

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/3930/P	B.M. Shaughnessy	20 Kylemore Road London NW6 2PT	14/09/2016 17:00:44	OBJ	<p>There are a number of elements of this proposed development on a low rise, mainly residential street with small shops running off West End Lane which need careful scrutiny and members of WHGARA, a local residents association near the site would like to raise the following issues:</p> <p>The site has been unloved by its owners for approx. 10 years and many of its business units at street level, including a viable restaurant space, have been left empty and largely unoccupied when they might have been used to encourage small business over the short term as Camden Policy DP10 recommends. Neither is any small business provision included in this present application</p> <p>The plan is overcrowded, extremely bulky, and it would be of interest to know the density and viability calculations which have not been made available. The height, despite the slope in the roadway, is not in keeping with the established roofline as the neighbouring properties are between 3- 4 storeys and the use of a mansard, set-back strategy to increase height by stealth does not disguise the inappropriate design against Camden policy DP24 and should be discouraged by Camden Planning.</p> <p>The building heights proposed at the lower end of the site from WELane, will also seriously overshadow the properties opposite at key times of the day- CP 2.10 and does not conform to standards in the Conservation Area according to Camden policy DP25.</p> <p>As far as we can tell without detail in the application, 30 new rental only units are intended with no reasons offered for the failure to provide any affordable unit. It is not unlike student or hostel accommodation for a transient demographic and does not really provide the secure housing recommended by the Mayor of London and is also in direct and overt breach of Camden Core Strategy Policy CS6, DP3. For this reason alone, Camden must stand by its commitment to affordable housing and refuse planning permission to this scheme as it stands.</p> <p>At the October 2013 public exhibition by the site's owners to showcase the scheme pre-application, undertakings were given to a) consult with interested parties, b) present the amended scheme to a development management forum, c) provide a review followed by d) a briefing before the scheme was finalised and an application submitted. None of these communication/ liaison steps have been taken and there is a lack of transparency as a result. We are concerned that, with this background, Camden policy DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours will not be met in a robust and accountable way by the applicants who have already failed to disclose matters of access, affordable provision and there are growing concerns about disruption during the demolition & construction phases as well as in the future operation of the site. It is in a sensitive and pivotal setting and extensive works will have a directly adverse effect on the surrounding community. This is a narrow, one-way street but a vital and busy route through to Finchley Road for cars, buses and foot traffic. Planning should not be granted without a robust condition for a comprehensive traffic and construction plan as well as measures to alleviate a significant potential for noise and nuisance to residents across a wide area.</p> <p>Again, sadly there seems to be no follow through by any agency on the resolution to support or foster small business in the area. We have now lost over 70% of the small units which existed locally up to 2015 and the two overlarge shops proposed on this site are designed for corporate chains. According to</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

Neighbourhood Plan Policies 12 & 13, a number of small units - some at affordable rents- would be the preference of the community but there seems no method to either encourage or enforce this wish or to replace the small entrepreneurs we have lost. The large glass shopfront design is entirely out of keeping with the look and scale of the traditional shops down this road and should be amended.

Finally despite a lengthy tree report by Quaife Woodlands, the removal of a healthy, mature sycamore tree in the rear garden of the 159 site is unnecessary and perverse - undermining the intent and logic of the TPO granted by Camden in December 2013. Defining the tree as 'of marginal importance' does not mitigate Camden policies for Conserving and enhancing the natural environment. It is not causing damage (some minor cracking in an adjoining wall only).The tree may well need to be prune to manage it but the whole tree (not just the crown as mentioned in the report) provides a now precious green amenity as, perhaps the only tree left in West Hampstead and there seems no case to make that it has decreased in either value or benefit since the TPO was placed in 2013. If a TPO is to be lifted on the basis of this report, the protection it offers is seriously compromised throughout the borough.

On balance, this scheme is seriously deficient for the reasons we have given and should be refused until the matters raised above are addressed in detail and good faith by the applicant. We request that the application, as it stands, be refused.
