

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Franziska hasford	14 B Belsize lane	09/11/2016 10:28:39	OBJ	

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 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

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

Comment: **Response:**

only recreational space available for young people in the area. No development plan should threaten or encroach upon this valuable public space.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.

I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Sarah Petherick	49B Elspeth Rd London	09/11/2016 09:53:23	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I write this as a frequent visitor to the neighbourhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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:**

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

Finally, I am aware of the alternative scheme by Create Streets which I feel provides a more realistic and welcome approach to the site.

I ask that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this letter and refuse this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Linda Bick	5 Lymington Road London NW61HX NW61HX	09/11/2016 17:05:06	OBJLETTE R	<p>Camden Planning Officers, Councillors, London Borough of Camden.</p> <p>Dear Councillors,</p> <p>Once again it appears I have to write to object to this wholly inappropriate plan to build on the 156 West End Lane site and adjoining land. The small modifications in the newly submitted planning application do nothing to change my views and fears. I hope my previous letters of objection will be considered in addition to this letter. I can only hope that reason and fairness will prevail in the minds and be reflected in the decisions of those trusted to work for us in Camden Council and that they will represent and stand up for the wishes and concerns of the local residents, who will be most affected by any development on the site.</p> <p>I live on the north side of Lymington Road, in the third private house from West End Lane. I grew up and have lived in West Hampstead most of my life. A happy, inclusive, welcoming place... West Hampstead always seemed to evolve, for the better, adapting to modern life and absorbing a rich mix of residents, culture and facilities.</p> <p>This brutal development would radically change the whole area. The conservation area cannot be eroded by greedy use of the site – We know Camden needs the money, due to cuts, but surely the money already in the Camden coffers from previous sell-offs (e.g. the Town Hall extension) can be used, instead of secreted away in a “rainy-day” account. drastic change by the fact we were in a conservation area, with set and well-defined rules.</p> <p>Whoever thought that it would be our own local authority who might ditch principles and sell off their own land for profit, obviously with a built-in guarantee that the developers will be allowed to do what they like with the site-otherwise they would not buy it.</p> <p>I'm sure others will speak up for Travis Perkins – a well managed, established business causing no harm to anyone and working well in that site for years.</p> <p>My main objections, apart from the fact that the site could work well as a much needed school and G.P. Facility with all the new residents moving in to West Hampstead Square soon are :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The mammoth size and towering, looming height– shadowing houses and the Crown Close play area in Lymington Road, West End Lane and to some extent Crediton Hill justpreposterously out of proportion to anything in the area. I have been looking at 8 floor buildings in other areas, e.g. the old mansion blocks in Maida Vale and St Johns Wood, and trying to imagine them looming up behind Lymington Road. Even with the proposed “ step “ design of tiers, this will be very ugly and seem threatening, robbing those of us nearby of light all round. 2. The proposed service road for the shop units (... and what else ?? this has not been made clear – is it

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

Comment: **Response:**

to be for all servicing of the flats, i.e. rubbish collection, workmen, boilers/ aircon work). This is planned to be a new entry point from West End Lane (probably dangerously near to the junction of W.E.Lane and Sumatra Road) , with a lorry bay (for how many ??) more or less opposite the back gardens of 4- 6 Lymington Road.

WHY on earth should the noise from arriving and departing vehicles be added to the woes of those of us living on Lymington Road. The constant noise of lorries and vans manoeuvring in a tight space with their beeping warning noises would be a constant irritation and disturbance of the right to quiet enjoyment of any of the residents at that end of Lymington Road, both north and south of the road. Plus the pollution from their engines.

The current road by the side of the railway is the obvious place to have a road, where people already expect noise and usually accept that if they live in a flat overlooking the railway, there will be some noise. Also exhaust and pollution should be whisked away by the movement of frequent trains. Access would be much easier and less likely to cause bother and accidents.

2a. Apart from the lorry bay, now there are to be 12 parking spaces as well. Surely any deliveries or parking should be sited UNDERGROUND, to minimise the noise, pollution and hassle for nearby residents and anyone who comes to live there. The developers will be making enough money from the site, - let them pay for the dig and let it be next to the railway, as far away from the residents as possible.

Re "service road", which the developers prefer to call the "wheelchair route", to make it sound more of a community service project -

the proposed location is just a couple of metres from the junction with Sumatra Road, and about 3 metres from the junction with Lymington Road. Therefore I think that even the authorities in charge of road/traffic planning would deny that it would be a safe place to add another road access point. The current one, opposite Thameslink, is a much better site for road access from all aspects, including convenience and safety.

3. Lastly, the noise, dirt, pollution, traffic interruption, damage to approach roads, pedestrian safety....all would be detrimental to those unfortunate enough to be living or working near the development – for YEARS , whilst it might be built. Look at the catastrophic effect the West Hampstead Square development has had, with only a thin strip of houses currently directly on one side (Iverson Rd) of the oversized development.

West Hampstead is FULL ! You cannot keep pouring concrete into it without breaking the mould. The LDP for the area has already been realised. Now, please leave us alone.

As our elected councillors I dearly hope that you will take these points into consideration and act for your electors, - be brave and act honourably , not just accepting deals done behind closed doors which although making much needed money for the Borough are ultimately serving the powerful developers and the interests of their bosses and shareholders, rather than the community which makes West

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

Hampstead and the Borough what it is.

Please notify me by letter of decisions or further chances to appeal against this development.

L
