Regards

Jessica

**Jessica Learmond-Criqui**  
**Learmond Criqui Sokel LLP, Solicitors**  
**Partner – Employment & Executive Immigration Law**

---

DDI: +44 (0) 20 7794 5992 • Mob: +44 (0) 7770 231 367 • Fax: +44 020 7794 0429

Learmond Criqui Sokel LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registration number OC317878. It is a body corporate which has members whom we refer to as "partners". It is regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority of England and Wales. A list of members and their professional qualifications is open to inspection at the registered office, 14A Redington Road, London NW3 7RG. Members are solicitors.

This communication and all attachments are private and confidential sent by a law firm may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the information and use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that the content or attachments to this communication may not be disclosed, copied, used or distributed without our express permission and we would be grateful if you would then advise the sender immediately of the error in delivery by responding to this message, and then delete it from your system. Thank you.

The contents of an attachment to this e-mail may contain software viruses which could damage your computer system. While Learmond Criqui Sokel LLP has taken every precaution to minimise this risk we cannot accept liability for any damage which you sustain as a result of software viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the attachment.