

Gentet, Matthias

From: Chug, Josleen
Sent: 16 December 2015 10:45
To: Planning
Subject: FW: objection to application 2015/6455/P.

Please log the objection received below.

Thanks

Josleen Chug
Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: 02079744672

We want to hear your views on the changes we are proposing to how we consult on planning applications. To find out more and have your say visit www.camden.gov.uk/sci. Consultation closes on the 20 January 2016.

From: Brigid Shaughnessy [mailto:]
Sent: 16 December 2015 10:43
To: Chug, Josleen
Subject: objection to application 2015/6455/P.

I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P.

Design : The scheme does not conform to Camden Development Policy High Quality Design DP24. The bulk and density of the proposed development is out of keeping with the character of the surrounding residential buildings (despite a faint reference in the brickwork to Canterbury Mansions façade) and the existing environment. Nearby houses are three storeys high and the (allegedly) 8 storeys of 156 will loom over these - harming occupants light and privacy and their peaceful enjoyment of their properties.

We were told during the pre-application 'exhibitions' that the southern elevation of the front building was not definitive or finalised. The large, fortress-like expanse of brick, unbroken by any feature or window is exceptionally poor design and, in a prominent position, dominates and overwhelms its surroundings. The scheme running down beside the railway line is not coherent and has no merit in terms of visual amenity. This could have been a landmark development and is instead an eye sore.

Traffic & Congestion: The proposed development is not in line with Camden development Policy DP16 and DP17 and DP19 as it creates further traffic and transport problems in the central growth area of West Hampstead. The scheme includes only a single access road as entry and exit to the on a dangerous narrow curve, unlike the current wide-open entrance and exit to the Travis Perkins site. No parking is provided (again) as in Ballymore site arrangement and the unintended consequences of this are that of the 163 flats, a high proportion of tenants will be driving around the nearby streets seeking parking spaces or applying illegally for permits from Camden whose computer systems do not seem robust enough to identify 'car free' applicants

Infrastructure: The development will bring in a minimum of 400 new residents. There is insufficient infrastructure to support this number with the Ballymore development due to complete in June 2016 and other schemes nearby already approaching the 800 dwellings specified in the Mayor's London Plan. These were supposed to be phased in over 15 years and have been put in place far too quickly. Camden, TFL and the utilities have all given little or no consideration to the social and environmental impact of so many developments in such a short space of time. No planning for extra healthcare services has been done. There is no masterplan for the intensification area.

The development will result in growing pressure on public transport and pedestrian numbers in the space of two blocks around the interchange. The footfall on the underground, trains and buses is already at dangerously high peak levels.

I object strongly to this scheme and hope the DCC will protect this community from it as well as question why the services and resources needed have not been upgraded to cope with over 1000 new residents. I strongly object to this scheme and hope the DCC will protect this community from it as well as question why the services and resources needed have not been upgraded to cope with over 1000 new residents.

--

Brigid Shaughnessy