



Dear Sir or Madam,

I would like to make some objections to this proposed planning of the Travis Perkins site next to the Thameslink railway, ref: Planning Application 2015/6455/P .

This over-intensive over-development of the site, with 163 'units' instead of the original 164, including an additional private sale unit, two fewer so-called 'affordable' units, while 'affordable' housing falls short of 50% requirement is beyond unacceptable. The last thing we need in our already over-saturated area are any more large scale development to add to the burden! There are days where I can't get on a train during rush hour, having to wait for 2 or more to pass. Does that seem right to you?? Why not take this development elsewhere, like Dollis Hill, where there is plenty of land and a lot less residents.

Why does this development offer almost half of the 'affordable' units as "shared ownership" when the developer was explicitly instructed by yourselves at Camden planning that **shared ownership** is not a viable option?? Additionally, both Phil Jones, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport & Planning, and Theo Blackwell, Cabinet Member for Finance, have stated publicly that "shared ownership is a pricey and unattractive model which needs to be replaced". Do you really want to be a council that lies and goes against their own rules, just to make more money and upset the long standing residents?? Abhorrent.

Combine that with the imposition of yet **another large supermarket** across the ground floor retail units, thereby magnifying the already existing problems with supermarket deliveries and their impact on traffic, congestion and amenity, is baffling. What 'planning' is there when you're not paying attention to the existing issues and seek to further add to them??

- You alone will cause irrevocable damage the West End Green Conservation Area. Shameful behaviour by greedy thoughtless politicians who have no concept of what it means to do the right thing.

- 

Sincerely,

Hana Levy

I welcome the Camden's efforts to increase the availability of housing stock in West Hampstead.

However I query the impartiality of Camden Council's ability to decide the 156 West End Lane matter on fair grounds given that the land is owned by the Council, and the developer is The Council's chosen developer.

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.

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.

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: "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:

- 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".

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 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":

"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.

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.

I 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.

I 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.

The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is a fairly obtuse and difficult to understand document. Many Lymington Road residents will already be aware that the loss of light (and we will all lose from this development) takes some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. Camden should carry out its own independent assessment. It is fairly obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.

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.

A2 domain agents have been requesting signatures from residents in the Sumatra Road to support this large scale development. People came ringing all doors stating - "we would like your support and signature as there is going to be built resident flats in West End Lane. Would you support us and sign": lobbying local people is manipulative and dishonest and they provided little information or explanation of the size and development in any real detail. These signatures should be disregarded as a friend of mine, who lives in Sumatra Road, thought they worked for the council and were supporting improvements to the 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](#), and the [West End Green Conservation Area Advisory Committee](#).