

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Sara Dibb	63 Solent Road London NW6 1TY	06/01/2016 10:50:00	INT	<p>This development does nothing to serve the community and its needs or to genuinely provide a significant level of affordable housing. The area is already extremely congested, roads and pavements are hazardous and facilities, such as my doctor's surgery, are stretched to breaking point. This is before people move into all the other developments (such as Liddell and Iverson Rd) which will have a further adverse impact on a local community and previously benign environment to breaking point. The last thing we need is another tower block. We need community facilities and buildings which enhance the area and are appropriate in type and in scale. Who is this development for? Investors and developers not the local community whom you have been elected to serve.</p>
2015/6455/P	Abigail England	246a Randolph Avenue	06/01/2016 01:00:08	OBJ	<p>I am writing as a former tenant of a home on West Hampstead who cares about the area and was thinking of returning to live in W Hamp one day....</p> <p>There are a multitude of concerns when a Proposal of this size surfaces, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity – West Hampstead is already overcrowded and infrastructure and facilities are at their tipping point in terms of being able to cope • Unacceptable level of overshadowing and overlooking – negative impacts on homes, gardens, play areas and open space of residents • There are too many development projects concurrently and the overall impact has not been properly assessed. • Bulk, massing, density, scale – exceeds maximum density recommended in the London Plan, resulting in an over-intensive over-development in which "affordable" units are proposed that fall below Camden's minimum floor space requirements. • Height – too high and out of keeping - seven storey blocks tower over the surrounding terraces • Impact on Conservation Area – views in and out of the Conservation Area will be eradicated, setting a worrying precedent for Conservation Areas across Camden and indeed wider London • Lack of transition from “high street” to “side street” – Out of keeping with character of West Hampstead roads and intersections where up to five-storey "high street" blocks drop to three-storey blocks on the "side street". Ignores Camden's own requirement for this transition as outlined in the Site Allocations document. <p>I would urge the planners to take note of the hundreds of residents of the local area who do not want the development as it stands. They are the people who live in the area and pay Council Tax! It will cause irreversible damage to a beautiful Conservation Area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Paul Knowles	28 Canfield Gardens West Hampstead London NW6 3LA	02/01/2016 15:39:31	OBJ	<p>The proposed development is completely oversized and should not be allowed. The planned buildings aren't in keeping with existing architecture in the area and would be an eyesore.</p> <p>Pedestrians, public transport users and traffic is at full capacity on West End Lane as it is (and that's before anyone has moved in to the new developments at West Hampstead Square, Iverson Road, Maygrove Road etc.). One just has to watch how busy West End Lane gets in the morning and evening with all the commuters, to realise how crazy these plans are. Often the pavements are totally full and pedestrians have to walk in the road, which is narrow and full of traffic.</p> <p>Why are no council/social housing homes being built on this site? The last thing West Hampstead needs is yet more expensive luxury housing. And don't try to fob off the community by saying "affordable housing" will be included as it's in no way affordable to most people (even people earning a modest salary won't be able to afford "affordable housing", let alone people earning the minimum wage or the London Living Wage). It's a complete farce.</p> <p>I would also like to point out that some of the proposed development would be built on land which the public has had unimpeded access to since the existing building was built. How can the developer lawfully build on land which has now become a public right of way?</p> <p>The lack of schools in the area is also an issue which will only get worse if new housing is built. This site would actually be a perfect location for a school, rather than this unwanted development. In fact, there are many things Camden Council could use this publicly owned land for, instead of selling it off to make a quick buck.</p> <p>The children's playground would be overshadowed by this development, resulting in loss of light. Not only would this make the playground cold, dull and dark, but there are health concerns too; we all now know how important vitamin D is and there is already a major problem with kids not playing outside much these days, so the last thing we need is a playground with little sunlight. At least let children get vitamin D on the rare occasions they do leave their computers and go outside to play.</p> <p>The proposed oversized buildings will be seen from miles away and ruin the views for tens, if not hundreds of thousands of people (just like the West Hampstead Square and Blackburn Road developments which have ruined views for many people living within a few miles radius).</p> <p>The only people who would benefit from this development are the developers who would make a fortune, at the expense of Camden residents (who technically own the land). Once the council sells the land, it is gone forever and there is no other land nearby that could be used for future council housing, schools etc. (because the council has already sold it all off over the years).</p> <p>It should also be noted that if this development were to go ahead, then it would result in the loss of the Travis Perkins builders merchants. Camden Council has already granted planning permission to demolish the builders merchant on Blackburn Road and replace it with housing. If local builders can't source materials locally, this results in even more traffic on the roads as they have to travel backwards</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>and forwards to builders merchants further away (there are none left at this end of the borough) which also means local residents and businesses will have higher costs when getting building work done, as their builders will have to travel further and of course time (and fuel) is money.</p> <p>There is so much that is wrong with this proposed development that I could go on and on.</p> <p>I have spoken to a lot of local people about this proposed development and haven't found a single person in support of it. This speaks volumes. The residents of West Hampstead do NOT want this developed so it would be wrong for the council to grant planning permission.</p>
2015/6455/P	alyson Phillips	Flat 2 2 Sandwell Crescent London NW6 1PB	05/01/2016 21:52:25	OBJ	<p>How can you possibly think the high street can handle these new residents? The bridge is a complete danger zone, with people forced into the road to get to the stations on both sides of the street. parents with buggies get knocked around and elderly people get shoved aside.</p> <p>Then there is the traffic. When these residents have friends visiting, or supermarket deliveries or any other delivery, West End Lane will be completely backed up. it is horrific now with cars and Tesco delivery vans - it simply cannot handle any more opportunities for halted traffic on west end lane.</p> <p>You need to INSIST the developers build a pedestrian walkway over the road, or even better and more sensibly widen the bridge before you even consider this monstrous development.</p> <p>In addition, what are these developers doing to support the local community? Are they building a doctors surgery? a nursery? supporting local young people? If they are to be considered for this site (and it should be a much smaller development) they need to seriously dig into their pockets and start supporting the community.</p> <p>Also, the right to light for the residents of Lymington road is a huge issue. This development is simply too large and grotesque. West Hampstead cannot handle all these new residents. We do not need them. Let those residents keep their light filled properties they have spent their hard earned money on - do not ruin their chances of happiness by destroying their homes.</p>
2015/6455/P	Philip Sethill	6 Lymington London Nw6 1hy	08/01/2016 16:06:25	COMMNT	I totally reject the planning
2015/6455/P	Jordan Cushing	30 Lymington Road Flat 2 NW6 1HY	08/01/2016 21:24:55	OBJEMPER	<p>I have emailed a letter c/o planning@camden.gov.uk addressed to Ms. Chug detailing my comments about this planning application.</p> <p>I would like to attend the committee and speak at the committee.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Sally Jeffrey	2 Dene Mansions Dennington Park Road NW6 1AY	07/01/2016 15:02:08	COMMNT	As a resident of West Hampstead, I am very considerably pro development and renewal, however not at the harm of the community. The inflow of new residents to the area with the proposed development is outrageous! The local transportation systems are already straining under the weight of residents and will be further tested once the development of 'Hampstead Square' opens. I am opposed to the development proposal.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Kathryn Lord	2 hall Farm Cottages Church Road West Beckham Holt NR25 6NX	07/01/2016 09:59:53	COMMNT	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.</p> <p>I write this as a frequent visitor to the neighbourhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not meet the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011. • The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area. • The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its existing form will tower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties. • The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents' right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property. • The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population. • The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road. • While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space. • The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of: loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year.• The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lymington Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the Street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.• The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing – this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan. Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development. <p>Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.</p> <p>I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.</p> <hr/>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Ekaterina Shanova	Flat 1 68 Crediton Hill NW6 1HR	07/01/2016 10:51:48	COMMNT	<p>I query the impartiality of Camden Council's ability to decide this matter on fair grounds given that the land is owned by the Council, and the developer is The Council's chosen developer.</p> <p>Due to the fact that there was no Master Plan or strategy for the West Hampstead area we now appear to be in a position whereby 156 West End Lane is being used as a possible solution to previous planning errors, thereby resulting in a totally inappropriate development for reasons listed below.</p> <p>West Hampstead as you are aware is an area characterised by Victorian and Edwardian (mostly) red-brick individual and terraced housing, with some mansion blocks. The area is home to a number of designated heritage assets. This of course is an important factor to bear in mind when considering the style and nature of any proposed developments.</p> <p>I refer you to paragraphs 126 and 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework which must apply to all proposed developments. Paragraph 126 for example states:</p> <p>“Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; – the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring; – the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and – opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place”. <p>Having considered the policy I am of the view that no proper account has been taken of the policy and feel this is partly to do with the way in which the proposed plans have been hastily put together.</p> <p>I would also draw your attention to the “Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, Local Development Framework” document, which “contributes to delivering the Core Strategy by providing</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

detailed policies that [Camden Council] will use when determining applications for planning permission”, specifically item 25.9 which refers to the existing “largely dense urban nature of Camden”:

“Due to the largely dense urban nature of Camden, the character or appearance of our conservation areas can also be affected by development which is outside of conservation areas, but visible from within them. This includes high or bulky buildings, which can have an impact on areas some distance away, as well as adjacent premises. The Council will therefore not permit development in locations outside conservation areas that it considers would cause harm to the character, appearance or setting of such an area.”

Having also examined the information and design proposals made available by the preferred supplier, I also submit the following further objections to the proposed development:

The “West Hampstead: Shaping the Future” plan for West Hampstead issued by Camden Council expressly sets out that the area is “well loved for its village feel” and that the Council commits to “enhancing the distinctive village character” and to provide “support for local business”. The proposed project is in breach of these commitments.

The proposed development is completely out of keeping with the character of the surrounding residential buildings. It completely disregards the environment around it and the character of other buildings. The houses in Lymington Road – for example – are three storeys high, the development in its existing form will tower over these properties blighting their light, use and enjoyment of their properties.

The plans are not in keeping with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area.

The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents’ right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property.

The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population.

West Hampstead has benefited from an influx of young families, the population of children has steadily grown in recent times. The proposed development and its impact on the environment will be have a detrimental effect on the well-being of those in near and surrounding areas.

The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road.

The proposed buildings themselves will have a considerably negative impact on the conservation area which the planned development adjoins.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

The development proposes to house between 600 – 800 residents. There is simply insufficient infrastructure to support this number of additional residents into West Hampstead; there is already one development due to complete later this year, West Hampstead Square – the impact from this development is yet to be seen alongside other developments in Blackburn Road, Iverson Road, and Liddell Road.

We respectfully submit insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental impact of so many developments in such a short space of time.

There is already insufficient parking capacity in the surrounding areas. This has been further reduced as and when JW3 host events. The burden on parking may in turn assist applicants wishing to convert front gardens into drives, thereby completing spoiling the entire area.

The development will result in a substantial increase in footfall in what are already overcrowded surrounding roads.

The footfall on the underground, trains and buses – without yet taking additional traffic from West Hampstead Square into account – is already at close to maximum level.

Another new development will shunt public transport levels on the tubes and trains to dangerously high levels, thereby putting public safety at risk.

The narrow pavements over the bridge between this proposed development and two stations is already heaving with pedestrians in the mornings and evenings.

We support the use of space for developmental purposes, but any proposed development must be viable and properly benefit the community.

Travis Perkins is a long-standing business and significant local employer on the existing site and welcomes any opportunity to negotiate a redevelopment of the adjacent former council offices for housing. This would be in line with Camden's own planning policies CS8 and DP13.

The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on GP services, of which there are fewer in the area, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan.

The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.

The proposed blocks will overshadow and deprive of light the green space and children's playground at the Lymington Road Estate, which is closest to the 156 West End Lane site, as well as to the homes and gardens on Lymington Road Estate.

In addition, the period over which such a large development would be built, will be very long and it would be untenable for the children to use the playground for a very long time in such close proximity to such a noisy and large building site.

The proposed project is located on the immediate border of a conservation area. A conservation area is defined in Section 69 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as an area of "special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance" and that the project is irreconcilable with the Council's duty to ensure such preservation.

The plans are also in direct contravention of the policies outlined in the Neighbourhood Development Plan for this area.

The proposed plans are opposed in their entirety by the combined forces of Save West Hampstead,

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Lymington Road Residents' Association, Crediton Hill Residents' Association, West Hampstead Gardens' & Residents' Association, the West End Green Conservation Area Advisory Committee and the Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead (CRASH).</p> <p>The extensive nature of the proposed over-development has the potential to inflict upon the long-established surrounding properties, many of which are in the West End Green Conservation Area, serious structural issues such as subsidence.</p> <p>The Travis Perkins business operating at 156 West End Lane is closed from 12pm on Saturdays, meaning that residents in the adjoining properties and roads benefit from quiet and peaceful homes and gardens in the evenings, at weekends and on Public Holidays.</p> <p>The proposed road from West End Lane is on a dangerous narrow curve, unlike the current wide-open entrance and exit to the Travis Perkins site.</p> <p>I would like to reiterate my absolute opposition to the proposal and expect all of my above points to be considered, addressed and responded to appropriately.</p>
2015/6455/P	Jeanette Murch	Flat 1 36 Lowfield Road London	08/01/2016 14:48:34	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Re Planning Application 2015/6455/P for 156 West End Lane</p> <p>I am writing to object to the above application and request that Camden does not grant planning permission for the proposed development in its present form.</p> <p>Although there have been a number of modifications made by the applicant's architects to the initial design, there is much still to be done to make the development an appropriate and desirable addition to the locality.</p> <p>The design is mediocre, it certainly wouldn't make it to the Stirling Prize for architecture long list. Its mass and bulk is out of scale and harmony with its potential setting. In fact I would go as far as to say that it would be more appropriate as a prison such is the bulk and looming nature of it.</p> <p>Many earlier objectors have made objections with which I entirely agree. However, it does need emphasising that the application does NOT comply with a number of requirements in the Neighbourhood Plan and, moreover, a number of Camden's own policies including DP24, DP25, DP26 and DP16.</p> <p>It would therefore be quite wrong if Camden granted planning permission for this application and would make a mockery of the planning process which is supposed to safeguard communities, neighbourhoods and the environment.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jeanette Murch</p>
2015/6455/P	Janet Nabney	28 Dennington Park Road	06/01/2016 23:22:10	PETITNOBJ E	<p>This project proposes buildings of an unacceptable height in comparison with the majority of the surrounding small buildings. It will increase the population which is already pushed to provide crucial amenities for the present population both Medical surgeries, Schools, and public transport.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	John Vos	Flat 3 28 Crediton Hill London NW6 1HP	06/01/2016 23:33:28	COMMEM AIL	<p>I would like to object to the proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <p>Overcrowding There are currently numerous developments which are not yet complete which will over-burden the area significantly. The submitted reports do not properly cater for these additional demands.</p> <p>Traffic West End Lane is currently a traffic nightmare. The report submitted bears no resemblance to the West End Lane that I witness every morning. (20mph!!!! LOL) The proximity of the Thameslink to the project and the number of drop-offs will result in multiple accidents to pedestrians and cars if the project is allowed to proceed for which the council will be morally responsible.</p> <p>Infrastructure Where are the additional school places, doctors etc to support the additional residents in these high density schemes??</p> <p>In summary this is a morally bankrupt proposal that does not serve the community and flies in the face of the development strategies that Camden likes to think it promotes.</p>
2015/6455/P	H Levy	Welbeck Mansions Inglewood Road	06/01/2016 11:23:36	OBJ	<p>The area is already over saturated with development. We simply do not have the infrastructure in place to deal with any more! Our GP surgeries have 2-3 week waiting times, the tubes and trains are at break point during rush hour and that's the without the slew of developments already underway in the area: Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads are all yet to be populated. Please don't even consider this plan. Travis Perkins has been a staple at the heart of our community for years! This means all their jobs will be gone adding to unemployment levels. Disgraceful.</p>
2015/6455/P	Brinsley Dresden	21 Menelik Road London NW2 3RJ	24/12/2015 13:41:59	AMEND	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed development is too high and too bulky. 2. It's impact will be inappropriate for the Conservation Area, dominating the local streets, both West End Lane and Lymington Road. 3. West Hampstead is already overdeveloped, and this development fails to take account of the cumulative effect of the new developments on West End Lane, as well as those on Iverson Road and Mangrove Road, as well as others. The pavements and stations are overcrowded, and where are the amenities such as schools and GP places going to come from? 4. Access to and from Travis Perkins is already a problem, creating traffic jams when vehicles are queuing to turn right into the site from West End Lane, often resulting in aggressive behaviour by drivers which endangers pedestrians. This problem can also be seen with a similar problem with cars coming and going from the car park on the south east side of West End Lane on the other side of the railway tracks.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Claire Burton	60 Finland Road	07/01/2016 12:13:08	COMMNT	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.</p> <p>I write this as a frequent visitor to the neighbourhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not meet the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011. • The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area. • The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its existing form will tower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties. • The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents' right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property. • The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population. • The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road. • While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space. • The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

- The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of: loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year.

- The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lymington Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the Street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.

- The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing – this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan.

Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development.

Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.

I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Vicki Doe	6b Lymington Road West Hampstead London NW6 1HY	06/01/2016 22:32:43	OBJLETTE R	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.</p> <p>Personally:</p> <p>As a resident on the south side of Lymington Road and the owner of a ground floor flat, I am substantially affected by the proposed development and object on a basis of a loss of light. Having reviewed the “BRE Daylight and Sunlight (Neighbouring Properties) 18 December 2015 document” supplied by A2 Dominion and created by Right of Light Consulting the following is clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The report states that “a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings. We note that the proposed development is to be of similar height and proportion to that of the existing surrounding buildings”. This statement is simply untrue – the development does not match the height or proportions at all of the existing buildings and is in fact 3-4 stories higher than the properties on Lymington Road which it faces and blocks the light from. If the proposed building DID adhere to the height and proportions of the existing buildings then there would be almost no Loss of Light issues at all. o My property will suffer dramatically- with ALL windows below the BRE Guidelines. o In the Sunlight to Windows Tests 153 out of the 396 windows reported will fall below the 21st March recommended minimum ratio of 0.8 which is 39% of all windows and, although this is just the winter figures, it shows the scale of impact that the development has at a crucial time of the year when many windows will lose significant light. This should not be averaged over to the whole year to try to wiggle out of the fact as to how the development will affect people’s properties and quality of life during the winter months when many will be living in almost total overshadowing. <p>Given the above it is clear that not only are a number of windows and open spaces falling well below the BRE guideline figures, a great many other windows are only marginally above the guidelines and a great many are well below them for substantial parts of the year. On this basis the development is unacceptable and if approved a considerable number of local residents would have to consider Right of Light legal claims to stop the development proceeding as proposed. The fact that Camden are being made aware of these breaches at this stage should give them plenty of opportunity to ensure the matter is rectified so that they are not culpable in allowing this legal infringement to take place</p> <p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not meet the policies in our Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011. • The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area. • The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

existing form will tower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties.

- The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents' right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property.
- The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population.
- The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road.
- While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space.
- The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.
- The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of: loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year.
- The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lymington Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the Street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.
- The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing – this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>been properly examined or considered by this plan.</p> <p>Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development.</p> <p>Finally, I attended the NDF presentation and believe the alternative scheme by Create Streets provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.</p> <p>I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.</p> <p>Vicki Doe</p>
2015/6455/P	Christine De Poortere	17 Lymington Road NW6 1HX	05/01/2016 18:46:18	OBJ	<p>I live in Lymington Road and would like to register my opposition to such a development. It is far too dense and high for the area, and would not be appropriate. This is a conservation area and this massive redevelopment would severely affect it. It would be a blot on the landscape and potentially block out sunlight.</p> <p>There is a need for new affordable housing for the local community, but not on such a scale. This development is not meant to be for the community but for overseas investment, which is the wrong thing for west Hampstead.</p> <p>Please do not allow this to go ahead based on the current plans. Thank you.</p>
2015/6455/P	Brett John	185 Sumatra Rd West Hampstead NW6 1PF NW6 1PF NW6 1PF	06/01/2016 10:36:10	OBJ	Objection!
2015/6455/P	meher toorkey	65 Cholmley gardens NW61AJ NW61AJ NW61AJ	05/01/2016 10:47:05	COMMNT	This will add to the chaos and disruption already caused by new developments sanctioned by greedy developers. West End Lane is a bottle neck stretching over 2 kms. The pollution increases. We cannot sustain any more people, traffic or development unless we wish to see the whole infra structure break down.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Penny Liechti	91 Ravenshaw Street London NW6 1NP	08/01/2016 13:18:20	COMMNT	<p>1. I am a long-standing West Hampstead resident, currently living a few minutes' walk from the site in question and previously a resident of the neighbouring Doulton Mews for six years. I am particularly concerned with the provision of affordable housing on the site.</p> <p>2. With the pace of new development in West Hampstead, inevitable given its position as an area of intensification under the London Plan, there has been much justified local concern about the mix of residents and the increasing socioeconomic divide in the area. Part of West Hampstead's appeal has always been its diversity and the West End Square development in particular, 70% of which was apparently sold off-plan to overseas investors, looks set to undermine this community mix.</p> <p>3. The conversations I have had with other local residents on the subject of the 156 West ned Lane development have principally revolved around provision of truly "affordable" (ie not just at the standard 80% of market rate) housing which will serve the needs of low- and middle-income families rather than the wealthy who can afford the ever-increasing sale and rental prices in the area.</p> <p>4. The local furore over the lack of affordable housing in the Liddell Road development (the reasons behind which were understandable, and of which I was supportive) makes it even more crucial that the issue of housing provision is addressed properly at 156 West End Lane. 50% affordable housing on this development is very welcome, and the delivery of this provision should be a major priority for Camden. Ensuring that the developer sticks to this plan is paramount and I hope the Committee will focus on this target.</p> <p>5. Truly affordable housing, at 25-30% of market rates, ie the level of the council's social rents, should be the aim here, as mentioned above – I'd like to see the Committee making the involvement of a housing association partner and guarantee of rents being placed at this level a mandatory part of the approval.</p> <p>6. It's welcome that the majority of affordable homes in the development seem to be planned as three or more bedrooms, and I'd like to see this also being made a condition of the planning consent. There is a real need for accommodation for local families, with overcrowding a terrible problem for many, and larger units, positioned with good access to the open space and playground, would be an essential part of making this development work.</p> <p>7. The units should also be "pepperpot", ie not segregated into market level and affordable homes, and the proposal for entrances to be mixed is welcome. Again I'd like to see this as a condition of consent so there can be no back-tracking on this.</p> <p>8. The proposed new open spaces attached to the development would be very welcome, as would the increased use of the Potteries Path which would go with it. This should be opened up, refurbished and made a key walkway in the area – I know from my time living on the Potteries Estate that it's currently underused. Again these proposals should be a mandatory part of the planning consent.</p> <p>9. There will inevitably be greater pressure on local amenities with this development, though the</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Adam Erusalimsky	Flat 2 2 Sandwell Crescent West Hampstead London NW6 1PB	05/01/2016 09:44:39	OBJ	<p>provision of the new school on Liddell Road should help accommodate new children moving into the area. It would be good to see the Committee add its voice to the local campaign (via WHAT, the West Hampstead Amenity & Transport group) to persuade TfL to install a lift at the tube station. With the new Overground station design incorporating a lift, and the Thameslink station already having one, it's absurd that the key part of the interchange at the tube is the only West Hampstead station without one. TfL's contention that the lift at Kilburn station is an adequate substitute is a nonsense, as anyone with a vague knowledge of the area would be bound to agree.</p> <p>I have the following five objections to this development:</p> <p>Firstly, this development is far too high and will ruin the local landscape. To erect a seven storey building in such a low rise neighbourhood is quite frankly staggering. It will cast shadows on much of Lymmington Road and parts of Crediton. I suspect that if such a high building is erected, the local neighbours will seek and obtain a High Court injunction protecting their right to light. This would lead to protracted litigation that will waste the Council's resources.</p> <p>Secondly, the design of the building is not in keeping with the local character of the high street. Many of the buildings on the high street are beautiful Victorian or Edwardian buildings. Whilst 156 West End Lane is currently occupied by an ugly building that broke with this Victorian/Edwardian style, any redevelopment should seek to re-establish the Victorian/Edwardian style by imitating the period buildings of that era.</p> <p>Thirdly, little thought has been given to how the extra congestion caused by the additional residents that will be accommodated in an already swelling area will be managed. If developed, the site should be linked by pedestrian paths/tunnels/bridges to the O2 Centre, the Jubilee line station and the Thameslink Station. Otherwise, during rush hour all the residents of this massive block will spill out onto an already very overcrowded high street.</p> <p>Fourthly, the green or community space is tiny. It is clear that Camden is prioritising the developers over the local community. This land belongs to Camden. Camden residents should benefit from this land, not rich developers.</p> <p>Fifthly, it is clear that only a fraction of this land is going to be developed as affordable housing. Given the number of teachers, nurses, transport workers, cleaners, social workers, junior doctors and other public servants who work in Camden, one would have thought that the Council should be using this land to house them. If the Council does not ensure there is affordable housing for key workers, it polarises the social demographic such that those who serve Camden will never be able to afford to live in Camden, fomenting inequality and iniquity which is bad for social cohesion and results in increased crime and anti social behaviour.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Madeline ioannidis	37 Chandos Way	07/01/2016 13:57:29	COMMNT	Proposal would negatively impact West End Lane and adjacent streets overshadowed by proposed blocks. Far-reaching negatives outweigh any proposed "benefit" to local residents. Key concerns include: overshadowing/overlooking homes/gardens and childrens play areas on Crown Close and Lymington Rd estate, already overcrowded pedestrian walkways (and stations) on West End Lane will become significantly more overcrowded and dangerous, the proposed development will eradicate views into and out of the conservation area-this will have worrying knock on effect for other Conservation areas across Camden, Design of units in proposed development are completely out of character with existing buildings, thereby having destructive impact on history and character of West End Lane and surrounding streets specifically those closest to the proposed development. SEVEN story blocks are totally inappropriate. The proposed development's "affordable housing" are blatantly dishonest and a total fallacy. The area is already suffering from a shortfall in critical amenities specifically GP services, and school places, the proposed development will exacerbate this already very serious problem. There will be increased congestion in traffic on West End Lane, adding to existing pollution levels.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	David McNeight	2 Hall Farm Cottages Church Road West Beckham NR25 6NX	07/01/2016 10:17:08	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.</p> <p>I write this as a frequent visitor to the neighbourhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not meet the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011. • The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area. • The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its existing form will tower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties. • The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents' right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property. • The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population. • The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road. • While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space. • The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

- The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of: loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year.

- The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lymington Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the Street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.

- The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing – this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan.

Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development.

Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.

I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
-----------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------

2015/6455/P	nick walford	7 eton road	07/01/2016 18:05:52	COMMNT	Dear Camden Council,
-------------	--------------	-------------	---------------------	--------	----------------------

I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.

I write this as a frequent visitor to the neighbourhood.

- The proposal does not meet the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011.
- The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area.
- The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its existing form will tower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties.
- The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents' right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property.
- The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population.
- The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road.
- While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space.
- The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

- The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of: loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year.

- The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lymington Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the Street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.

- The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing – this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan.

Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development.

Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.

I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Mr R C Meares	18 Dene Mansions Kingdon Rd NW6 1QU	07/01/2016 12:18:24	OBJ	<p>I live in West Hampstead near to 156 West End Lane. I have attended a briefing by the architects and read documents from the Neighbourhood Development Forum. While this development has some very good points I fear that overall it is a bad design for the area. This is mainly because it is too high and too massive.</p> <p>On the West End Lane frontage it seems more or less in keeping with the area, but then expands hugely east along the railway line at the same height. I think this should be lower, and should not uniform be all the way – instead, the block should be broken up to allow some space for light and visual relief when viewed from West End Lane from the stations.</p> <p>I fear the current proposal would particularly blight many homes in Lymington Road and north thereof, robbing them of light.</p> <p>I know the area is set for densification, but feel a somewhat smaller development would not mar the feel of the area as much, and would not cause extra congestion in an area that is already bursting to the seams with through (pedestrian) traffic at rush hours – and that is without the many new residents of the large adjacent developments currently nearing completion.</p> <p>Regards Richard Meares</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Mandy Reddington	20 Hoddesdon Road Stanstead Abbotts Herts SG12 8EQ	07/01/2016 08:27:54	OBJLETTE R	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.</p> <p>I write this as a frequent visitor to the neighbourhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not meet the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011. • The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area. • The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its existing form will tower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties. • The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents' right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property. • The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population. • The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road. • While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space. • The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of: loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year. The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lymington Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the Street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light. The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing – this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan. Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development. <p>Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.</p> <p>I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.</p>
2015/6455/P	Tatjana Vucanovic	6a Lymington Rd	07/01/2016 11:03:40	OBJ	This development is right across my flat and given the size and height of it, it will completely block the light to my flat (ground floor). Also, the West Hampstead area is already so busy and it is near impossible to get around as there are so many people living there so by adding more housing this would just make it worse. This has to be reconsidered and residents comments should be taken into account.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	WHGARA	20 Kylemore Road London NW6 2PT	06/01/2016 12:25:19	OBJEMAIL	Dear Sir/Madam,

Re Planning Application for 156 West End Lane Ref: 2015/6455/P

We would like to object to the application for the proposed development at 156 West End Lane.

This property is publicly owned land and the development is being made in collaboration with Camden Council. Camden has completely failed to seize the opportunity for replacing a rather dull and uninspiring public building with a piece of good, modern architecture which will be in tune with the character of its prominent position in West Hampstead.

The mass and bulk of the proposed buildings are out of keeping with the surrounding area, do not conform with traditional scaling between, West End Lane and the residential side street. This entirely breaches Camden Policy DP24. They configuration of the proposed development will overshadow and adversely affect the nearby Conservation Area (Camden Policy DP25).

The eviction of Travis Perkins/Wickes, one of the last remaining significant local employers and local suppliers who draw in customers and traders to the area will be an irretrievable loss for West Hampstead and directly contravenes Camden Policy DP13.

In addition, the Council has not done the necessary work of master planning and building up the infrastructure: schools, doctors' surgeries and the like and we now have an accelerating, rolling deficit of services as developments like West Hampstead Square will already overstretch existing resources.

We are concerned that the vehicular access arrangement to the proposed development, a new single entry and exit road on the north side, is not fit for purpose and is badly designed. It creates a traffic hazard and will cause yet another congestion hotspot on West End Lane. It is not in any way sufficient for managing the likely volume of traffic generated by a 163 flat scheme plus retail units. Emergency services, retail / occupant deliveries and rubbish disposal will all also be severely compromised. .

Taking the above points into account, we strongly urge you to reject this application in its present form.

Officers and Core Committee
West Hampstead Gardens and Residents' Association
WHGARA

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Alan Watson	Flat 3 94 West End Lane NW6 2LU	08/01/2016 17:54:07	COMMEMP ER	<p>1: Secrecy of Viability assessments of planning applications. Local people not consulted or still not privy to negotiations of developers with supposed representatives of the electorate. Especially relevant regarding development is on publicly owned land.</p> <p>2: After correspondence with Mr Blackwell ascertained that just over 20% of units proposed will be for rent and will be administered by A2 Dominion. I have strong objections. Why are the proposed rented units not being administered by the council? What are the proposed rents? Is there any guarantee that the rents for the 20% of units proposed will be affordable for local families? Lack of this information prior to granting of planning permission is outrageous and I object strongly.</p> <p>3: No guarantees have been submitted that the so called 50% of unaffordable units proposed will not be lucrative investments for foreign financiers to provide London flats for very wealthy outsiders.</p> <p>4: The termination of Travis Perkins business on the site, A long standing local employer and business which will be missed.</p> <p>5: The misinformation provided by the developers, their publicity agents and the lack of transparency of the council and their officials and councillors has convinced me that this proposed development is in the interest of greedy developers and their friends in Camden Council and against the interests of Londoners and local people.</p> <p>For these reasons alone I must strongly object to the proposed development of 156 West End Lane.</p>
2015/6455/P	Denis Quilligan	22 pandora Road london nw6 1tt	07/01/2016 22:24:04	COMMNT	<p>Overbearing nature of proposal</p> <p>The number, height, size, layout, siting, density and design of buildings</p> <p>Overshadowing of surroundings, including homes, gardens, open spaces and public thoroughfares</p> <p>Loss of sunlight (See Building Research Establishment Guidelines)</p> <p>Loss of outlook to the detriment of residential amenity</p> <p>Overlooking</p> <p>Loss of privacy</p>
2015/6455/P	Paddy Bazeley	25 Cumberland Mansions West End Lane London NW6 1LL	07/01/2016 18:38:40	COMMEMP ER	<p>West Hampstead is a lovely, vibrant easy-going area and I I have lived for 48 years and seen many changes, mostly good but the well -being of the area and therefore of its residents feels very much under threat. The new complex by the bridge is ugly enough but the proposed development of the Travis Perkins site is extremely worrying. Of course, we need more housing - but affordable/social housing for the wonderfully diverse population of West Hampstead.All I can see from these plans is a commercial enterprise that takes no account of healthy living and the community spirit that protects society and provides a safe environment thus reducing expenditure on the public purse. The use of the church (St James) is a wonderful example of providing the social contacts via the post office, children's play area and cafe that alleviate isolation and some of the social problems that face people in this world of economic uncertainty as well as other fears of violence etc.</p> <p>I would like to see plans for the development of this site that takes into consideration the wider view of humanity. Of course, you will argue that the proposed plans will bring business and therefore jobs to the area but I contend that there are other considerations that I hope I have outlined above and that will be for the greater good!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Sarah Owen	49 church street	08/01/2016 14:28:29	COMMNT	I object
2015/6455/P	Robert Collinge	12 Walsingham St. John's Wood Park LONDON NW8 6RG	30/12/2015 10:39:12	NOBJ	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to welcome a development providing more much needed homes in such a suitable location for high density housing. It is ideal with first class transport links, local shopping, restaurants, and other services.</p> <p>We shall also benefit from some reduction in traffic, particularly of dangerous and diesel polluting HGVs. The current use of the site is of little historic or aesthetic value and more suited to a site with better HGV access.</p> <p>Although there will be some short term disruption during the development of the site this is unfortunately true of building on most of London's brown field sites which is vital if we are to meet our city's housing needs.</p> <p>In the long term the downside to neighbouring homeowners will be small and the site design will help to mitigate this. However, there will be improvement to the area's ambiance as well as significant advantage in allowing so many more people to join them as West Hampstead householders.</p> <p>I hope the project will proceed as proposed so that it can help to improve the area and meet local housing needs.</p>
2015/6455/P	Dan Myers	Flat 1 29 Kingdon Road NW6 1PJ	08/01/2016 11:46:25	COMMEM AIL	<p>I have seen the plans for this new building. I don't think it should go ahead. I walk to work on West End Lane every day and it is already very busy with people filling the pavements around the stations. With such a big building it will be even worse. Also, the playground at the back will be in shade, which is not fair on local children.</p> <p>The inclusion of additional car parking spaces is particularly troubling. West End Lane already suffers from extreme traffic congestion and we do not need any more cars on the road.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the local infrastructure (for example, schools, doctor's surgeries, local amenities) will not be able to cope with the influx of people to the area, which will increase massively once West Hampstead Square and the other developments are completed. It is already extremely difficult to get children into the 3 local primary schools in the area, and this will only get worse. The area is saturated with residential accommodation. To introduce more residential dwellings will make the area unpleasant and unworkable. In short the quality of life in West Hampstead will be harmed. This development should not be approved.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	David Gardner	Flat 1 30 Lymington Road West Hampstead London NW6 1HY	08/01/2016 18:57:05	OBJEMAIL	<p>I live at Flat 1, 30 Lymington Road – a ground floor flat with garden which backs on to the ball court – with my wife and family.</p> <p>I am extremely concerned by the proposed development in West End Lane which I believe will have a severe detrimental effect on me, my family and on the local neighbourhood.</p> <p>We have lived at our property since 2007. Our rear garden currently enjoys sunlight for most of the day – indeed, having a garden which is bright and not heavily overlooked was one of the most attractive selling points when we purchased the property – and is enjoyed by the whole family. Personally, as someone with restricted mobility and health issues, the opportunity to step outside and spend time in our garden and in the sunshine is very important for my overall health and wellbeing. I am very alarmed, therefore, by the plans I have seen which indicate a serious reduction in the sunlight on our property, should the building go ahead as planned. This is hugely disappointing, having invested in a property for the long term, and with plans to spend my retirement years here.</p> <p>For other neighbouring properties in Lymington Road, closer to the site of the proposed development, the problem of reduced daylight is even greater and I am quite shocked at the size of the proposed development with, it seems, very little consideration for the outlook from those properties in Lymington Road.</p> <p>Aside from the direct impact on me and our family in terms of the reduction in daylight, it is the long-term detrimental impact on the local environment which is a very serious concern. I note that residents will not be allocated parking spaces and this will be made very clear to them. However, I do not believe that the roads and local infrastructure can support a housing complex of this size.</p> <p>As a frequent user of West End Lane during rush hour (I catch the 328 bus to work from West End Lane), I know first-hand how congested the roads can get. The additional residences (with the increased volume of deliveries, visitors, workmen, etc.) can only increase and further aggravate the traffic congestion, noise, traffic pollution and parking difficulties which can already be very problematic in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development.</p> <p>One of the most attractive features of the local neighbourhood for a buyer – particularly for someone like myself with reduced mobility – is the local amenities (transport links, shops, library, etc.). However, I cannot see how the local infrastructure (including doctors' surgeries, schools, public open spaces and children's play area, etc.) can possibly cope with the increased demand a development of the size proposed would inevitably bring – particularly when one considers the additional residential development already taking place close by.</p> <p>I urge you to consider the adverse social and environmental impact that this additional proposed development in West End Lane will bring to the neighbourhood. Thank you.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Oonagh O'Hagan	Flat 3 24 Lymington Rd	08/01/2016 11:45:05	OBJ	<p>I am an immediate neighbour to the site of the proposed development referred to above. The proposed development fails to comply with Camden's development policies and related plans, and will have a serious impact on my standard of living. I strongly object to the proposed development on the basis of the following material considerations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of light. The proposed blocks will overshadow local homes and gardens, causing local residents -- particularly those of us who live on Lymington Road -- to suffer a significant and unacceptable loss of light, including in numerous habitable rooms and gardens. In my case, the loss of light would be suffered in a living room, kitchen, south-facing balcony and garden. The daylight and sunlight report accompanying the planning application for the proposed scheme appears to be lacking and there is insufficient support for a scheme of this magnitude, contrary to Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, Local Development Framework at section 26.3. 2. Loss of privacy and overlooking. Properties on Lymington Road, especially on the south side of the road, will be directly and severely overlooked (particularly from the proposed north facing balconies on the blocks towards the east of the site), causing a significant and unacceptable loss of privacy. Building a series of 7 storey blocks directly behind existing houses on Lymington Road would create an oppressive and overbearing environment, and infringe rights to privacy and quiet enjoyment of property (see Article 8 of the Human Rights Act and Article 1 of the First Protocol). 3. Inappropriate design and appearance. The design, size and, in particular, the height of the new buildings, are inappropriate for the site and area. These key elements are out of character and out-of-scale with surrounding residential buildings and local architecture. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Camden's own plan documents describe West Hampstead as being "well loved for its village feel" and having a "human scale" -- 7 storey tower blocks would ruin this and are at odds with Camden's own description of the area. (see "West Hampstead: Shaping the Future", Foreword.) o The proposal also contradicts the section on "design and character" in the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, which Camden Council adopted in September 2015. The plan, which 93% of residents voted in favour of in a referendum on 9 July 2015, makes clear that, "The height of new buildings shall have regard to and respect the proportion, scale, massing and rooflines of existing buildings in their vicinity and setting. In all development there shall be a clear presumption in favour of preserving the distinct character and appearance of the Area, as well as the views across it." 4. Serious negative effect on conservation area. The design, size and, in particular, the height of the new buildings would cause harm to the West End Green Conservation Area immediately to the north of the site -- contrary to Camden's own development policies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Importantly, Camden's policies recognise that "the character or appearance of our conservation areas can also be affected by development which is outside of conservation areas, but visible from within them. This includes high or bulky buildings, which can have an impact on areas some distance away, as well as adjacent premises." o Camden should adhere to its own policy, which states that "[t]he Council will therefore not permit development in locations outside conservation areas that it considers would cause harm to the character, appearance or setting of such an area".

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

See “Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, Local Development Framework” document at section 25.9.

The developer claims in its Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (sections 5.21 onwards) that the impact of the proposals on the character of the conservation area as a whole “is very limited”. This claim lacks any credibility. Describing the nature of the conservation area as a “settlement next to railway lines”, and suggesting that the development would not alter the view to the south or harm the character of the conservation area, is fundamentally misguided and wrong.

5. Negative impact on local area and further pressure on already insufficient public services. The impact of the new use of the land will increase congestion in an area that already has insufficient essential public services, notably schools. Current local infrastructure simply is inadequate to support the number of proposed additional residents on this one site. This is an important issue in an area where many families live, and where many people, including me, have in recent years not received an offer of a place for a child at a school in the area despite making extensive efforts.

6. Impact on ground stability, drainage and water supply. I have serious concerns about the impact that the proposed works could have on the stability of our property, and about the impact of the scheme on drainage and water supply. In a submission dated 14 December 2015 in response to the current application, Thames Water states that: “the existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands of the proposed development”, warning that “the development may lead to sewage flooding”.

7. Increased congestion and traffic generation. The development will result in a substantial increase in footfall and more congestion and traffic in what are already overcrowded surrounding roads. The narrow pavements over the bridge between this proposed development and nearby stations are already packed with pedestrians in the mornings and evenings. I contest the developer’s claims that the area is not congested, and doubt that the developer’s view would be shared by anyone who regularly walks along West End Lane. Increasing footfall in this area flatly is at odds with Camden’s vision “To make it easier and more pleasant for people to move around the area”. (See “West Hampstead: Shaping the Future”, Summary and more fully described at pages 41-45.)

8. Noise and disturbance. Given the number of proposed new residents, the noise and disturbance from the scheme is likely to be considerable and to compromise existing residents’ enjoyment of our homes.

9. Negative impact on parking. There already is inadequate parking in the area. The scheme would make this problem worse.

I request that the council take these objections into consideration when deciding the application. I also appeal to the council to recall the following key elements of the Camden Core Strategy, which the current application plainly contradicts and undermines:

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

"Central to managing Camden's future growth is the need to consider not just the scale and nature of that growth, but how it is provided and the effect on those who live in the area and the borough as a whole. All development in Camden, large or small, whether located in growth areas, highly accessible locations or in other parts of the borough, should take place in accordance with all relevant policies in the Core Strategy and the other documents that form part of Camden's Local Development Framework . . . to ensure that the Council's vision for the borough is achieved. The Council will seek to ensure that the borough's growth brings benefits and opportunities to all. " (Section 5.2)

"Protecting amenity is, therefore, a key part of successfully managing growth in Camden. We will expect development to avoid harmful effects on the amenity of existing and future occupiers and nearby properties or, where this is not possible, to take appropriate measures to minimise potential negative impacts." (Section 5.8)

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	anna jeffrey	9 Fremont Street London	07/01/2016 09:18:57	OBJ	

Dear Camden Council,

I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.

I write this as a frequent visitor to the neighbourhood.

- The proposal does not meet the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011.
- The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area.
- The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its existing form will tower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties.
- The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents' right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property.
- The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population.
- The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road.
- While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space.
- The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

- The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of: loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year.

- The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lymington Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the Street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.

- The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing – this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan. Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development.

Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.

I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.

2015/6455/P	Peter Lane	42 Hillfield Road West hampstead London NW6 1PZ	29/12/2015 10:05:32	OBJ	<p>I object to the planning application at 156 West End Lane. The development does not include enough affordable housing or shared housing which W Hampstead does not currently offer sufficiently. Instead it principally consists of luxury flats which are already in plentiful supply in the area. I object to the architectural design of these blocks which have little sympathy with the surrounding buildings in West End lane. Every proposed building at 156 WE is rectangular and all the windows, doors, roofs etc are right angled; no curves, pointed roofs etc or decorative features. This is totally unimaginative and has no visual appeal or interest. There is too little open space in the development for families to enjoy or children to play. My proposal would be for fewer flats- and a greater proportion of affordable housing. There should be more open space/ play areas. The design needs to be scrapped and replaced with common features based on Victorian style architecture. The flats should also include larger room sizes, greater storage and less retail outlets.</p>
-------------	------------	----------------------------------------------------------	---------------------	-----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Peter and Barbara Akhurst	Rosemullyon	06/01/2016 15:45:49	OBJEMPER	We would like to object strongly to this planning application as we feel it will overcrowd the West Hampstead area and spoil the look and feel of West Hampstead. We have known and lived in the area for over 65 years and, while we do not object to progress and change, we feel enough is enough.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Janet Crawford	32A Kylemore Road nw6 2pt	05/01/2016 20:27:34	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to the proposed development at 156 West End Lane on the grounds of transport, specifically with regard to pedestrians and the cumulative effect of development.</p> <p>A2 Dominion's Transport Assessment includes a 'Pedestrian Comfort Level Assessment', conducted just outside the proposed site, which states that the pavements are wide enough for maximum comfort. However, it is well known by local people, train passengers, and the local and transport authorities that the pavements just south of the site, at the West Hampstead Interchange (i.e. between the Thameslink and underground stations), which is also the section most likely to be used by the residents of the new development to access rail transport, can become dangerously overcrowded at rush hours. This is especially true at the narrowest points on the bridges where the pavements cannot be widened. Whilst Appendix 3 does describe the pavements on this stretch of road, there is no actual assessment of their comfort levels.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also provides a projection of the increase in footfall resulting from the development. However, this does not take into account the projected effects of the other large developments already underway in the area, including the Ballymore site (West End Square) and the developments on Iverson Road and Liddell Road, as well as other smaller ones, which are all likely to substantially increase footfall at the Interchange. Additionally, the new annex of Kingsgate School, to be built on Liddell Road, will create the necessity for more children and parents (some with push chairs) to walk between Sherriff Road and Iverson Road during the periods of maximum pedestrian and road traffic.</p> <p>To add to this, all three of the railway companies served by the Interchange are confidently predicting a substantial increase in passenger numbers over the coming years, to allow for which trains are being lengthened and stations expanded. This will lead to yet more footfall between the stations, including more wheelchair users if / when the underground station ever acquires a lift. Furthermore, the increased number of people crossing the road will slow down traffic, leading to more pollution.</p> <p>At this stage, the actual effects of increased passenger numbers and ongoing residential developments on pedestrian congestion at the Interchange are unknown. Although there have been discussions in the past about improving the Interchange, there are still no firm plans.</p> <p>The 2015 London Plan (Policy 6.3) states that:-</p> <p>'Where existing transport capacity is insufficient to allow for the travel generated by proposed developments, and no firm plans exist for an increase in capacity to cater for this, boroughs should ensure that development proposals are phased until it is known these requirements can be met, otherwise they may be refused. The cumulative impacts of development on transport requirements must be taken into account'.</p> <p>Until the effects of the ongoing new developments are known, or until Camden and TfL have at least produced a properly evidenced interchange master plan, I believe this development should not go ahead. To do so could well put pedestrians at an unacceptable level of risk.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Mark Woolnough	Flat 2 4 Lymington Road NW6 1HY	08/01/2016 10:06:07	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I would like to lodge an objection to the proposals for the development at 156 West End Lane.</p> <p>I live in a garden flat at 4 Lymington Road.</p> <p>There are a number of issues but the most obvious one is the oversized nature of the plans.</p> <p>In my property, the ONLY natural light entering the living areas of the flat is provided by rear windows as the flat is "landlocked" from the North side.</p> <p>This means that, in essence, the light will be completely blocked by the development.</p> <p>To my knowledge, no one from the planning department has visited the property to see the effect that the development will have on the property and/or to survey the loss of light. I would like to request that a visit by a planning officer takes place as soon as possible.</p> <p>There are also the following issues to be addressed and which form part of this objection :</p> <p>Noise control and Security: the proposal is to have the service areas at the rear of my property which will increase noise pollution. The removal of the wall to the rear will increase the risk of burglary and will render the security surrounding the property virtually non-existent as it will become space which is open to the public. Please let me know how this issue is to be rectified.</p> <p>The loss of privacy is unquantifiable.</p> <p>There is likely to be an infestation of rats due to displacement, which is common after major building works. Please let me know the proposal to combat this.</p> <p>The proposed development is not in keeping with the surrounding areas in West Hampstead where tall buildings on West End Lane give way to lower storeys on adjoining streets. The skyline looking out and into the conservation area of West Hampstead will be eradicated completely.</p> <p>The number, height and density of flats is overbearing and will put a significant strain on local services. NHS Quotas at local dentists are already full and waiting lists at local GP's are long. This is before taking into account other developments in the area which are currently under construction.</p> <p>The risk of water displacement and flooding will be increased : please advise on measures taken to mitigate these risks.</p> <p>The use of materials suggested for the development are not in keeping with buildings in the adjacent conservation area, an issue which can be solved, albeit at greater cost to the developer.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>There seems to be a lack of impartiality which would be the primary role of any planning department when assessing the impact of large scale developments. If this was not council land, how would the proposed proposed plans be reviewed?</p> <p>I look forward to your comments,</p> <p>Mark Woolnough</p>
2015/6455/P	David Aarons	1 and 12 Lymington Road NW6 1HY	05/01/2016 16:59:51	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this development.</p> <p>The proposed will overshadow 12 Lymington Road, which we own, and will destroy the existing fine views from the back of the house.</p> <p>The roadway you are building will cause a security headache to the residents.</p> <p>The development will also overload the stations of West Hampstead which are full to bursting point already.</p> <p>West Endv Lane is already congested to near standstill at rush hours and this development will probably bring the road to a halt.</p> <p>This high density development will destroy the lovely character of West Hampstead.</p>
2015/6455/P	David Aarons	1 and 12 Lymington Road NW6 1HY	05/01/2016 16:59:28	OBJ	
2015/6455/P	Sue HArris	11 Lymington Mansions Lymington ROad NW6 1SF	05/01/2016 22:37:16	OBJ	<p>I have lived in. West Hampstead for 45 years and live in a mansion block overlooking lymington road and west end lane. The erection of further blocks in this area is not compatible to an area which is already bursting at the seams. Traffic. The influx of travellers using the stations morning and evenings with passengers crossing the roads in crowds , the pavements cannot cope with the amount of people and many accidents have occurred during these periods. The addition of 500 flats in "West Hampstead square" which we have yet to feel the impact of as they are not yet completed. Where are all these people going to access services, GPs's schools etc. It is not acceptable to build further flats which will block out light, cause a further environmental negative impact on our area and community. The only purpose of building further in this crowded area would be for Camden to consider its growing elderly population and to build environmentally friendly low rise sheltered accommodation in this area. please do not build these eyesores in our neighbourhood as it is struggling to cope with the existing population.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Teagan Martin	Flat 1 16 Lymington Road West Hampstead London NW6 1HY	04/01/2016 22:15:31	OBJLETTE R	<p>I wish to outline below my objections to the current plans for the re-development of 156 West End Lane, NW6.</p> <p>There are numerous breaches of guidelines including National Planning Policy Framework and others which have been highlighted already by many objectors and I also fully concur with those points raised. The proposed development also fails to comply with many parts of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and I also fully support the objections raised by the NDF in this regard.</p> <p>As the site at 156WEL borders a conservation area Camden, by their own admission, need to adhere to the wording of their Development Policies 2010-2025 which states “Camden will therefore not permit development in locations outside conservation areas that it considers would cause harm to the character, appearance or setting of such an area.”</p> <p>The proposed development at 156WEL will completely block views into and out of the Conservation Area (CA) from a number of places and should therefore not be permitted in its current form. It is also highly visible within the conservation area itself and therefore its height and design is inappropriate as it causes damage to the CA itself.</p> <p>As a resident on the south side of Lymington Road and the owner of a ground floor flat, I am substantially affected by the proposed development and object for the following key reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of light – Having reviewed the BRE Daylight and Sunlight (Neighbouring Properties) 18 December 2015 document supplied by A2 Dominion and created by Right of Light Consulting the following is clear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The submitted document states some figures that are inaccurate. The developer states that only 29 neighbouring windows fail the Vertical Sky Component test where we believe this is in fact at least 36 windows so 9% fail that test, not the 7% as stated. o The report states that “a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings. We note that the proposed development is to be of similar height and proportion to that of the existing surrounding buildings”. This statement is simply untrue – the development does not match the height or proportions at all of the existing buildings and is in fact 3-4 stories higher than the properties on Lymington Road which it faces and blocks the light from. If the proposed building DID adhere to the height and proportions of the existing buildings then there would be almost no Loss of Light issues at all. o The garden at my property will suffer dramatically with a 21 March light reduction from 67% to 48% of the area receiving at least 2 hours of sunlight per day meaning I lose around 28% of winter sunlight – well below the BRE Guidelines. o Gardens at 24 and 28 Lymington Road will in fact lose even more light suffering a 46% and 66% loss respectively plus these properties suffer from substantial losses to windows too (well below BRE guideline recommendations). o Windows to my own property will all lose light and the main set of windows into my living room fail all BRE recommendations totally with a reduction of 31% of light in the most important room (window 265 which is misleadingly noted as “secondary” on the BRE report which is not true as this is a primary living room). On this room alone, should planning permission be granted then I would be forced to launch a legal fight on the ground of a Right Of Light. A number of other windows are also only marginally acceptable under the BRE recommendations. o Sunlight to Windows tests show that ALL my windows will lose more than the recommended minimums during the winter months with an average reduction of almost 40% and one (window 270)

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

losing 70%.

- o In the Sunlight to Windows Tests 153 out of the 396 windows reported will fall below the 21st March recommended minimum ratio of 0.8 which is 39% of all windows and, although this is just the winter figures, it shows the scale of impact that the development has at a crucial time of the year when many windows will lose significant light. This should not be averaged over to the whole year to try to wiggle out of the fact as to how the development will affect people's properties and quality of life during the winter months when many will be living in almost total overshadowing.
- o No proper shadow path documents have been supplied to graphically show the real impact of the development and these "Transient Shadowing" documents showing hourly impacts at various times of the year should be made available for all to view and really see the true impact of the development.
- o The MUGA overshadowing is substantial when considering its most frequent usage period (after school hours) when it will be almost in total shade. The BRE Guidelines are just that "Guidelines" and have to be taken as such and common sense needs prevail too. The fact that the MUGA will in fact lose ALL its sunlight at its time of most frequent usage means that there is substantial and noticeable loss of light to all people who will use the area.
 - Given the above it is clear that not only are a number of windows and open spaces falling well below the BRE guideline figures, a great many other windows are only marginally above the guidelines and a great many are well below them for substantial parts of the year. On this basis the development is unacceptable and if approved a considerable number of local residents would have to consider Right of Light legal claims to stop the development proceeding as proposed. The fact that Camden are being made aware of these breaches at this stage should give them plenty of opportunity to ensure the matter is rectified so that they are not culpable in allowing this legal infringement to take place.
- The proposed service road will run along the back of my garden (and all gardens on the south of Lymington Road) and therefore directly affect us with increased noise, increased pollution and increased security risk.
- The local area does not have the infrastructure to support all the current developments let alone more. Pavements are too narrow, doctors too busy, schools oversubscribed and roads too busy. This development will increase all these issues further.
- Overlooking from the new development into both my garden and flat will be significant from both windows and balconies. This is not acceptable.
- There will be substantial light pollution from the property into neighbouring properties.
- The proposed vehicle exit/entrance from 156WEL into West End Lane itself is too narrow and too dangerous for both pedestrians and local traffic on West End Lane. Visibility of traffic emerging from the site is poor and will create safety risks for pedestrians on West End Lane and vehicles emerging will not be able to turn safely/properly into or out of the site without causing further traffic congestion.
- The height of the development running from West to East is way too high for the area and is not in-keeping with the scale of the neighbouring area. The main property runs parallel to Lymington Road

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>and should be similar in size to those properties on Lymington Road which are 3-4 stories high and not 7 stories as currently planned. This also has substantial negative impact on the conservation area. Every other mansion block or taller building running along West End Lane reduces in height as it runs East to West or West to East off of West End Lane to 3-4 stories and this development should not be an exception to this rule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camden has a duty to ensure the preservation of the West End Green Conservation Area and, in allowing this development to proceed will be negligent in its duty as there is simply no justification to grant such a large scale/tall development. <p>Clearly, I am not happy to allow the development to proceed and would expect Camden to ensure that the above points are all fully addressed and any plans amended prior to any permission being granted.</p> <p>As a planning department, you are positioned to ensure that laws, policies, frameworks or whatever else you wish to call them are followed and to prevent developers like A2 Dominion from riding roughshod over carefully put together regulations. Please ensure that you act accordingly and that you do not allow another ill-conceived development be built with your approval!</p>

2015/6455/P	Nat	Lymington Road	25/12/2015 17:30:56	COMMNT	<p>I am objecting to the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Overbearing nature of proposal •The number, height, size, layout, siting, density and design of buildings •Overshadowing of surroundings, including homes, gardens, open spaces and public thoroughfares •Loss of sunlight (See Building Research Establishment Guidelines) •Loss of outlook to the detriment of residential amenity •Overlooking •Loss of privacy •Adverse impact on nature conservation interests & biodiversity opportunities •Loss of ecological habitats •Loss or effect on trees •Archaeology •Inadequate or inappropriate landscaping or means of enclosure •Deficiencies in physical infrastructure •Public transport •Public amenity •Public drainage •Water systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Deficiencies in social facilities •School places, •Health service provision •Provision of other social services
-------------	-----	----------------	---------------------	--------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Laura Canevari	7 Crediton Hill	03/01/2016 04:19:16	OBJEMAIL	<p>I object to the application for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) It is too tall. A large proportion of the upper storeys will affect the view from Crediton Hill, which is in a Conservation Area. The proposed buildings would be considerably taller than the adjacent houses on Lymington road and spoil the character of the area, where there are no tall buildings on side streets. The renderings of the proposal shown as part of the application (DAS Section 3 pg23-34.pdf) are very misleading, for example the view from Crediton Hill (image 3, p. 33) is taken from a perspective that doesn't even show Lymington Road. I have not found the additional view promised in the document (p.34).</p> <p>2) My children play in the area at the back of the site ("MUGA"), which would be overwhelmed and deprived of sunshine by the proposed building in the afternoon hours, when children most use it. The building is again too tall and too close to the party wall, and would give a sense of oppression from the play area. Again the renderings in the application (DAS Section 3 pg23-34.pdf) are misleading, the photo is taken from outside the far end of the landscaped playground area, rather than from the MUGA, or even the near end of the playground. The proposal would impact very heavily on the enjoyment of the facility, which is one of the very few play and socialising spaces available to children in the area.</p> <p>3) Added pedestrian congestion. The pavements on West End Lane in the direction of the 3 stations are already incredibly crowded as I walk my children to school in the morning. In some parts the pavements are very narrow (such as on the two bridges between the proposed development and the stations) and already feel unbearably unpleasant and dangerous, especially for the more vulnerable pedestrians such as children and the elderly caught among the commuters rushing to the stations and the crowds waiting at the bus stop. Cycling on West End Lane feels particularly dangerous as pedestrians often step off the busy pavement onto the road while passing each other. The proposed 164 new units, in addition to the large numbers already under construction in the immediate vicinity, would worsen a situation already at crisis point. The evaluation of the impact presented in the application documents is in my opinion completely unrealistic.</p> <p>4) The area has been the target of a large development in a very short time, but I have not seen clear plans for an increase in the local infrastructure adequate to support such an increase in the local population – such as GP places, school places (especially secondary), community amenities, green spaces, bus services, and physical size of the stations. Access to the underground station is very narrow and already very congested in the morning, as many commuters change from the two overground train stations, as well as access from the local area. Crowds trying to enter the tube station are already spilling out and obstructing the pavement at peak times, I cannot imagine what will happen when the numerous new buildings will be occupied. Something must be done to connect the three stations and provide additional access points, and proper planning must be in place before permission for any further residential building is granted.</p>
2015/6455/P	Ann-Marie King	156 Maygrove Road NW62EP	08/01/2016 20:26:28	OBJ	<p>I object to this planning due to the pressure already put on the roads, transport links and parking in West Hampstead. I object to further blocks being built in this area which had an adverse effect on the village feel of West Hampstead. Also, I object to any further disruption which building contractors will bring.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Ann-Marie King	156 Maygrove Road NW62EP	08/01/2016 20:26:06	OBJ	I object to this planning due to the pressure already put on the roads, transport links and parking in West Hampstead. I object to further blocks being built in this area which had an adverse effect on the village feel of West Hampstead. Also, I object to any further disruption which building contractors will bring.
2015/6455/P	meher toorkey	65 Cholmley gardens NW61AJ NW61AJ NW61AJ	05/01/2016 10:47:06	COMMNT	This will add to the chaos and disruption already caused by new developments sanctioned by greedy developers. West End Lane is a bottle neck stretching over 2 kms. The pollution increases. We cannot sustain any more people, traffic or development unless we wish to see the whole infra structure break down.
2015/6455/P	meher toorkey	65 Cholmley gardens NW61AJ NW61AJ NW61AJ	05/01/2016 10:46:59	COMMNT	
2015/6455/P	meher toorkey	65 Cholmley gardens NW61AJ NW61AJ NW61AJ	05/01/2016 10:46:51	COMMNT	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Ritu Singh	7 Fawley Road	05/01/2016 19:57:21	OBJ	<p>I am commenting below in objection to the plans.</p> <p>Amenity – lack of infrastructure ie school places, GPs etc to cope with such a huge increase in people moving into the flats</p> <p>Unacceptable level of overshadowing and overlooking – negative impacts on homes, gardens, children's play areas and designated open space on Crown Close & Lymington Road Estate</p> <p>Access – Dangerous lack of visibility for pedestrians and vehicles from a concealed new road accessed via a brick arch onto/from a dangerous, already congested bend in West End Lane</p> <p>Lack of cumulative impact assessment - the raft of developments already underway in the area – Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads are all yet to be populated</p> <p>Bulk, massing, density, scale – exceeds maximum density recommended in the London Plan, resulting in an over-intensive over-development in which "affordable" units are proposed that fall below Camden's minimum floor space requirements</p> <p>Height – inappropriate and ridiculous seven storey blocks</p> <p>Impact on Conservation Area – views in and out of the Conservation Area will be eradicated, setting a worrying precedent for Conservation Areas across Camden</p> <p>Lack of transition from “high street” to “side street” – Out of keeping with character of West Hampstead roads and intersections where up to five-storey "high street" blocks drop to three-storey blocks on the "side street". Ignores Camden's own requirement for this transition as outlined in the Site Allocations document</p> <p>Employment - Loss of long-term employment arising from the eviction of Travis Perkins</p> <p>Design – claims to be “modern mansion blocks" but are oversized with none of the charm and character of West Hampstead's mansion blocks. Instead of a truly mixed development proposes to 'design in' inequality with segregated blocks and a gated private community</p>
2015/6455/P	L Casey	20 Beswick Mews London NW6 1XT	04/01/2016 08:49:55	OBJ	<p>I do not think the block should be built like this as it will mean the loss of local jobs at Travis Perkins. The blocks are too high. Why can't you just development the old camden office as a school. Using what is their already. Schools are needed badly in the areas.</p> <p>We don't need more blocks as loads have just been built opposite. An area needs to grow at a slower pace so the community can be kept.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Rebecca Wall	6D Lymington Road	07/01/2016 23:05:00	COMMNT	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.</p> <p>I write this as a resident of Lymington Road who backs on to the proposed development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not meet the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011. • The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area. • The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its existing form will tower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties. • The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents' right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property. • The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population. • The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road. • While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space. • The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of: loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year.• The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lymington Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the Street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.• The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing – this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan. Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development. <p>I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application</p> <hr/>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Sonal Kantaria	Flat 5 4 Lymington Road London	07/01/2016 22:07:18	COMMNT	<p>As a resident of Lymington Road, I am appalled at the proposed development.</p> <p>I am contacting you to lodge an official opposition to the proposed development of 156 West End Lane, London, NW6 1SD.</p> <p>West Hampstead as you are aware is an area characterised by Victorian and Edwardian (mostly) red-brick individual and terraced housing, with some mansion blocks. The area is home to a number of designated heritage assets. This of course is an important factor to bear in mind when considering the style and nature of any proposed developments.</p> <p>I refer you to paragraphs 126 and 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework which must apply to all proposed developments. Paragraph 126 for example states:</p> <p>“Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; – the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring; – the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and – opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place”. <p>Having considered the policy in full I am of the view that no proper account has been taken of the policy and feel this is partly to do with the way in which the proposed plans have been hastily put together.</p> <p>I would also draw your attention to the “Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, Local Development Framework” document, which “contributes to delivering the Core Strategy by providing detailed policies that [Camden Council] will use when determining applications for planning permission”, specifically item 25.9 which refers to the existing “largely dense urban nature of Camden”:</p> <p>“Due to the largely dense urban nature of Camden, the character or appearance of our conservation areas can also be affected by development which is outside of conservation areas, but visible from</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

within them. This includes high or bulky buildings, which can have an impact on areas some distance away, as well as adjacent premises. The Council will therefore not permit development in locations outside conservation areas that it considers would cause harm to the character, appearance or setting of such an area.”

Having also examined the information and design proposals made available by the preferred supplier, I also submit the following further objections to the proposed development:

The “West Hampstead: Shaping the Future” plan for West Hampstead issued by Camden Council expressly sets out that the area is “well loved for its village feel” and that the Council commits to “enhancing the distinctive village character” and to provide “support for local business”. The proposed project is in breach of these commitments.

The proposed development is completely out of keeping with the character of the surrounding residential buildings. It completely disregards the environment around it and the character of other buildings. The houses in Lymington Road – for example – are three storeys high, the development in its existing form will tower over these properties blighting their light, use and enjoyment of their properties.

The plans are not in keeping with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area.

The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents’ right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property.

The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population.

West Hampstead has benefited from an influx of young families, the population of children has steadily grown in recent times. The proposed development and its impact on the environment will have a detrimental effect on the well-being of those in near and surrounding areas.

The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road.

The proposed buildings themselves will have a considerably negative impact on the conservation area which the planned development adjoins.

The development proposes to house between 600 – 800 residents. There is simply insufficient infrastructure to support this number of additional residents into West Hampstead; there is already one development due to complete later this year, West Hampstead Square – the impact from this development is yet to be seen alongside other developments in Blackburn Road, Iverson Road, and Liddell Road.

We respectfully submit insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental impact of so many developments in such a short space of time.

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

I would also like to reiterate the point of "right to light" which has not been met through these proposals. As a south facing property, this flat receives substantial sunlight, one reason for choosing this property. The proposed development will block this light completely.

There is already insufficient parking capacity in the surrounding areas. This has been further reduced as and when JW3 host events. The burden on parking may in turn assist applicants wishing to convert front gardens into drives, thereby completing spoiling the entire area.

The development will result in a substantial increase in footfall in what are already overcrowded surrounding roads.

The footfall on the underground, trains and buses – without yet taking additional traffic from West Hampstead Square into account – is already at close to maximum level.

Another new development will shunt public transport levels on the tubes and trains to dangerously high levels, thereby putting public safety at risk.

The narrow pavements over the bridge between this proposed development and two stations is already heaving with pedestrians in the mornings and evenings.

The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.

The proposed blocks will overshadow and deprive of light the green space and children's playground at the Lymington Road Estate, which is closest to the 156 West End Lane site, as well as to the homes and gardens on Lymington Road Estate.

The proposed project is located on the immediate border of a conservation area. A conservation area is defined in Section 69 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as an area of "special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance" and that the project is irreconcilable with the Council's duty to ensure such preservation.

The plans are also in direct contravention of the policies outlined in the Neighbourhood Development Plan for this area.

The proposed plans are opposed in their entirety by the combined forces of Save West Hampstead, Lymington Road Residents' Association, Crediton Hill Residents' Association, West Hampstead Gardens' & Residents' Association, the West End Green Conservation Area Advisory Committee and the Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead (CRASH).

I would like to reiterate my absolute opposition to the proposal and expect all of my above points to be considered, addressed and responded to appropriately.

Your sincerely,
Sonal Kantaria

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Syed Abid Bilgrami	88 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London	06/01/2016 17:36:00	COMMEMP ER	I object to this development as this will unduly increase the pressure on roads and services, which are already problematic.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Rachel Marks	13 Lymington Road NW6 1HX NW6 1HX NW6 1HX	08/01/2016 18:16:58	OBJ	<p>I wish to categorically object to the proposed application on the grounds that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It damages the bordering conservation area in both poor quality design and more importantly bulk, mass and height. Running almost the same height from East to West is unacceptable and does not match the local neighbourhood at all. 2. There will be substantial overshadowing to both local properties and to local play areas such as the MUGA and playground. Many of these properties will find themselves below recognised BRE guidelines after the development. 3. The development breaches the NDP in a great many ways and should be re-designed to take into consideration this legally accepted policy document. 4. The proposed exit road is unsafe for pedestrians and must not be permitted in its proposed location. 5. Local amenity will be lost as the infrastructure is not in place to support even the current developments that have not completed yet. Adding to this is irresponsible. <p>6. Granting permission as planned would breach a great many rules, regulations and policies set by Camden including:</p> <p>“Camden Planning Guidance 6 Amenity Daylight and sunlight 6.13 These minimum [light] figures may not be applicable when measuring the impact of new buildings on existing dwellings as the simple preservation of minimum ADFs will not necessarily be seen as an indication of acceptability, especially if the VSC demonstrates a significant worsening in daylight levels. For existing dwellings the Council will consider the overall loss of daylight as opposed to the minimum acceptable levels of daylight. “</p> <p>“Camden Development Policy DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours</p> <p>The Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors we will consider include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) visual privacy and overlooking; b) overshadowing and outlook; c) sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels; “ <p>7. The development will cause considerable damage to the West End Green Conservation Area and, as it directly borders the Conservation Area and should therefore be more or less treated as if it were in the Conservation Area. Camden Council has a duty to protect and uphold conservation areas and approving this plan would go wholly against that duty.</p> <p>8. You should not require reminding that the Committee has recently refused a 7 storey block on Iverson Road in December 2014 (Application 2014/5341/P), on the grounds that:</p> <p>“The proposed development, by virtue of its height, mass and scale would result in an over dominant form of development causing harm to the streetscene and negatively impacting on long views, contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.”</p> <p>The same policies should be applied here. The A2 Dominion proposal is an even greater example of</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

over dominant mass and scale causing harm to the street scene and to the adjacent conservation area.

I trust these objections will be carefully considered and action taken to ensure the plans are revised to fit in with the local area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Aleks Phillips	2 Gladys Rd NW6 2PX	31/12/2015 10:26:31	COMMLET TER	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>I am writing as a resident of West Hampstead to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P.</p> <p>My main concerns about the proposed plan on the 156 site are with regards to the visual aspects of the plan, the increased pressure on local infrastructure, as well as ramifications it will have for the property market in the area. Whilst I can understand that development is a good thing and that the West Hampstead area has been earmarked as a development area, I believe strongly that the manner in which such developments are executed, by both developer and council, is as important, if not more important, than the binary question of whether or not there should be a development; this plan should be evaluated not on the criteria that it fulfils the want of a development and an amount of housing in the area, but on the merits of the fashion in which this is done.</p> <p>After reviewing the plans for the site submitted by a2 Dominion, I could plainly see that what is proposed is not aesthetically in keeping with the immediate surrounding area, and even the wider West Hampstead. Whilst the mansion blocks on West End Lane are higher than most houses in the area, they are limited to the West End Lane area. The proposed plans take this elevation along the stretch of land parallel to Lymington Road, of which the house levels are far lower, creating overshadowing for those residents. Whilst I am not a resident of Lymington Road, I know if I were in their position, I would definitely not want a development so tall overshadowing my property, not only for the effect it would have on the function of the property, but the effect on the value. Going ahead with such plans could possibly lead to a legal challenge by such residents on the basis of damages to assets, something which I would not want tax funds being diverted towards fighting at any time, let alone one where the council is having to make vast cuts to services due to a lack of funds.</p> <p>There is also something to be said about the design. Properties in West Hampstead were predominantly built in the Victorian era, and so for any new development to be in keeping with its surroundings must honour Victorian-style design, something which I can't help but notice the 'Create Streets' plan does elegantly. Simply using red bricks to mimic the Victorian mansions nearby is tantamount to saying a concrete footpath mimics the Tower of London since they are both grey. Whilst I understand that construction methods have come a long way in the last 150 years, the design of the building does not have to be, and should not be, sacrificed. I also notice the inspiration for the proposed design was taken from the nearby Ballymore development, which must have been difficult, since the Ballymore development is yet to be fully finished, and so is hardly an accepted part of the West Hampstead landscape. I assume that the design stimulus of Ballymore was from their architectural drawings but, since there was local outcry over those as well, two wrongs do not make a right. On this basis, I would hope the proposed plan is rejected, as it does not fulfil the demands of the site sufficiently.</p> <p>As someone who commutes using the C11 bus route along West End Lane every day, I know any disruption to the road can have a detrimental effect on transport, not least of which are the many people who move between the three stations and across the road. I notice that the site is opposite a bus stop for three major bus routes, and, given the disruption caused by the Ballymore development, I can safely</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

assume that the 156 development would create equal strain. Beyond this, the extra people living on the site, so near to an already heavily congested transport hub, would only worsen the situation by adding more bodies to the daily scrum. I also notice some of the apartments are earmarked as family dwellings, suggesting a rise in the number of children in the area. Whilst, taken in isolation, I would have no qualm with this, adding the number of possible children that would come to live in this site, the Ballymore site, the site on Iverson Road, the site of Maygrove Road and possibly a further site in Blackburn Road, could mean the local schools, all of which I believe are already over-subscribed, would find it hard to cope. It would be negligent of the council not to factor the education of possible future residents into the decision. Also, there is a strain on medical facilities in the area, something which a deluge of people which would, at some point, need medical attention, would not help.

Having spoken in passing about the proposed development to a number of other residents, I have noticed a trend of hostility towards it, as well as a weariness of constant large development in the area. I have seen in the local papers many articles about various campaigns against it and a flood of letters and opinion pieces from residents and local figures, the vast majority of which are against the plans. For the council to go against such strong public opinion would be seen as our elected representatives failing in their function that they were elected for, which would make me consider them very differently. I have no idea as to the internal council and party politics that would will the council to vote in favour of the plans, but the council should not need reminding that they first and foremost are elected to represent the people, and from what I have seen, the people do not want this plan approved.

Yours faithfully,
Aleks Phillips

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Angela Gardner	Flat 1 30 Lymington Road West Hampstead London NW6 1HY	08/01/2016 17:36:41	COMMNT	<p>I live at Flat 1, 30 Lymington Road – a ground floor flat with garden which backs on to the ball court – with my family.</p> <p>I am hugely concerned by the proposed development in West End Lane which I believe will have a severe detrimental effect on my family and on the local neighbourhood.</p> <p>We have lived at our property since 2007. Our rear garden currently enjoys sunlight for most of the day – indeed, having a garden which is bright and not heavily overlooked was one of the most attractive selling points when we purchased the property – and is enjoyed by the whole family. I am very alarmed by the plans I have seen which indicate a serious reduction in the sunlight on our property, should the building go ahead as planned. This is hugely disappointing, having invested in a property for the long term.</p> <p>For other neighbouring properties in Lymington Road, closer to the site of the proposed development, the problem is even greater.</p> <p>Aside from direct impact on our family and our ability to enjoy our garden at our leisure, it is the long-term detrimental impact on the local environment which is my major concern. I note that residents will not be allocated parking spaces and this will be made very clear to them. However, I do not believe that the roads and local infrastructure can support a housing complex of this size.</p> <p>West End Lane and neighbouring roads can already get extremely congested. The additional residences (with the increased volume of deliveries, visitors, workmen, etc.) can only increase and further aggravate the traffic congestion and parking difficulties which can already be very problematic in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development.</p> <p>Moreover, it is my firm belief that our local amenities (doctors' surgeries, schools, shops, nearby green spaces, resident children's play area, etc.) are insufficient to cope with an additional development of the size proposed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Alexandra Delp	30 Lymington Road NW6 1HY	06/01/2016 14:10:40	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to the development as planned. I do not believe the Council has given due consideration to the profound impact that so many new residents to West Hampstead will have on the already strained resources of the community.</p> <p>The train stations, the pavements and West End Lane are all already dangerously overcrowded during peak times, and this is before the massive West Hampstead Square project has been completed. There also seems to be no provision for new schools, doctors' surgeries or other community services for the increased population.</p> <p>The buildings proposed are much too big for the site. The current building at 156 West End Lane is ugly but it is proportionate. More importantly, the builder's yard behind it provides ample light to the Conservation Area behind the site. The buildings proposed, at 7 stories tall, will destroy, by their sheer bulk, the decidedly human-scale character and charm of West Hampstead.</p> <p>Frankly, the buildings as proposed have been designed solely to maximise profitability for the developers; they have not been designed to either reflect the spirit of or enhance the surrounding community.</p>
2015/6455/P	Chenxi Ma	209 Sumatra Road	05/01/2016 20:52:02	OBJ	I object this planning application. I would like to preserve the community space for West Hampstead residents

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Kathryn Marston	7 Ranworth Mansions 23 Compayne Gardens London NW6 3DE	07/01/2016 23:11:49	OBJEMPER	<p>Health & safety. Apart from the concealed new road (on the plans) accessed via a brick arch which is potentially an</p> <p>additional danger ,there are already serious concerns regarding overcrowding that should be considered, especially during</p> <p>rush hours between the 3 stations here :- West Hampstead tube , over ground & thameslink, opposite the proposed</p> <p>development.</p> <p>I strongly recommend planning dept visits this area of West End Lane during rush hours on working weekdays & observes</p> <p>large movement of people & vehicles on this narrow rd.</p> <p>This is before Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads developments are finished & populated, adding to the</p> <p>pressure on local population .Which also raises the point OF CUMULATIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT.</p> <p>The infrastructure is already struggling, to provide essential amenities, I know from personal experience, I live round the</p> <p>corner from this proposed development & my son could not get into a Camden secondary school 18 years ago.</p> <p>No additional secondary schools have been built since then and the numbers of children refused places increases every</p> <p>year as the population increases here.</p> <p>The design is inappropriate; it is too high, bulky, dense, overpopulated, blocking light from homes and gardens, which will</p> <p>also have a knock on effect on the decreasing wildlife of London as well as the quality of life of local residents.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Haf Davies	10 Meakin House London N78jb	07/01/2016 22:42:31	COMMNT	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.</p> <p>I write this as a frequent visitor to the neighbourhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not meet the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011. • The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area. • The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its existing form will tower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties. • The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents' right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property. • The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population. • The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road. • While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space. • The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

- The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of: loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year.

- The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lymington Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the Street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.

- The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing – this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan.

Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development.

Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.

I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Ciara Martin	Flat 1 16 Lymington Road West Hampstead London NW6 1HY	04/01/2016 22:13:40	OBJLETTE R	<p>There are numerous breaches of guidelines including National Planning Policy Framework and others which have been highlighted already by many objectors and I also fully concur with those points raised. The proposed development also fails to comply with many parts of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and I also fully support the objections raised by the NDF in this regard.</p> <p>As the site at 156WEL borders a conservation area Camden, by their own admission, need to adhere to the wording of their Development Policies 2010-2025 which states “Camden will therefore not permit development in locations outside conservation areas that it considers would cause harm to the character, appearance or setting of such an area.”</p> <p>The proposed development at 156WEL will completely block views into and out of the Conservation Area (CA) from a number of places and should therefore not be permitted in its current form. It is also highly visible within the conservation area itself and therefore its height and design is inappropriate as it causes damage to the CA itself.</p> <p>As a resident on the south side of Lymington Road and the owner of a ground floor flat, I am substantially affected by the proposed development and object for the following key reasons. •</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Loss of light – Having reviewed the BRE Daylight and Sunlight (Neighbouring Properties) 18 December 2015 document supplied by A2 Dominion and created by Right of Light Consulting the following is clear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The submitted document states some figures that are inaccurate. The developer states that only 29 neighbouring windows fail the Vertical Sky Component test where we believe this is in fact at least 36 windows so 9% fail that test, not the 7% as stated. o The report states that “a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings. We note that the proposed development is to be of similar height and proportion to that of the existing surrounding buildings”. This statement is simply untrue – the development does not match the height or proportions at all of the existing buildings and is in fact 3-4 stories higher than the properties on Lymington Road which it faces and blocks the light from. If the proposed building DID adhere to the height and proportions of the existing buildings then there would be almost no Loss of Light issues at all. o The garden at my property will suffer dramatically with a 21 March light reduction from 67% to 48% of the area receiving at least 2 hours of sunlight per day meaning I lose around 28% of winter sunlight – well below the BRE Guidelines. o Gardens at 24 and 28 Lymington Road will in fact lose even more light suffering a 46% and 66% loss respectively plus these properties suffer from substantial losses to windows too (well below BRE guideline recommendations). o Windows to my own property will all lose light and the main set of windows into my living room fail all BRE recommendations totally with a reduction of 31% of light in the most important room (window 265 which is misleadingly noted as “secondary” on the BRE report which is not true as this is a primary living room). On this room alone, should planning permission be granted then I would be forced to launch a legal fight on the ground of a Right Of Light. A number of other windows are also only marginally acceptable under the BRE recommendations. o Sunlight to Windows tests show that ALL my windows will lose more than the recommended minimums during the winter months with an average reduction of almost 40% and one (window 270) losing 70%. o In the Sunlight to Windows Tests 153 out of the 396 windows reported will fall below the 21st

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

March recommended minimum ratio of 0.8 which is 39% of all windows and, although this is just the winter figures, it shows the scale of impact that the development has at a crucial time of the year when many windows will lose significant light. This should not be averaged over to the whole year to try to wiggle out of the fact as to how the development will affect people's properties and quality of life during the winter months when many will be living in almost total overshadowing.

- o No proper shadow path documents have been supplied to graphically show the real impact of the development and these "Transient Shadowing" documents showing hourly impacts at various times of the year should be made available for all to view and really see the true impact of the development.

- o The MUGA overshadowing is substantial when considering its most frequent usage period (after school hours) when it will be almost in total shade. The BRE Guidelines are just that "Guidelines" and have to be taken as such and common sense needs prevail too. The fact that the MUGA will in fact lose ALL its sunlight at its time of most frequent usage means that there is substantial and noticeable loss of light to all people who will use the area.

- Given the above it is clear that not only are a number of windows and open spaces falling well below the BRE guideline figures, a great many other windows are only marginally above the guidelines and a great many are well below them for substantial parts of the year. On this basis the development is unacceptable and if approved a considerable number of local residents would have to consider Right of Light legal claims to stop the development proceeding as proposed. The fact that Camden are being made aware of these breaches at this stage should give them plenty of opportunity to ensure the matter is rectified so that they are not culpable in allowing this legal infringement to take place.

- The proposed service road will run along the back of my garden (and all gardens on the south of Lymington Road) and therefore directly affect us with increased noise, increased pollution and increased security risk.

- The local area does not have the infrastructure to support all the current developments let alone more. Pavements are too narrow, doctors too busy, schools oversubscribed and roads too busy. This development will increase all these issues further.

- Overlooking from the new development into both my garden and flat will be significant from both windows and balconies. This is not acceptable.

- There will be substantial light pollution from the property into neighbouring properties.

- The proposed vehicle exit/entrance from 156WEL into West End Lane itself is too narrow and too dangerous for both pedestrians and local traffic on West End Lane. Visibility of traffic emerging from the site is poor and will create safety risks for pedestrians on West End Lane and vehicles emerging will not be able to turn safely/properly into or out of the site without causing further traffic congestion.

- The height of the development running from West to East is way too high for the area and is not in-keeping with the scale of the neighbouring area. The main property runs parallel to Lymington Road and should be similar in size to those properties on Lymington Road which are 3-4 stories high and not 7 stories as currently planned. This also has substantial negative impact on the conservation area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Every other mansion block or taller building running along West End Lane reduces in height as it runs East to West or West to East off of West End Lane to 3-4 stories and this development should not be an exception to this rule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camden has a duty to ensure the preservation of the West End Green Conservation Area and, in allowing this development to proceed will be negligent in its duty as there is simply no justification to grant such a large scale/tall development. <p>Clearly, I am not happy to allow the development to proceed and would expect Camden to ensure that the above points are all fully addressed and any plans amended prior to any permission being granted.</p> <p>As a planning department, you are positioned to ensure that laws, policies, frameworks or whatever else you wish to call them are followed and to prevent developers like A2 Dominion from riding roughshod over carefully put together regulations. Please ensure that you act accordingly and that you do not allow another ill-conceived development be built with your approval!</p>

2015/6455/P	Claire Mellish	13 Howard Road Surbiton Surrey KT5 8SA	07/01/2016 22:37:50	OBJ	<p>objections based on material planning considerations:</p> <p>Amenity – lack of infrastructure, school places, GPs, overcrowding of pavements and stations. Unacceptable level of overshadowing and overlooking – negative impacts on homes, gardens, children's play areas and designated open space on Crown Close & Lymington Road Estate. Access – Dangerous lack of visibility for pedestrians and vehicles from a concealed new road accessed via a brick arch onto/from a dangerous, already congested bend in West End Lane. Lack of cumulative impact assessment - the raft of developments already underway in the area – Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads are all yet to be populated. Bulk, massing, density, scale – exceeds maximum density recommended in the London Plan, resulting in an over-intensive over-development in which "affordable" units are proposed that fall below Camden's minimum floor space requirements. Height – inappropriate seven storey blocks. Impact on Conservation Area – views in and out of the Conservation Area will be eradicated, setting a worrying precedent for Conservation Areas across Camden. Lack of transition from “high street” to “side street” – Out of keeping with character of West Hampstead roads and intersections where up to five-storey "high street" blocks drop to three-storey blocks on the "side street". Ignores Camden's own requirement for this transition as outlined in the Site Allocations document. Employment - Loss of long-term employment arising from the eviction of Travis Perkins. Design – claims to be “modern mansion blocks" but are oversized with none of the charm and character of West Hampstead's mansion blocks. Instead of a truly mixed development proposes to 'design in' inequality with segregated blocks and a gated private community,</p>
-------------	----------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------	-----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Colleen Toomey	3 Hilltop Road London NW6 2QA	05/01/2016 11:11:12	COMMNT	I object strongly to the application. There is already intensive over-development in West Hampstead village. The imposing ugly blocks planned will contribute nothing to our community, and worse, be an eyesore and cast a great shadow over all who live in close proximity. I urge you to reject this application for development.
2015/6455/P	Cristian Sutter	12 Lymington Road Flat 2	07/01/2016 22:16:43	OBJ	I want to express my opposition to the development because it will really affect the dynamics and tranquility of the neighbourhood once finished. Specially with two major developments ongoing at the moment the transport links and the Westend lane sidewalks will be more overcrowded than already are become dangerous for pedestrian and motorists alike. The parking on the near streets will be a nightmare due to the influx of new cars of the new people moving. Lastly the design breaks with all building codes and will really affect the landscape of the neighbourhood. The construction will also create massive disruption on Westend lane and the near by street will be unable to cope with the additional diverted traffic. Therefore I will firmly express my opposition to the development.
2015/6455/P	John Mennis	46 Crediton Hill London nw6 1hr	07/01/2016 15:49:15	OBJEMPER	As a local resident for well over 20 years, I don't think that this application should be permitted. West Hampstead is starting to show signs of not having the appropriate infrastructure to handle many more additional residents. Pavements are becoming very congested at key times of the day, and there has not been a corresponding investment in facilities as the population has grown. I would also be concerned about the environmental impact, and the impact on general quality of life in the area. The Ballymore development seems to have had a much bigger impact on the area than it looked like it would from the plans. Large amounts of light are now blocked by that development. I'm very much in favour of high quality family accommodation being built in West Hampstead, but this proposal doesn't achieve that.
2015/6455/P	Katerina Maidment	18 Pandora Road London NW6 1T	02/01/2016 10:59:26	COMMNT	I object to the current plans for this proposal on the following main grounds: 1) the height of the proposed buildings. Most of West Hampstead around that area is low-rise. This 7 storey proposal is out of step with that; will spoil the sky-line; and set an undesirable precedent for Camden; 2) the increase in population (taken with other proposed developments in the area such as Liddell Road, Builder's Yard) will lead to West Hampstead being a very densely populated area. Already, the pavements are dangerously crowded at peak times as people walk to the tube etc in the morning. Sometimes the underground station has to be closed in order to stagger entrance at peak times.
2015/6455/P	Matthew	99 Greencroft Gardens NW6 3PG	07/01/2016 00:53:34	OBJ	I have seen the pace of development going far to fast as a resident of 8 years here. West Hampstead high street has become crowded, especially on the bridge over the rainway and around the tube and otherground stations. I am concerned about having dismount my bike. Also the community facilities at the back of proposed development are a vital asset to families with children.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	J Fernandes	3 Lymington Road London NW61HX	05/01/2016 22:49:18	OBJEMAIL	<p>I object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Loss of light / shadowing. Most of the South side residents of Lymington will lose light in the mornings as will buildings on West End Lane. -The proposed playground lacks light; medical research shows that it is highly recommended for children to have a certain level of sunlight per day for both physical and emotional reasons (sources: http://www.nhs.uk/Livewell/Summerhealth/Pages/vitamin-D-sunlight.aspx, http://www.nhs.uk/Livewell/Summerhealth/Documents/Concensus_statement%20_vitd_Dec_2010.pdf) -Health and safety issues resulting from overcrowding on pavements and station platforms -Loss of outlook and amenity for residents in the area -Traffic, parking, noise, pollution and waste management / refuse collection issues -Removal/reduction of community assets (the building, the children's two play areas) and conversion into private ones, which is in contradiction to the council's policies <p>There appears to be no guarantee of community spaces and the necessary associated funding to be made available in the proposed development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Loss of local amenities: Travis Perkins and Wickes are currently one of only two building / plumbing merchants in the area and the loss of them would inconvenience and add to time / cost of repairs and refurbishment work for locals and tradesmen working in the area. -"Ghettoisation" risk - it would appear that the prices of the future flats would be out of the range of most local residents, leading to a drastic shift in the demographics and loss of a sense of community typically achieved by owner occupiers if the flats were typically used as investment properties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Gross undervaluation of real estate. -Diversion of public funds to private interests, at little or no benefit to the local community, rather degradation, nuisance and inconvenience.
2015/6455/P	Toby Sagers	Flat 64 Yale Court Honeybourne Road NW6 1JQ	05/01/2016 11:49:38	SUPPRT	<p>I would like to offer my support of this application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial aesthetic improvement on the existing property and appropriate for this increasingly modern part of West Hampstead. • More appropriate use than light industrial for this Town Centre location. • Height in keeping with that on West End Lane and other sites in West Hampstead adjacent to the railways. • The further improvements to the public realm are to be welcomed. <p>My only concern is that the floor to ceiling height of the retail and offices may be insufficient.</p> <p>Nevertheless, this is a welcome redevelopment of a dated and inappropriate site.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Corinne Aveyard	Flat 4 24 Kingdon Road London NW61PH	05/01/2016 18:23:44	OBJ	<p>I'm very unhappy and concern with this redevelopment proposal.</p> <p>My reasons are:</p> <p>Building too high (7 storeys is too much)</p> <p>doesn't fit within the village atmosphere of West Hampstead which people love so much and is so looked after</p> <p>enough monstrous new developments in the area (West Hampstead Square in particular - too bulky, big, high)</p> <p>no character</p> <p>no infrastructure changes to cope with increase of population (i.e transports - 0 additional trains during rush hour and gp - more gp recruited?)</p> <p>i would appreciate if you could seriously review and take those concerns into account. We are only thinking of the long term well being and prosperity of West Hampstead residents and not making a quick profit!</p> <p>Thnaks and regards</p>
2015/6455/P	West Hampstead Local Consultation Group	5 Ranulf Road London NW2 2BT	05/01/2016 13:38:56	COMMEM AIL	<p>No right turn into new entrance from West End Lane as it affects pedestrian and traffic flow. Existing entrance should be used and central entrance as access for deliveries, etc.</p> <p>Entrance to new public space along West End Lane should be landscaped to east side of new development up to wall of Rail bridge.</p> <p>A contract of maintenance by Camden, A2 Dominion and Network Rail should be drawn up. Work with Network Rail to improve, clean up and landscape the spare land below the Potteries path and area around. Removal of Graffiti, etc.</p> <p>Additional Bus stop for Thameslink Station North Entrance opposite existing one.</p> <p>The CIL should reflect the increase of interchange users as the Thameslinnk and the Overground stations come on line in the next 2 years. This development should input financially into the increase and improvement to on street interchange access. This is a car capped development.</p> <p>Financial support for the existing open space facilities because of the increase in family use.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Nick Jackson	42 Sarre Road NW2 3SL	08/01/2016 15:14:40	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed development described under application 2015/6455/P .</p> <p>Although there was a period of consultation before the application was submitted, and improvements were made to the scheme particularly to the West End Lane frontage, the rest of the scheme remains too high and is too massive in its context, especially in relation to the Conservation area.</p> <p>The proposal does not meet policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, in particular relating to the Conservation Area; Views through the site and in the area in general; Height and sympathy with neighbouring buildings; Employment space.</p>
2015/6455/P	West Hampstead Local Consultation Group	5 Ranulf Road London NW2 2BT	05/01/2016 13:38:54	COMMEM AIL	<p>No right turn into new entrance from West End Lane as it affects pedestrian and traffic flow. Existing entrance should be used and central entrance as access for deliveries, etc.</p> <p>Entrance to new public space along West End Lane should be landscaped to east side of new development up to wall of Rail bridge.</p> <p>A contract of maintenance by Camden, A2 Dominion and Network Rail should be drawn up. Work with Network Rail to improve, clean up and landscape the spare land below the Potteries path and area around. Removal of Graffiti, etc.</p> <p>Additional Bus stop for Thameslink Station North Entrance opposite existing one.</p> <p>The CIL should reflect the increase of interchange users as the Thameslink and the Overground stations come on line in the next 2 years. This development should input financially into the increase and improvement to on street interchange access. This is a car capped development.</p> <p>Financial support for the existing open space facilities because of the increase in family use.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Nicholas Jones	24b Lymington Road West Hampstead London NW6 1HY	08/01/2016 19:52:04	OBJ	<p>Ref: 2015/6455/P</p> <p>Sir, Madam -</p> <p>I am contacting you to lodge an official opposition to the proposed development of 156 West End Lane, London, NW6 1SD.</p> <p>West Hampstead as you are aware is an area characterised by Victorian and Edwardian (mostly) red-brick individual and terraced housing, with some mansion blocks. The area is home to a number of designated heritage assets. This of course is an important factor to bear in mind when considering the style and nature of any proposed developments.</p> <p>I refer you to paragraphs 126 and 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework which must apply to all proposed developments. Paragraph 126 for example states:</p> <p>“Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; – the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring; – the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and – opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place”. <p>Having considered the policy in full I am of the view that no proper account has been taken of the policy and feel this is partly to do with the way in which the proposed plans have been hastily put together. I also believe that the application is misleading and not entirely honest in their statements especially the capacity of housing so many more people. West Hampstead Square will see an influx of almost 1000 additional people into West Hampstead. Currently West Hampstead does not have the infrastructure for this development. Every single day West End Lane is grid lock with vehicles and people. It is already at maximum. With West Hampstead Square you are already putting people’s lives at risk through over crowing on pavements and roads. The proposal of 156 West End Lane will further add to this and you are going to be responsible for dangerous overcrowding. You can’t widen the pavements or the roads so people will spill out onto the roads endangering lives.</p> <p>I would also draw your attention to the “Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, Local Development Framework” document, which “contributes to delivering the Core Strategy by providing detailed policies that [Camden Council] will use when determining applications for planning permission”, specifically item 25.9 which refers to the existing “largely dense urban nature of Camden”:</p> <p>“Due to the largely dense urban nature of Camden, the character or appearance of our conservation areas can also be affected by development which is outside of conservation areas, but visible from within them. This includes high or bulky buildings, which can have an impact on areas some distance away, as well as adjacent premises. The Council will therefore not permit development in locations</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>outside conservation areas that it considers would cause harm to the character, appearance or setting of such an area.”</p> <p>Having also examined the information and design proposals made available by the preferred supplier, I also submit the following further objections to the proposed development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The “West Hampstead: Shaping the Future” plan for West Hampstead issued by Camden Council expressly sets out that the area is “well loved for its village feel” and that the Council commits to “enhancing the distinctive village character” and to provide “support for local business”. The proposed project is in breach of these commitments. The proposed development is completely out of keeping with the character of the surrounding residential buildings. It completely disregards the environment around it and the character of other buildings. The houses in Lymington Road – for example – are three storeys high, the development in its existing form will tower over these properties blighting their light, use and enjoyment of their properties. The plans proposed by A2 Dominion proposes buildings of up to 8 floors which will be more than double the height of all nearby homes. This is in complete violation of Camden’s policies. 2. The plans are not in keeping with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area. 3. The height of the proposed development will overlook other buildings and significantly impact on residents’ right to light and privacy, the impact will be particularly severe over Lymington Road where residents will be overlooked when in their gardens and main living areas of their property. A2 Dominion have stated that the majority of the windows that will be looking out onto the development are “minor” dwelling rooms. This is categorically incorrect. Due to the way the flats have been proportioned, the majority of windows are all main livings areas and bedrooms 4. The majority of the ground floor and basements flats will almost certainly go below the minimum BRE acceptable levels with regard to light. 5. The proposed development includes a proposed private road for which it is envisaged residents of the proposed development will use as an access road. It is proposed the access is situated immediately behind the garden walls of the Lymington Road properties. The obvious consequence of this will be a substantial increase in dust, pollution, noise and damage to the general conservation area. The impact on the Lymington Road residents will be substantial but generally this increase in pollution will also have an impact on the wider population. 6. West Hampstead has benefited from an influx of young families, the population of children has steadily grown in recent times. The proposed development and its impact on the environment will be have a detrimental effect on the well-being of those in near and surrounding areas. 7. The proposed road between the Lymington properties and the proposed development is an obvious security risk. It will allow easier access to the gardens and properties of Lymington Road. 8. The proposed buildings themselves will have a considerably negative impact on the conservation area which the planned development adjoins. 9. The development proposes to house between 600 – 800 residents. There is simply insufficient infrastructure to support this number of additional residents into West Hampstead; there is already one development due to complete later this year, West Hampstead Square – the impact from this development is yet to be seen alongside other developments in Blackburn Road, Iverson Road, and Liddell Road. West end Lane is grid lock with cars and lorries every day and the pavements are at maximum capacity. With the increase in population from West Hampstead Square and the proposed

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>156 development the infrastructure cannot carry this safely.</p> <p>10. We respectfully submit insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental impact of so many developments in such a short space of time.</p> <p>11. There is already insufficient parking capacity in the surrounding areas. This has been further reduced as and when JW3 host events. The burden on parking may in turn assist applicants wishing to convert front gardens into drives, thereby completing spoiling the entire area.</p> <p>12. The development will result in a substantial increase in footfall in what are already overcrowded surrounding roads.</p> <p>13. The footfall on the underground, trains and buses – without yet taking additional traffic from West Hampstead Square into account – is already at close to maximum level. Roads and pavements can't be widened so the risk of people spilling out onto the roads is hugely increased.</p> <p>14. Another new development will shunt public transport levels on the tubes and trains to dangerously high levels, thereby putting public safety at risk.</p> <p>15. The narrow pavements over the bridge between this proposed development and two stations is already heaving with pedestrians in the mornings and evenings.</p> <p>16. We support the use of space for developmental purposes, but any proposed development must be viable and properly benefit the community. What exactly does West Hampstead need? Its needs a Health Centre as it is extremely challenging to get to see Doctors within a reasonable timeframe, there is no community centre, no facilities for children. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on GP services, of which there are fewer in the area, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan.</p> <p>17. Travis Perkins is a long-standing business and significant local employer on the existing site and welcomes any opportunity to negotiate a redevelopment of the adjacent former council offices for housing. This would be in line with Camden's own planning policies CS8 and DP13.</p> <p>18. The development plan appears to have dismantled two walls, one along Potteries Path and one currently at the end of Travis Perkins' yard which form the walls of the football pitch, currently the only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.</p> <p>19. The proposed blocks will overshadow and deprive of light the green space and children's playground at the Lymington Road Estate, which is closest to the 156 West End Lane site, as well as to the homes and gardens on Lymington Road Estate.</p> <p>20. The extensive nature of the proposed over-development has the potential to inflict upon the long-established surrounding properties, many of which are in the West End Green Conservation Area, serious structural issues such as subsidence.</p> <p>21. The Travis Perkins business operating at 156 West End Lane is closed from 12pm on Saturdays, meaning that residents in the adjoining properties and roads benefit from quiet and peaceful homes and gardens in the evenings, at weekends and on Public Holidays.</p> <p>22. The proposed project is located on the immediate border of a conservation area. A conservation area is defined in Section 69 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as an area of "special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance" and that the project is irreconcilable with the Council's duty to ensure such preservation.</p> <p>23. The plans are also in direct contravention of the policies outlined in the Neighbourhood</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Development Plan for this area.</p> <p>24. The proposed plans are opposed in their entirety by the combined forces of Save West Hampstead, Lymington Road Residents' Association, Crediton Hill Residents' Association, West Hampstead Gardens' & Residents' Association, and the West End Green Conservation Area Advisory Committee. I would like to reiterate my absolute opposition to the proposal and expect all of my above points to be considered, addressed and responded to appropriately.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Nick Jones</p>
2015/6455/P	Susanne Tide-Frater	Flat 154 Cholmley Gardens Mill Lane London NW6 1AD	05/01/2016 10:26:04	OBJEMAIL	<p>I have lived in 154 Cholmley Gardens for the last 19 years. During that time, the local infrastructure has been pushed to the limit in terms of congestion and development. West-End lane is a notorious gridlock during all hours of the day. Mill Lane has tail backs to almost Kilburn due to everyday traffic, but also constant building works and road works. Taxi drivers refuse to go to our area, as they spend hours in traffic! How will the planned development make the current situation even worse?? I would invite the Camden responsables to spend a few mornings between 8 and 9 at the junction Mill Lane and West-end Lane to get an accurate picture. Also, the area has partially preserved a very strong architectural identity. Why would we destroy that??? What is the benefit of pushing West-Hampstead to the brink with atypical construction and over development?? I strongly object the development on 156 West End Lane</p>
2015/6455/P	Susanne Tide-Frater	Flat 154 Cholmley Gardens Mill Lane London NW6 1AD	05/01/2016 10:26:04	OBJEMAIL	
2015/6455/P	Joanne Scott	Ground floor flat 101 fordwych road London Nw2 3tl	08/01/2016 20:23:22	OBJ	<p>I object to this application. The scale of this development is not in scale or character of West Hampstead. There are too many high rise blocks in this area. We cannot cope with any more traffic on west end lane. There is not enough infrastructure. A basement impact study must be done to avoid any issues with flooding. It will also be an eyesore.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Jill Henry	66 Agamemnon Road London NW6 1EH	07/01/2016 16:36:58	OBJEMAIL	<p>I object to the planning of the development of 156 WELane for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Overbearing nature of proposal •The number and height is too high and siting poor and too dense a •Overshadowing of surroundings, including homes, gardens, open spaces and public thoroughfares •Loss of sunlight •Loss of outlook to the detriment of residential amenity •Public visual amenity •The external appearance of buildings not in keeping with the area •Effect on listed building(s) and Conservation Areas (e.g. West End Green Conservation Area, South Hampstead Conservation Area) •Impact on the neighbourhood •Amenity •General noise and disturbance •Proposed hours of operation during which noise and disturbance may be caused •Disturbance from smells <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Access and highways considerations •Proposed means of access •Type and nature of vehicular access •Impacts arising from means, type and nature of access •Road safety •Pedestrian safety •Adequate parking and servicing •Traffic generation •Noise and disturbance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Deficiencies in physical infrastructure •Public transport •Public amenity •Public drainage •Water systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Deficiencies in social facilities •School places, •Health service provision •Provision of other social services <p>Overcrowding population of West Hampstead and strains on transport and walkways in west end land</p> <p>Thames Water have claimed they would have insufficient capacity for this development</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Susanne Tide-Frater	Flat 154 Cholmley Gardens Mill Lane London NW6 1AD	05/01/2016 10:25:42	OBJEMAIL	I have lived in 154 Cholmley Gardens for the last 19 years. During that time, the local infrastructure has been pushed to the limit in terms of congestion and development. West-End lane is a notorious gridlock during all hours of the day. Mill Lane has tail backs to almost Kilburn due to everyday traffic, but also constant building works and road works. Taxi drivers refuse to go to our area, as they spend hours in traffic! How will the planned development make the current situation even worse?? I would invite the Camden responsables to spend a few mornings between 8 and 9 at the junction Mill Lane and West-end Lane to get an accurate picture. Also, the area has partially preserved a very strong architectural identity. Why would we destroy that??? What is the benefit of pushing West-Hampstead to the brink with atypical construction and over development?? I strongly object the development on 156 West End Lane
2015/6455/P	Kristyan Robinson	28 B Sarre Road London NW2 3SL	05/01/2016 08:38:07	COMMNT	I strongly object to this proposal. The vital and cohesive community of West Hampstead will not endure with this overdevleopement. There is not sufficient infrastructure (schools, doctors etc) to cope with another high density development. The design is too high and is grossly out of keeping with the local character. The proposed junction is dangerous and will greatly increase West End Lane which is already congested.
2015/6455/P	Joanne Scott	Ground floor flat 101 fordwych road London Nw2 3tl	08/01/2016 20:22:59	OBJ	I object to this application. The scale of this development is not in scale or character of West Hampstead. There are too many high rise blocks in this area. We cannot cope with any more traffic on west end lane. There is not enough infrastructure. A basement impact study must be done to avoid any issues with flooding. It will also be an eyesore.
2015/6455/P	Martin Phillips	4A Tanza Road	07/01/2016 12:32:15	OBJ	<p>I am horrified by the size and design of this development and that it is even being considered. Camden has the opportunity to get rid of the existing eyesore and do something far better but yet it considering replacing one overbearing eyesore with another as well as making the views of many others, previously relatively unaffected, worse!</p> <p>I also object because it will add to the population density in the area, which during rush hours, is ridiculous. Given the narrowness of the pavements on West End Lane, it is a wonder that there have not been a whole host of accidents in the area. Adding these buildings will make matters worse.</p> <p>I am truly astonished that Camden has allowed any new development along West End Lane without insisting that the developers put money into a pool to widen the road and bridge in the vicinity of the stations. The new development next to the key/shoe repairer shop shows this up in full relief. No developments should be allowed so close to the road.</p> <p>I am completely opposed to this development. the staggering numbers of people who transfer between rail lines en route to and from workIt will add to the complete over</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	John Vos	Flat 3 28 Crediton Hill London NW6 1HP	06/01/2016 23:33:20	COMMEM AIL	<p>I would like to object to the proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <p>Overcrowding There are currently numerous developments which are not yet complete which will over-burden the area significantly. The submitted reports do not properly cater for these additional demands.</p> <p>Traffic West End Lane is currently a traffic nightmare. The report submitted bears no resemblance to the West End Lane that I witness every morning. (20mph!!!! LOL) The proximity of the Thameslink to the project and the number of drop-offs will result in multiple accidents to pedestrians and cars if the project is allowed to proceed for which the council will be morally responsible.</p> <p>Infrastructure Where are the additional school places, doctors etc to support the additional residents in these high density schemes??</p> <p>In summary this is a morally bankrupt proposal that does not serve the community and flies in the face of the development strategies that Camden likes to think it promotes.</p>
2015/6455/P	Aynur Mukhametshin	43A Crediton Hill NW6 1HS	05/01/2016 10:54:17	OBJ	I am a landlord and a resident of a nearby property on Crediton Hill and would like to object this development. The area as it stands now is already overcrowded with lack of schools, GPs, and even pavement space near the stations. The development, with it's modern design, height and scale, would have a damaging effect on Conservation Area.
2015/6455/P	Mrs Liping Durrant	74 Gilbert Road Cambridge	07/01/2016 22:06:17	OBJ	The proposed development will adversely affect the local environment and character of surrounding Victorian roads such as Lymington Road. The height of the proposed development is out of character and will be detrimental to views from top floors of these properties. It will also increase the use of the underground station and other public transport leading to greater crowding.
2015/6455/P	meher toorkey	65 Cholmley gardens NW61AJ NW61AJ NW61AJ	05/01/2016 10:47:31	COMMNT	This will add to the chaos and disruption already caused by new developments sanctioned by greedy developers. West End Lane is a bottle neck stretching over 2 kms. The pollution increases. We cannot sustain any more people, traffic or development unless we wish to see the whole infra structure break down.
2015/6455/P	meher toorkey	65 Cholmley gardens NW61AJ NW61AJ NW61AJ	05/01/2016 10:47:13	COMMNT	