



Planning Inspectorate's Appeal Reference No.

APP/X5210/W/15/3141326

The appellant asserts a number of trumped up/irrelevant reasons in their appeal for the planning directorate's decision to be overturned.

1. Longevity factor. The fact that the Lola Rose business has been located in Camden for 15 years and in West Hampstead for the last year or two is insignificant. Some residents of the residential block Redcroft, have been living here for over **25** years in enjoyment of the pleasant and spacious design and layout of the nine units of Hampstead West. Hampstead West is the immediate view from the front doors and walkways of Redcroft. Some of us, ie those on the first floor of this development, have patios where we can take advantage of the sunshine and views. We have created gardens from pot plants and have even successfully grown vegetables in our location. We do not wish our amenities/views to be compromised nor to set a precedent for other buildings in Hampstead West to be extended, thus depriving us of light, views and the purposefully uniform design of Hampstead West. Lola Rose's plan would turn the site into a mish mash of styles and affect the continuity of line with the houses in neighbouring Rowntree Close. Their proposed layout negatively impacts on the character of the area, giving an unsettling/entropic impression in its disrespect of the original model which links all nine buildings to produce one consummate design for Hampstead West.
2. Lola Rose knew that when they purchased this site, less than two years ago, there was no guarantee that the Planning Inspectorate would permit it to be extended. If they required this level of expansion they should not have bought a building of this size. Perhaps there has been a lack of foresight on their part. They promise the instigation of six additional design jobs should they receive planning permission. This is not a planning consideration, it is irrelevant, and anyway, who is going to check whether Lola Rose fulfil this pledge? They refer to their great and international success in their appeal and the implication thus is that they have a large available budget. There is hence no reason why part of their business cannot be housed separately, as is common practice in companies

throughout the world. If they need extra staff, surely they will employ them whatever their location and whether or not they take up one or two buildings.

3. Lola Rose mention a small backwards facing window that unit 9 were given permission to build in 2011. Unit 9 is on the opposite side from unit 5 (Lola Rose) and thus this small window backs onto the railway line. It is not an issue and does not in any way affect the design or views of Hampstead West as eg. perceived from Redcroft. What Lola Rose fail to mention in their appeal is that the main part of Unit 9's application was for a large dormer window on the opposite side to the railway, (similiar to part of their application) ie affecting the uniform structure and layout of the nine buildings of Hampstead West, which was dismissed on the same grounds as with Lola Rose's currently rejected application. Nothing has changed and there is still no reason that the nature of Hampstead West should be compromised by the self serving needs of Lola Rose. The Planning Inspectorate's Decision re 5 Hampstead West and the former identical decision for extension of 9 Hampstead West, should stand:

"The proposed front dormer would, by reason of its excessive size and inappropriate design, be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider local area, 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."

Lola Rose is not a public company and does not offer any employment opportunities that would not occur if they had to make other arrangements for the positioning of extra staff. Claims that their expansion plans would in any way benefit the local area or anyone other than their own business are specious. Lola Rose has attempted, in their appeal against the Inspectorate's considered and wise decision, to give the impression that they are contributing to the West Hampstead area in some way. In truth their expansion plans are totally based in self interest and with no regard to conserving heritage or their surroundings. The planned alterations are innapropriate in shape and size and will spoil the attractive design and lines of Hampstead West, sacrificing light and creating an overcrowded and anomalous impression. Their claims to contribute to local/Camden growth according to the mayor's vision for London are specious, to say the least.

Yours sincerely,

Candice Temple (flat 5 Redcroft)
Stephen Jones (flat 5 Redcroft)

Neil Jones (flat 4 Redcroft)
Pumudi Jones (flat 4 Redcroft)
Johnny Buccheri (flat 3 Redcroft)
Kay Buccheri (flat 3 Redcroft)
Niko Kalfigkopoulos (flat 3 Redcroft)
Neil Shah (flat 8 Redcroft)
Suman Bhadresa (flat 10 Redcroft)
James Wright (flat 6 Redcroft)
Kay Buccheri (flat 3 Redcroft)
Majid Attar (flat 7 Redcroft)
Filiz Ulker (flat 7 Redcroft)
Malcolm Lim (flat 1 Redcroft)



