

**Response:**

**Comment:**

**Received:**

**Consultees Addr:**

**Consultees Name:**


**Application No:**

08/11/2016 18:30:07 OIBJ

2 Opel News  
London


Pardl Rabbert

2015/6455/P




Printed on: 09/11/2016 09:05:08

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



Printed on: 09/11/2016 09:05:08

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Consultees Addr:      Received:      Comment:      Response:



**Application No:** 2015/6455/P  
**Consultees Name:** Claire eve  
**Consultees Addr:** 262 earshalton road  
**Received:** 08/11/2016 17:01:26 OJB  
**Comment:** Dear Camden Council,  
**Response:** I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.

I write this as a frequent visitor to the neighbourhood.

- The proposal does not meet the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011.
- The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area.
- The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its existing form will tower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties.
- 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.
- 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.
- While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space.
- 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.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of: loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year.</li><li>• The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lynton Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.</li><li>• The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing - this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan. Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development.</li></ul> <p>Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.</p>	<p>I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.</p>

<b>Application No:</b> 2015/6455/P	<b>Consultees Name:</b> Charlie Burton	<b>Consultees Addr:</b> 60 Finland Road	<b>Received:</b> 08/11/2016 16:59:01	<b>Comment:</b> OBJCOM1 AP	<b>Response:</b> Dear Camden Council,  I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.  I write this as a frequent visitor to the neighbourhood. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposal does not meet the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011.</li><li>• The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area.</li><li>• The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its existing form will lower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
---------------------------------------	---	--	---	----------------------------------	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Dawn Baker	51 Harvard Court Honeybourne Road London NW6 1HN	08/11/2016 16:38:27	COMMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year.</li> <li>The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lymington Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.</li> <li>The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing - this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan.</li> </ul> <p>Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development.</p> <p>Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.</p> <p>I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.</p>
					<p>The proposed addition of 164 flats will bring greater congestion in an already congested area. There are several blocks of flats under development (opposite West Hampstead tube, on Iverson Road, etc) that are not complete, once these are fully occupied there will be even greater numbers of residents in West Hampstead with no additional facilities (doctors, schools, transport, etc.) to support the increased number of residents. I support the redevelopment of this site, but with far fewer residential properties as the area does not have the infrastructure to support the number of residential developments in such a small area. The area is already congested, both on the roads, paths and on local public transport. One positive comment on the proposal is the large number of affordable flats in this development.</p>

**Application No:** 2015/6455/P  
**Consultees Name:** Alan Proddger  
**Consultees Addr:** 76 Poplar Avenue  
Hove  
BN3 8PS  
BN3 8PS  
**Received:** 08/11/2016 17:54:08  
**Comment:** OBJECTION  
**Response:** Dear Camden Council,  
I am writing to comment on the planning application for 156 West End Lane, ref: 2015/6455/P. I strongly object to the planning application as submitted, for the reasons set out below, both individually and in combination together.

I write this as a frequent visitor to the neighbourhood.

- The proposal does not meet the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, which has now been formally adopted by Camden Council, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011.
- The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area.
- The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding built environment. It completely disregards the architecture around it and the character of other buildings. In particular, the houses in Lymington Road are three story Victorian properties and the proposed development in its existing form will lower over these properties impacting their light, their views and the use and enjoyment of their properties.
- 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.
- 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.
- While I support the proposals for 50% affordable housing, I suggest the proposed location of the affordable housing - which will include larger units for families - would be much better located at the eastern end of the site, where it will provide much easier access to the games area and open space.
- 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.



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The games area (MUGA) to the west of the site, although not being sold by the Council, will be significantly affected by the proposed development - especially in terms of loss of light where children will be playing in shadows after 4pm for most of the year.</li><li>• The developer's Daylight and Sunlight report is probably one of the most deceiving documents I have ever read in respect of this issue and one which completely ignores the reality of loss of light in the context of this development. Lymington Road residents generally will already be aware that the loss of light will impact almost every home on the street and will take some homes below the minimum BRE acceptable levels. We would ask that Camden, who will profit massively from any development on this site, should carry out its own independent assessment. It is patently obvious from the report that the only reason the height and mass has been slightly reduced during the early consultation process is to mitigate against even more massive overshadowing and loss of light.</li><li>• The lack of cumulative impact assessment of the raft of developments already underway in the area is disappointing - this includes Ballymore, Iverson, Maygrove and Liddell Roads which are all yet to be populated. The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on already overstretched GP services, of which there are fewer in the area than in living memory, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan. Thames Water has already filed significant objections to this development on the grounds that there is insufficient water and sewage infrastructure in the area to support the development.</li></ul> <p>Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.</p> <p>I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.</p>