

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5372/P	Jehane	56 Lady Somerset road NW5 1TU NW5 1TU	04/10/2016 12:05:13	COMMNT	I strongly object to this proposed development. We are already suffering from the height of the "Maple Building" which blocks out sky and will further contribute to light pollution at night. The proposed site is a disgrace - we do not need any more luxury flats dominating our landscape. The existing building is good and sturdy and serves a useful purpose. How could you have let developers get their hands on this building? Camden I am ashamed to live in this borough now, where I have lived for forty years in a diverse and supported community, once a Camden tenant myself.
2016/5372/P	Mary Dickins	70 B Lady Somerset Road London NW5 1TU	04/10/2016 18:15:24	OBJ	I would like to object most strongly to the current plans for this development. The scale of the planned development is huge and it will tower over existing buildings including the Linton development next door which has just had two additional floors added. We are facing a glut of luxury apartments in this immediate area which will be unaffordable to local residents. This is a plea for a more modest truly affordable development
2016/5372/P	Debbie Humphry	14 College Lane	05/10/2016 07:40:20	OBJ	Only 8 social rented properties? At a time when the Housing and Planning Act (2016) is forcing councils to sell off their social rented properties? At a time when property prices are so high in this area the developer will be making a huge profit? There should be at least 50% social rented properties so people on lower and middle incomes can stay in Camden and retain the amazing mixed community we live in, and do the jobs necessary for all of us to live in a nice place. I object strongly to insufficient percentage of social rented units. And what about the infrastructure required? What provision has been made for extra schools, doctors services etc? Thanks, Debbie Humphry
2016/5372/P	paul sparrow	91 Burghley Road	04/10/2016 12:00:47	OBJ	I wish to OBJECT to the proposed development on two main counts: 1. The scale of the development is too large; out of proportion to surrounding buildings. 2. In any event, there is not sufficient, much needed, social housing; in my opinion, the entire site should be exclusively dedicated to social housing.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5372/P	Greg Rubinstein	6 Evangelist Road London NW5 1UB	04/10/2016 11:46:15	OBJ	<p>The scale of this proposed development is TOTALLY inappropriate. If built, this complex would overwhelm both the church to its left and Linton House to its right, and also unacceptably dominate the visual environment of Burghley Road.</p> <p>After much discussion, the developers refurbishing Linton House were, controversially, allowed to add two more floors to the top of the building, but only if they were stepped back from the front line of the building. This proposed building would be a further two floors higher than the newly heightened Linton House, which would be both unacceptable, and inconsistent with very recent planning decisions.</p> <p>On a more general note, the enormous number of housing units that have recently been added in this immediate area (Piano Yard, Railway Club site, Linton House, etc.) are in the process of placing intolerable additional burdens on the infrastructure - particularly schools, doctors and buses, all of which are already overstretched, yet there seems to be no appetite in the planning department to take any of this into consideration, when deciding whether or not to allow developers to do what they want.</p> <p>While a development on this site is not necessarily a bad thing, it must be kept to a size that is not out of keeping with the surroundings, and provision must also somehow be made for the considerable increase in the local population that will result.</p>
