

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Sarah Owen	49 Church Street AL3 5NG	10/11/2016 15:48:34	NOBJ	<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	Mark Weeks	11 West Common	10/11/2016 13:46:16	INT	<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	Vicki Doe	6b Lymington Road NW61HY NW61HY	10/11/2016 23:52:06	OBJEMPER	<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>Personally:</p> <p>As a resident on the south side of Lymington Road and the owner of a 1st floor flat, I am substantially affected by the proposed development and object on a basis of a loss of light and outlook. Having reviewed the “BRE Daylight and Sunlight (Neighbouring Properties) 18 December 2015 document” supplied by A2 Dominion and created by Right of Light Consulting the following is clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The report states that “a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings. We note that the proposed development is to be of similar height and proportion to that of the existing surrounding buildings”. This statement is simply untrue – the development does not match the height or proportions at all of the existing buildings and is in fact 3-4 stories higher than the properties on Lymington Road which it faces and blocks the light from. If the proposed building DID adhere to the height and proportions of the existing buildings then there would be almost no Loss of Light issues at all. I would not object to a building 3/4 stories. o My property will suffer dramatically- with ALL windows below the BRE Guidelines. o In the Sunlight to Windows Tests 153 out of the 396 windows reported will fall below the 21st March recommended minimum ratio of 0.8 which is 39% of all windows and, although this is just the winter figures, it shows the scale of impact that the development has at a crucial time of the year when many windows will lose significant light. This should not be averaged over to the whole year to try to wiggle out of the fact as to how the development will affect people’s properties and quality of life during the winter months when many will be living in almost total overshadowing. <p>Given the above it is clear that not only are a number of windows and open spaces falling well below the BRE guideline figures, a great many other windows are only marginally above the guidelines and a great many are well below them for substantial parts of the year. On this basis the development is unacceptable and if approved a considerable number of local residents would have to consider Right of Light legal claims to stop the development proceeding as proposed. The fact that Camden are being made aware of these breaches at this stage should give them plenty of opportunity to ensure the matter is rectified so that they are not culpable in allowing this legal infringement to take place</p> <p>Overall</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

- The proposal does not meet the policies in our 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.

- 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

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Sheila Bull	27 Lyncroft Gardens West Hampstead London NW6 1LB	10/11/2016 16:09:09	OBJ	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <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 attended the NDF presentation and believe the alternative scheme by Create Streets 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 the application.</p> <p>Vicki</p> <p>Far too big. Far too tall. Too ugly. Blocks light. Overshadows homes. Too many people for size of site. Steals open space. Not enough affordable/low rent units. Too many job losses. One large retail unit - stupid idea, wrong for the area.</p> <p>The freehold should remain owned by Camden - short-sighted policy to let it go.</p> <p>Why can't we have buildings that we locals like, are proud of, and enjoy living in and looking at?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Vicki Doe	6b Lymington Road NW61HY NW61HY	10/11/2016 23:51:50	OBJEMPER	<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>Personally:</p> <p>As a resident on the south side of Lymington Road and the owner of a 1st floor flat, I am substantially affected by the proposed development and object on a basis of a loss of light and outlook. Having reviewed the “BRE Daylight and Sunlight (Neighbouring Properties) 18 December 2015 document” supplied by A2 Dominion and created by Right of Light Consulting the following is clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The report states that “a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings. We note that the proposed development is to be of similar height and proportion to that of the existing surrounding buildings”. This statement is simply untrue – the development does not match the height or proportions at all of the existing buildings and is in fact 3-4 stories higher than the properties on Lymington Road which it faces and blocks the light from. If the proposed building DID adhere to the height and proportions of the existing buildings then there would be almost no Loss of Light issues at all. I would not object to a building 3/4 stories. o My property will suffer dramatically- with ALL windows below the BRE Guidelines. o In the Sunlight to Windows Tests 153 out of the 396 windows reported will fall below the 21st March recommended minimum ratio of 0.8 which is 39% of all windows and, although this is just the winter figures, it shows the scale of impact that the development has at a crucial time of the year when many windows will lose significant light. This should not be averaged over to the whole year to try to wiggle out of the fact as to how the development will affect people’s properties and quality of life during the winter months when many will be living in almost total overshadowing. <p>Given the above it is clear that not only are a number of windows and open spaces falling well below the BRE guideline figures, a great many other windows are only marginally above the guidelines and a great many are well below them for substantial parts of the year. On this basis the development is unacceptable and if approved a considerable number of local residents would have to consider Right of Light legal claims to stop the development proceeding as proposed. The fact that Camden are being made aware of these breaches at this stage should give them plenty of opportunity to ensure the matter is rectified so that they are not culpable in allowing this legal infringement to take place</p> <p>Overall</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

- The proposal does not meet the policies in our 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.

- 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

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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. <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 attended the NDF presentation and believe the alternative scheme by Create Streets 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 the application.</p> <p>Vicki</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6455/P	Miriam Porat	18b Lymington Road London NW6 1HY NW6 1HY	10/11/2016 21:33:03	COMNOT	<p>The "revised" October 2016 proposal of A2 Dominion remains in contravention of Camden Council's own 2011 Statutory Planning document in that this massive proposed development so out of keeping with the local area abuts the Conservation Area. It is not sympathetic to the residential area and at 6 or 7 storeys is too high, and the massing for too bulky for such a small site.</p> <p>There has no been no light survey from inside my flat or building, and please note if planning permission is granted as applicant currently proposes, and with the planned BRE levels stated, with this development being in contravention of Camden's own 2011 Statutory Planning document I reserve the right to seek remedy from the Courts under the Right of Light principles and pertinent Act(s).</p> <p>I strongly object for the following reasons:</p> <p>LOSS OF LIGHT</p> <p>The proposed development does not match the height or proportions at all of the existing buildings and is in fact 3-4 stories higher than the properties on Lymington Road which it faces and blocks the light from, including the gardens. If the proposed building DID adhere to the height and proportions of the existing buildings then there would be almost no Loss of Light issues at all.</p> <p>The garden at my property will suffer dramatically with a 21 March light reduction according to the difficult to interpret images the developer has supplied, which are wholly inadequate. I am not clear as to what % exactly as the developer has included the 3 gardens (1 per flat at Number 18) as one single garden. My garden is furthest south and right up against the perimeter of the fence/West End Green Conservation Area perimeter and accordingly this will suffer much more from loss of light and poor BRE % loss than the 3 gardens combined (where flat's gardens is further north than mine and further away from the proposed tower blocks footprint). Given that ground floor flat at Number 18 sees all of its south facing windows below (red) the BRE minimum level %'s, and given my garden starts approx 15m south of the house, than one can only draw the conclusion that the entirety of my gardens is (red) below the minimum BRE levels #</p> <p>Windows to my own property will all lose light and the main set of windows into my living room which only has one window will see a significant reduction in quality of light and for us quality of The MUGA and CROWN CLOSE childrens area overshadowing is substantial even with the exceptionally modest revised proposal and the new current proposal is unacceptable and will destroy the amenity of the playground and also the basketball court when considering its most frequent usage period (after school hours) when it will be almost in total shade.</p> <p>Existing Council Policies:</p> <p>“Camden Planning Guidance 6 Amenity Daylight and sunlight 6.13 These minimum figures may not be applicable when measuring the impact of new buildings on existing dwellings as the simple preservation of minimum ADFs will not necessarily be seen as an indication of acceptability, especially if the VSC demonstrates a significant worsening in daylight levels. For existing dwellings the Council will consider the overall loss of daylight as opposed to the minimum acceptable levels of daylight. As the BRE guidance suggests, the readings will be interpreted flexibly as their aim is to support rather</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

than constrain natural lighting. However, daylight is only one of the many factors in site layout design. Therefore, when applying these standards in Camden, we will take into consideration other site factors and constraints.”

“Camden Development Policy DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

The Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors we will consider include:

- a) visual privacy and overlooking;
- b) overshadowing and outlook;
- c) sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels;”

· 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.

SUBSIDENCE

Lymington Road is an area at very high risk of subsidence. South Side No.14 has previously in 2014 been treated to repair and reinforcement to combat subsidence. Already Thames Water has recently noted major concerns with suitable supply for the proposed development.

No.5 Lymington Road on North Side is currently being treated to repair and reinforcement to combat subsidence.

The area cannot be suitable for major excavation and building works.

VIEWS

All Lymington Road residents are severely impacted by the proposed development at 156 West End Lane (156WEL) directly.

I will face a massive overbearing site looming high above the Lymington Road Victorian houses and starting just 8m from my garden fence (West End Green conservation area) and only c20m from the my building. This will be removing considerable skyline views and cause considerable overshadowing across the entirety of South facing buildings and our gardens. The views from the only window of our south facing living room towards central London (where we can see London Eye fireworks) will be obliterated by the additional 3-4 stories of this proposed development looming over the Lymington Road houses. Every building in the horizon and the vast skyline, would be obliterated.

CONSERVATION AREA

The proposed project is located on the immediate border of a conservation area. A

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

Comment: **Response:**

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. Also at the centre of this particular point is Section 7.2 of the February 2011 West End Green Conservation Area Appraisal Plan (Control over New Development), which document notes that “Development proposals must preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West End Green Conservation Area. This requirement applies equally to developments which are outside the Conservation Area but would affect its setting or views into or out of the area.”

It is clear in every respect that this project contravenes these principles.

The Conservation Area in West Hampstead as you will know is specifically enshrined in the West End Green Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy document produced in February 2011. Camden Development Policies of 2010, under Policy DP25, “Conserving Camden’s Heritage”, further lend considerable weight to the local conservation area policies and principles, as do the Camden Site Allocation Plan and the recently adopted Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan. The CA Appraisal document of February 2011 specifically acknowledges the special qualities of the West End Green Conservation Area and clearly defines that character and the pressures that affect the area. Since the document was drafted in early 2011, those pressures have become all the more apparent and special care & attention are now required to maintain what is left of the character of the area.

The Management Strategy in the Appraisal document sets out actions for the preservation and enhancement of the area’s special character and to anticipate possible future changes. As such the Appraisal document forms an essential part of any material consideration of any planning applications in and around the area.

In February 2011 the Appraisal Document stated the following:

West End Green is a London village running along the spine of the West End Lane. The Lane rises and links Kilburn to Hampstead. The village character has been absorbed but not erased by the expansion of central London from the south, and by Hampstead from the north and east during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

The growth from tiny village to metropolitan suburb has resulted in a very homogeneous piece of Victorian and Edwardian domestic architecture and planning. The character of the area is still defined by the village with the busy commercial ‘spine’ street, the Green, the street trees and private gardens, the monumental mansion blocks, the variety of substantial houses for professional families and terraced housing. The public buildings support the community and provide landmarks.

In the space of almost five years much has obviously changed and unfortunately this no longer sounds like the same West Hampstead in which we now live. What is left of that

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

character - as defined in the Conservation Area Document - is now under severe threat. For a large part of the submissions made to the local community, the applicant has argued that Conservation Area principles were not relevant because the site was outside of the Conservation Area. The applicant has marginally modified their tone on this subject but largely seems to take the view that while Conservation Area principles are desirable in general terms, they can be circumvented through clever presentation and design.

I firmly believe, however, that they cannot be circumvented and must be considered. At the heart of this is Section 7.2 of the February 2011 CA Appraisal Plan (Control over New Development), which document notes that “Development proposals must preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West End Green Conservation Area. This requirement applies equally to developments which are outside the Conservation Area but would affect its setting or views into or out of the area.” This statement is precisely mirrored in the Camden Development Policy DP25(d), the Camden Site Allocation Plan and the Neighbourhood Development Plan. When one compares the applicant’s planning submission with the Appraisal Plan of February 2011 and other relevant planning guidelines, it is clear that the proposals fall well outside any attempt to work within the Conservation Area guidelines. If anything, they make a mockery of those guidelines.

The West Hampstead area has only one remaining long, open view in/out of the Conservation Area from West End Lane, this being from the bridge and junction with Iverson Road look northwards. We believe that the solution to a "lowgrade" "1970s office block" blighting "the view up from the station into the conservation area" is redevelopment of that office block into something more suitable. It certainly does not mean the obliteration of all views into the Conservation Area through the imposition of an impenetrable wall-of-blocks blight.

Furthermore, the Site Allocations Plan calls for the ensuring “of an acceptable relationship in the adjacent residential properties on Lymington Road” and for the protection and enhancement of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area with respect to any development such as the 156WEL site. The proposed plans clearly go far beyond what can be deemed as an acceptable relationship when the proposed 6/7 storey buildings sit within metres of the back gardens of the Lymington Road properties and would completely and perpetually overlook these properties and overshadow them for several months a year. Furthermore, the Neighbourhood Development Plan is explicit when it states that tall buildings “...will need to have regard to their impact on the setting of the ...conservation area in order to avoid any negative impact on it”. With regard to views, the Neighbourhood Development plan states at A11: “Also of importance to the character of the Area are the views across it, which give a widely appreciated sense of openness and space. ... Views of, from, and around the Area’s conservation areas are of great importance to their setting”. I would also like to draw the Committee’s attention to its own refusal of a 7-

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

storey block on Iverson Road in December 2014 (Application 2014/5341/P), on the following grounds:

“The proposed development, by virtue of its height, mass and scale would result in an over dominant form of development causing harm to the streetscene and negatively impacting on long views, contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.”The same policies should be applied here at 156 WEL. The fact is that 156WEL is an even greater example of over dominant mass and scale causing harm to the street scene and to the adjacent conservation, negatively impacting on views into and out of the Conservation Area.

It is obvious from the planning submissions that the proposed development will completely overshadow the private rear gardens on Lymington Road for many months of the year, destroy existing skyline views from both Lymington Road and Crediton Hill and massively disturb the “precious quality of the area” by the sheer bulk and mass of the buildings. A development of this nature was never foreseen nor intended for a site of this nature.

The whole of the Conservation Area is also a designated Heritage Asset and as such makes a positive contribution to its setting and to the Heritage of the area. The South Side properties of Lymington Road, forming part of Conservation area cannot be anything other than diminished by the proposed development.

There are further issues arising of significant importance about this application, including:

- Today, the roads within the Conservation Area which lead from West End Lane feature transitions from the "high street" norm of a maximum of five storeys, immediately transitioning down to "side street/residential street" levels of no more than three storeys. This is an essential part of the Conservation Area's character. This is not offered by uniform seven storey blocks along the proposed Potteries Path "side street". Critically, this transition is a requirement of Camden's Site Allocations Document (site 28, p124-127) and should reflect the existing Canterbury Mansions/Lymington Road transition which the site adjoins. The documents states that "If redeveloped the existing relationship of new development immediately adjoining Canterbury Mansions to the north should be considerably more sympathetic in terms of scale, height and design with an appropriate transition in massing towards the south and east of the site."

We would also draw specific 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”, and 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

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

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.”

One final point. West End Lane is a designated Archaeological Priority Area (APA) where there is significant known archaeological interest or potential for new discoveries. APAs as you know are used to help highlight where development might affect heritage assets. We must assume the applicant and Camden’s planners are well aware of this and are taking the appropriate steps to ascertain the special requirements associated with this APA status.

OUT OF CHARACTER

Indirectly, and with respect to the wider issues impacting West Hampstead,

- The plans are completely out of step with the existing character of the properties in the West End Green Conservation Area. The modern square blocks that are proposed at 6+ stories will overshadow and tower over our 3 story Victorian buildings 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 storey 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.

EROSION OF SECURITY AND INCREASED POLLUTION

- 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 main proposed access to the site by the bridge is one of the narrowest areas of West End Lane and at rush hour a major overspill from pavements is seen. Accordingly both the road and pavements will be seriously endangered by significant uplift in heavy vehicular access, for 2/3/4 years as will Lymington Road which despite speedbumps is already a road that sees continuous excessive vehicular speed throughout the average day, with the throughout

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>the day occasional parking on the single yellow side creating road blocks and inability for throughflow of traffic now (never mind with lorry access) and the inability of fire trucks from the local West End Lane fire station down Lymington Road and West End Lane now as it is, would be significantly increased to a patently dangerous and unacceptable level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 development proposes to house between 5/600+ 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, Ballymore West Hampstead Square – the impact from this development is yet to be seen alongside other developments in Blackburn Road, Iverson Road, and Liddell Road. 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>EROSION OF SAFETY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>IMPACT OF HEALTH AND EDUCATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. This, with West Hampstead Square, that was due to be finished and inhabited by September 2015 with an additional c400-500 people, but likely wont be until end 2016.. If West Hampstead Square was inhabited now it would be even worse at GP surgeries in West Hampstead. <p>Our Doctor at Chomley Gardens (the head of the Doctors Surgery) recentlytold me at an appointment that the Cholmley Gardens surgery is so stretched he was on tight schedule seeing patients in sequential 5 minute slots throughout the day.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

LOSS OF QUALITY SCARCE PUBLIC 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. The public space in the revised development proposal is so small as to be a joke and is in no way compensatory

CONTRAVENTION OF NDP

- The plans are also in direct contravention of the policies outlined in the Neighbourhood Development Plan for this area.

LOSS OF LONGSTANDING EMPLOYMENT

5,000 sq metres of space will be lost that has provided stable, long-term employment for almost forty years, being Travis Perkins/Wickes. These people will lose their jobs. Substitute employment no doubt will be minimum wage, and/or zero hours contracts.

POTENTIAL NEW SUPERMARKET ON GROUND FLOOR

We do not need a new supermarket with so many in the area, with the latest being Waitrose at the other end of WEL just a short walk from Waitrose on Finchley Road. Already in Lymington road we suffer the dangers of deliveries to Tesco that contravene the Road Traffic Act, a larger supermarket will just make matters worse and again be out of character with the local area.

CONCLUSION

I must reiterate again that the revised proposed project is located on the immediate border of the West End Green Conservation Area. It goes without saying that this proposed development would never be permitted within the Conservation Area, so we have to ask why it is being considered when it sits right on the edge of the Conservation Area. The damage this development would cause to the Conservation Area and to the lives of those residents living in the area is incalculable. If this development were to be permitted it would set a very dangerous precedent within the Borough generally regarding developments adjacent to Conservation Areas.

I would ask strongly that the Planners and the Committee should carefully consider all of the objections raised in this submission and also to respect the sanctity and authority of the Conservation Area policies and principles that apply in this case and refuse this application, together with the other sub heading which clearly

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>show this development is severely detrimental to this area of West Hampstead and also to the wider people in West Hampstead and that use West Hampstead transport. Planning permission should be refused, absolutely.</p> <p>Your website says "If you wish to be notified of the committee date, please clearly state in your comment."</p> <p>I WISH TO BE NOTIFIED OF THE COMMITTEE DATE</p> <p>Comment Type is Objection- Letter</p>

2015/6455/P	Wayne Stalley	18b Lymington Road London NW6 1HY	10/11/2016 21:29:16	COMNOT	
-------------	---------------	---	---------------------	--------	--
