

Flat 1
20 Lymington Road
London
NW6 1HY
6 January 2016

Camden Planning Department
REF: 2015/6455P – 156 West End Lane

Dear Ms Chung,

I am a resident on the southern 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.

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:

- 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.
- Windows to my own property will all lose light. The average reduction fails all BRE recommendations with a reduction of 27.3% of light (windows 291-293 and 296-298). Based on this fact, 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.
- 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 46% and many (windows 296-298) losing more than 50%.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Other Reasons

- 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. 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.
 - The Camden Site Allocations Plan suggests that there should be "*an appropriate transition in massing towards the south and east of the site*". The current design would in fact **increase** the current massing towards the south and east of the site.
-

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.

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!

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of Charles Openshaw.

Charles Openshaw

