

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7651/P	Carlotta Fiocchi	Iverson Road	04/02/2015 16:48:07	OBJ	Hello,

I have been following the situation for months now, though not being able to meet with associations due to work. I sincerely find the project needs to be far more clear for the residents of the area, for what concerns the school admission point, and many other things (it would not be nice if residents put up with all of this and cannot even access the school with their kids, I can see more than one family contacting national newspapers about it).

The Tower Block though, is the main reason no one likes this project, all residents between Maygrove road and Iverson road are appalled by the height of this monster, none of us want something like it.

The fact that there is no clarity again on traffic and many expenses is another point that makes the project not interesting to locals (and I will avoid talking of the lack of social housing that is shameful).

I personally think that if you started by eliminating the tower block maybe residents would manage to compromise more with all the rest and you could find common grounds, but until whoever is running the project does not realize that and the need of clarity, I think the council will go towards angry citizens that will do the best they can to avoid the whole project, and that will remember this when elections come.

Regards

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7651/P	James King and Janet Grauberg, Kilburn Liberal Democrats	33 Kingsgate House 2-8 Kingsgate Place London NW6 4TA NW6 4TA	12/02/2015 22:51:11	OBJNOT	<p>We strongly object to this application. The provision of only 4% social housing is a clear breach of Camden Council planning policies and the well-advanced West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan. It also runs completely contrary to the pledges made by the Camden Labour party in the local elections last year.</p> <p>The redevelopment of a light industrial site owned by the Council offers a unique opportunity to make a significant contribution towards addressing the shortage of affordable housing in West Hampstead. West Hampstead ward has one of the lowest proportions of social housing units in Camden borough, and there is also an acute need to offer shared ownership housing options to young families who are currently unable to secure a property in the area.</p> <p>The financial information in relation to this application is opaque, but the Council has previously stated that its political objective is to raise £3m profit from the scheme to fund unspecified purposes in relation to schools across the borough. We disagree with the notion that this excuses the absence of social housing provision in NW6 and consider it to be totally inconsistent with Council planning policies to address the need for affordable housing.</p> <p>We believe the application should include significantly larger numbers of both social and intermediate (part rent, part buy) housing units. If this application had been received from a private developer we would expect the development control committee to turn it down on these grounds, and we urge the committee to do the same in this case.</p> <p>We add that vague talk from Camden Labour councillors about an intention to meet policies in relation to the provision of affordable housing in a potential future application to redevelop the Council's site at 156 West End Lane (which has already been left dormant for over two years) are irrelevant to the committee's considerations in relation to this application. We trust that this will be made clear when the committee makes its decision.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7651/P	C Parfitt	12 Chatsworth Road	12/02/2015 15:42:26	COMMNT	Dear Camden Council

I am writing to object to the planning application for the Liddell Road development 2014/7651/P.

The Liddell Road development is another substantial development in an area that is being rapidly developed. The proposed development will lead to an unacceptably high density and overdevelopment of the site. Given that Liddell Road is outside the West Hampstead Growth Area, there seems to be no justification in planning terms for a development of such high density.

The proposed new residential buildings along Maygrove Road (Block C) and particularly the tall building (Block B) on the railway side of the site are out of character in terms of size, height, bulk and design with the character of the residential buildings in the area. The 11 storey building (Block B) is over-bearing and out-of-scale and, due to the elevated position, will appear higher than 11 storeys. The design does not respond to nor respect the character of the surrounding area. Both its height and design would harm the local character, and if approved, could set a precedent and lead to other tower blocks gaining permission in the vicinity outside the Growth Area, undermining agreed height limits. A more sympathetic, low-rise development which respects the character of the area and topography of the site would be more appropriate (similar to the Sidings Estate to the west of the proposed development).

As proposed, the tower block will result in overlooking, loss of privacy and overshadowing of neighbouring residential buildings, the school and the Maygrove Peace Park. Whilst the Peace Park is a public space, it will be a less-inviting space, given the negative impact resulting from overlooking of the tower block (in addition to the development at 65-67 Maygrove Road).

Consideration needs to be given to the impact on the area of the other approved and planned residential developments near the Liddell Road site and in the immediate area, these including developments at 59 Maygrove Road, 65-67 Maygrove Road, 159-161 Iverson Road (Iverson Tyres site) and 163 Iverson Road (former garden centre), as well as the extensive West Hampstead Square (Ballymore) development of 198 apartments.

I am concerned about the impact on amenities and infrastructure including the Maygrove Peace Park, GP surgeries and public transport. The increase in road and pedestrian traffic is likely to increase the problem of overcrowding and pedestrian safety in West End Lane particularly between the Thameslink, Overground and Underground stations.

There is very little open space in the vicinity and Maygrove Peace Park is an appreciated and well-used open space. There will be a significant increase in the use of the park. The open/wild area along Maygrove Road is also a valued green lung, punctuating an increasingly built up area. The green area along Maygrove Road will be reduced and there have been no plans to expand the park or provide any significant new green space – this is in breach of Camden planning policy and Neighbourhood Plan Policy 16.

Given that the proposals are in breach of a number of planning policies and would set a harmful

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					precedent, the application should be refused and a more appropriate and sympathetic scheme developed.
2014/7651/P	Cllr Angela Pober	Town Hall Judd Street	09/02/2015 19:42:27	COMM	I am voicing the concerns of my ward constituents regarding Part 2 of the Liddell Road Development and the lack of affordable /social housing. Residents have made it clear to me that the social mix of the area is being destroyed by not factoring in adequate provision for social housing. In addition, the current 4% is not in keeping with our Labour manifesto promise of 50% genuinely affordable housing.
2014/7651/P	Tim Francis	42 Broomsleigh Street London NW6 1QH	10/02/2015 18:22:51	OBJ	<p>I am owner occupier of 42 Broomsleigh Street. This is the southern most house on the west side of Broomsleigh Street, immediately adjoining the railway and across from the proposed construction site, and across the road from the flats referred to and depicted in the planning material. Even though my house falls within the curtilage of the plans provided in the Daylight & Sunlight report, my house has been omitted from the plans and the report.</p> <p>I am objecting to this planning proposal on the following basis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Height of proposed building <p>The proposed 11 story residential building will tower over my home, and is completely out of keeping with the character of the local area and neighbouring properties. The highest property nearby is 6 stories. A new 11 story building will dominate the skyline from Broomsleigh Street, especially as it will stand on a raised bank. Currently residents and visitors to Broomsleigh Street have a clear view across the railway to open skies. Planning offers recently rejected a proposal on nearby Iverson Road on the basis that a 7 story building would be ‘overdominant... causing harm to the streetscene... negatively impacting on long views.’ An 11 story building in the proposed location would do this to an even greater scale. If permission was given, precedent would be set and application for similarly overdominant buildings could not be refused, leading to a complete change in landscape of the local area. This is contrary to policies CS14 and DP24. The maximum height allowed should be 6 stories to match the neighboring properties.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of light & privacy <p>An 11 story tower block in the proposed location would cause loss of light to the windows on the front of my house. The Easterly aspect of my property has bay windows on the ground and first floors which are its main source of natural light. An 11 story tower would block some of this natural light. Also all windows on the North and West aspects of the proposed tower would have a clear view over my property and into the above mentioned windows serving my living room downstairs and bedroom on the first floor, causing sever loss of privacy. Not only would I suffer loss of light from the building itself, but I would need to draw blinds to maintain privacy, causing further loss of light in these rooms.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7651/P	Stephen Nathan QC	3 Hilltop Road London NW6 2QA	11/02/2015 11:54:14	OBJ	<p>For all of the reasons given by the Neighbourhood Development Forum, I strongly object to the proposed development.</p> <p>There is absolutely no justification for the proposed 11 storey tower block and the density is well above what would be permitted for any developer. It is completely unacceptable and wrong for Camden to choose to ignore its own planning guidelines.</p>
