

From: Ian Ferrie [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 November 2016 13:42
To: Planning; Glasgow, David
Subject: Fw: Objection to planning application 2015/6455/P

Dear sir/madam

Please find attached a copy of my comments on planning application 2015/6455/P made earlier this year.

It is very difficult for me to make further comments as significant information has yet to be provided by the developer.

As you will be aware, the applicant has consistently failed to provide technical information and 3D diagrams in regard to the way in which the surrounding areas would be significantly overshadowed. The Save West Hampstead "Stop The Blocks!" campaign group has also shown troubling discrepancies in the two daylight/sunlight reports provided the applicant, such that no faith can be placed in either sets of figures. There is also a pending review of technical information by Anstey Horne which has yet to be made available to the public as part of a "public consultation"

As such I reserve the right to submit further comments and objection to the applicant as and when the information becomes available

Yours sincerely

Ian Ferrie RTA. Resident since 1961

From: Ian Ferrie [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 January 2016 18:13
To: Ian Ferrie
Subject: FW: Objection to planning application 2015/6455/P

From: [REDACTED]
To: gavin.sexton@camden.gov.uk; josleen.chug@camden.gov.uk; planning@camden.gov.uk
Subject: FW: Objection to planning application 2015/6455/P
Date: Fri, 8 Jan 2016 10:20:05 +0000

Dear Ms Chug

I am contacting you as a ground floor resident of south side 14a Lymington Road having lived in this house since 1961, to make an objection to the proposed development of 156 West End Lane and call on the relevant Case Officer to recommend rejection to Camden Council of planning application 2015/6455/P.

I query the impartiality of Camden Council's ability to decide this matter on fair

grounds given that the land is owned by the Council, and the developer is the Council's chosen developer.

Due to the fact that there was no Master Plan or strategy for the West Hampstead area we now appear to be in a position whereby 156 West End Lane is being used as a possible solution to previous planning errors, thereby resulting in a totally inappropriate development for reasons listed below.

Having read the information made available by the preferred and only developer and having reviewed the design proposals and plans, the reasons for my opposition to the plans are as follows:

The proposed buildings are completely out of keeping with the character of the surrounding residential buildings. The houses in Lymington Road are three storeys high. The proposed plans are more than double that and absolutely incongruous with the existing architecture on Lymington Road and that of the West End Green Conservation Area. The applicant has ignored the requirements in Camden Council's Site allocations document for 156 West End Lane. The site allocation's document clearly states that any development should have transition in height and mass both to the South and East side of the site. The failure to incorporate such transitions will result in unacceptable changes to the amenity of residents and their children and irreversibly damaging effects on the one open space and the MUGA in the immediate vicinity of the site. Contrary to A2 developer's staff saying "lots of parents today do not like their children playing in the sun" children and adults need sun for vitamin D this is a medically recognised fact. On these grounds alone the Application must be rejected

The major concern for myself and the south side residents is the loss of light. We repeatedly requested from you to provide us with overshadowing diagrams that are normally readily supplied for developments of this enormity that are to my understanding of material consideration. Supplying us with a lot of figures is of no use to the older residents of Lymington Rd. I live here because of the light into my rooms that keep me sane, your proposal of a future that will take my light from me fills me with despair. It is my understanding that consultants producing the light loss document have been inconsistent in their description of the loss of light to some of the buildings. Also the loss is much greater if you take into account the number of windows which are affected close to the target of an 0.8 loss ratio [up to 0.83] This appears to be the case for my flat the overall light to some of the buildings will prove to be unacceptable as in the case of my flat, 12 windows which will lose between 6.4 and 9.9% of daylight [within 0.03 of the 0.8 target ratios] which results in 66% of the windows will be noticeably affected. I doubt the validity of your figures in view of the fact they appear to be massaged in the developer's favour and the refusal to provide a comprehensive sun path analysis. What methodology did you use to ascertain room usage and how were the houses and window heights modelled to obtain these results? Some I have checked are wrong. The majority of south side residents have their kitchens and living rooms at the back of the house to make the most of the light.

Camden's own policies on Amenity state that this amenity is protected for neighbouring properties and I would expect that Camden planners would apply these to this application:

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 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.

The proposed buildings will significantly impact our "Rights to Light". The overshadowing will block out maximum light along the majority of Lymington Road, our homes and gardens.

Due to the height of the proposed buildings and the proximity to the Lymington Road houses and back gardens our right of privacy will also be significantly compromised. On both sides we will be able to clearly view people in their private living areas and they will overlook our gardens and private living areas. This clearly contravenes yet another of Camden's Development Policy DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity NB. The factors we will consider include: Visual privacy and overlooking; Overshadowing and outlook ; sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels.

The proposed road that is planned to run immediately behind the garden walls will have a huge impact on dust, pollution, noise and also the conservation area. The present entrance to the builder's yard is wide and with clear visibility on to West End Lane for traffic and pedestrians. Offering very good visibility for pedestrians and road traffic. It should be noted that at peak times of the day both the pavement and the road are heavily congested. The applicant's idea of a new narrow road through a brick archway with limited visibility on a dangerous acute bend on a busy and congested thoroughfare is ridiculous and a series of accidents waiting to happen. The applicants own swept path analysis for the proposed new road clearly shows service vehicles emerging from the site needing to utilise both Northbound and Southbound lanes in order to emerge onto West End Lane at an already congested part of the road just a few metres away from the junctions of Sumatra Road and Lymington Road thereby adding to heavy traffic congestion. This will increase the risk of accidents for all users of West End Lane, pedestrians, cyclist and motorists to an unacceptable level. NB It should be noted that West End Lane is as it says in the name a lane not a dual lane carriageway nor a motorway.

The dust and pollution from this road will impact both adults and children but impact even more those with allergies and asthma impacting negatively the health and well-being of those in near and surrounding areas.

The current locked and secured yard with motion-sensitive CCTV and alerting system minimises any access to our back gardens via the wall. There are significant

security threats to the security of our homes and gardens attached to the notion of a road that is accessible from West End Lane. The proposed installation of metre-wide and high planters to prevent vehicles manoeuvring to exit the road from hitting our back walls will add to these security problems.

The proposed buildings themselves will have a considerably negative impact on the conservation area which it adjoins. Camden's Council own policies state:

"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 of conservation areas, but visible from within them. THIS INCLUDES HIGH OR BULKY BUILDINGS, WHICH CAN HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON AREAS SOME DISTANCE AWAY, AS WELL AS ADJACENT PREMISES. The council will therefore not permit in locations outside conservation areas that it consider would cause harm to the character, appearance or setting of such an area."

Yet another reason to refuse this application based on Camden's own policies.

There is simply not sufficient infrastructure to support this uplift of 600-800 residents in West Hampstead, in addition to West Hampstead Square – the impact from this huge development is yet to be determined – alongside other developments in Blackburn Road, Iverson Road, Maygrove Road and Liddell Road. Why has there been no impact assessment when anyone who lives in the area can tell you we are already at breaking point without the impact of the other MAJOR developments being populated.

There is already insufficient parking capacity in the local area. Evenings and weekends, when there are no parking restrictions, will see visitors to these developments using the already overcrowded surrounding roads. This is already an issue long before residents are installed in West Hampstead Square which is an even larger development.

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.

The narrow pavements over the bridge between this proposed development and two stations is already heaving with pedestrians in the mornings and evenings.

Travis Perkins is a long-standing business and significant local employer on the existing site and welcomes any opportunity to negotiate a redevelopment of the adjacent former council offices for housing. This would be in line with Camden's own planning policies CS8 and DP13.

The current lack of primary and secondary school places, along with the impact on GP services, of which there are fewer in the area, has not been properly examined or considered by this plan.

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.

The proposed plans will ruin the conservation area as the site is immediately adjacent to it.

West Hampstead is already being overdeveloped and the infrastructure cannot take this proposed increase in residents.

The plans are opposed in their entirety by the combined forces of Save West Hampstead, Lymington Road Residents' Association, Crediton Hill Residents' Association, West Hampstead Gardens' & Residents' Association, and the West End Green Conservation Area Advisory Committee; the plans are also in direct contravention of the policies outlined in the Neighbourhood Development Plan for this area.

I would like to reiterate my absolute opposition to the proposal and expect all of my above points to be considered, addressed and responded to appropriately by the application being rejected.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Ferrie, resident for over 50 years