

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	Adam Bruzon	52 Gondar Gardens	13/12/2017 22:49:16	OBJ	<p>I would like to formally object to these plans. The reservoir should be protected from development as the last piece of green space in the local area.</p> <p>I believe that a better use of the space would be to open it up to the public to enjoy instead of being locked up and inaccessible.</p> <p>This is not to mention the disruption of building works and the increase in traffic and parking congestion in an already 'at capacity' area.</p> <p>I implore you to make the right decision to reject this proposal and not allow the area to suffer with an out of place 4-6 storey building, where current residents of Gondar Gardens and surrounding roads will suffer the loss of privacy from overlooking windows, an expectation we held when choosing to move to the area.</p> <p>I also wanted to highlight the absurdity that is placing a nursing home at the top of a steep hill where residents of limited mobility will struggle to get home by themselves, and a bus transport bringing said people home will also struggle with the incline.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	Mr Fortune Green and West Hampstead NDF	c/o N Jackson 42 Sarre Road NW2 3SL NW2 3SL NW2 3SL	13/12/2017 22:16:03	OBJ	<p>Planning Application 2017/6045/P Gondar Gardens Reservoir</p> <p>Objection from Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Forum. The Neighbourhood Plan has specific reference to this site as it was recognised that it might be developed and there was already a permission for development at the time of examination of the plan. This latter application has since expired, although another one for the frontage only has since been approved on appeal. The reference to the site in the plan is as below.</p> <p>Pages 35/36 of Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan C2. Gondar Gardens Reservoir: in recent years, three developments have been proposed for this site. All three have been rejected by Camden Council, although one has been granted on appeal. At the time of writing, an appeal on the third scheme is pending. In light of its designation as a Site of Importance to Nature Conservation in existing planning documents, any development should retain as much open space as possible and offer limited, managed public access consistent with maintaining suitable conditions for bio-diversity and wildlife. Due to the significant amount of open space the site provides, views across the site should be protected from significant damage or loss; of particular significance is the view to the east to Hampstead. Any development of the frontage on Gondar Gardens shall match the character of existing development and shall be no higher or deeper than adjacent buildings (see Policy 2).</p> <p>We also make reference to Policy 2 and Policy 16 of the NDP. These are shown at the bottom of this document.</p> <p>The NDF is objecting to the application citing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no precedent</li> <li>• its height, size and bulk;</li> <li>• building design and inconsistency with neighbouring buildings and the local area;</li> <li>• overdevelopment in a congested area;</li> <li>• no affordable housing;</li> <li>• loss of views and green space;</li> <li>• the impact on traffic and parking</li> <li>• location</li> </ul> <p>No Precedent.</p> <p>The applicant claims (Planning Statement 6.1.3) that the previous approvals do not rule out a more comprehensive development, subject to the collective impact being fully assessed. This is either disingenuous or not true as it is clear from the Inspectors' Reports that both schemes were only approved because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the first scheme was ingeniously designed to not obscure the effect of open space and retained the views across the site, and</li> <li>b. the second scheme retained, in perpetuity, over 90% of the site as green open space.</li> </ol> <p>Both these approvals were therefore based on the premise that a double sized scheme would not be approved, and, from that, they are mutually exclusive.</p> <p>Height, size and bulk.</p> <p>The scheme is constructed as single building giving it an overwhelming impact due to mass, bulk and density, out of context with the surrounding buildings. The height of the buildings is above that of neighbouring buildings on the frontage in</p>

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

contradiction to Policy 2 (as above) of the Neighbourhood Plan. The extra height is well above anything that could be considered due to the topography of the site. We are strongly opposed to any development in the reservoir pit that rises significantly above the rim of the reservoir.

The depth of the frontage also greatly exceeds the depth of neighbouring buildings contrary to the site specific reference in the plan (as above)

Building design and inconsistency with neighbouring buildings and the local area; We believe that the design for the frontage does not adequately match the adjacent buildings, particularly due to the large glazing panels. The rear parts of the development have a very modern and irregular design, which does not reflect the consistency of the adjacent mansion blocks with their careful detailing. The bulk, mass and height of the rear part are very much out of context when compared to the mansion blocks. (Policy 2. i,ii,iii,iv,vi,vii,viii)

Overdevelopment in a congested area;

Local facilities such as doctors, and water are already overstretched. The population of the area is growing very rapidly due to other development, and there are several hundred new dwellings already with planning permission in the area. Housing Development is running ahead of the Local Plan.

The site is located on a narrow road which already gives problems to commercial vehicles. The steepness of the southern access to the site makes the junction difficult to negotiate and dangerous, particularly for heavy vehicles.

No affordable housing;

The scheme makes a case for avoiding a contribution for affordable housing. We believe that all large schemes in the Forum's area should have an affordable component as there is already a shortage, and demand is high.

(NDP policy1.i Residential development shall provide a range of housing types, to meet a range of needs, as appropriate, related to the scale of the development. This shall be achieved by:

i. The provision of affordable, social, intermediate, and shared-ownership housing - in line with the 50% target as set out in the development plan. .... )

Loss of views and green space;

The development would cause the permanent loss of open space with high environmental value and significant biodiversity (including a SINC designation). Protection of green space is one of the main thrusts of the Neighbourhood plan. (NDP Policy 16. i,ii,iii,iv,vi,vii,viii)

The scheme also destroys views across the area, north/south and east/west (NDP Policy 2.x)

The impact on traffic and parking

This is an excessively large scheme in a congested residential area. Two visits to the similar Battersea site, suggest that vehicle movements will be much higher than those suggested by the applicant. We have grave concerns about the impact of traffic generated by staff, deliveries, services and visitors and the lack of space on site to accommodate vehicles, resulting in the blockage of Gondar Gardens. The visits to the Battersea site confirmed that staff do use cars to arrive on that site and we can assume that will occur on this site. The impact of Blue Badge holders is not clear in the context of a car-free development - they would add very significantly to parking pressure in the area.

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

Location

The site, at the top of a steep hill, does not seem ideal for a large retirement home, given the elderly pedestrians, wheel chairs and mobility scooters.

Every (geographical) aspect of this scheme overlooks local residents' gardens. The high buildings will substantially reduce the privacy that rear gardens normally provide.

The NDF supports the objections and comments being made by the local residents and resident associations.

POLICIES

Page 16 Policy 2

All development shall be of a high quality of design, which complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead. This shall be achieved by:

- i. Development which positively interfaces with the street and streetscape in which it is located.
- ii. Development which maintains the positive contributions to character of existing buildings and structures.
- iii. Development which is human in scale, in order to maintain and create a positive relationship between buildings and street level activity.
- iv. Development which has regard to the form, function, structure and heritage of its context - including the scale, mass, orientation, pattern and grain of surrounding buildings, streets and spaces.
- v. A presumption in favour of a colour palate which reflects, or is in harmony with, the materials of its context.
- vi. New buildings and extensions that respect and are sensitive to the height of existing buildings in their vicinity and setting. Tall buildings in the Growth Area will need to have regard to their impact on the setting of the two immediately adjacent conservation areas, in order to avoid any negative impact on them.
- vii. Extensions - and infill development - being in character and proportion with its context and setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties.
- viii. The provision of associated high quality public realm.
- ix. Having regard to the impact on local views across the Area and the streetscapes within the Area (as identified in A11 and Map 2).
- x. Development which aims to fulfil the criteria set out in Building for Life 12 (as detailed in A18).

Policy 16 page 60

Development shall protect and improve, where appropriate, existing green/open space.

Development that increases the demand for recreation or amenity shall provide for new green/open space. This shall be achieved by, where appropriate:

- i. The protection of existing green/open space - from significant damage, or loss, through development.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. The appropriate provision (relative to the size of the development) of new green/open space, or contributing towards addressing the open space deficiencies in the Area as identified in the development plan.</li> <li>iii. Appropriate contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of existing and new green/open space, where applicable.</li> <li>iv. The offsetting of any loss of green/open space, ideally within the Area.</li> <li>v. The protection and appropriate provision of green corridors through existing and new streetscapes.</li> <li>vi. The appropriate provision of new small green/open space - such as pocket parks and active green spaces (eg green walls and green roofs) - and their maintenance.</li> <li>vii. The use of Sustainable Drainage Systems in all development, unless there are practical or viability reasons for not doing so.</li> <li>viii. The appropriate provision of outdoor leisure facilities - such as playgrounds, gyms and recreational spaces - and their maintenance, where applicable.</li> <li>viii. Development that has a positive impact on the relationship between urban and natural features.</li> </ul>

2017/6045/P	Pedro Tavares	26 Sarre Road	13/12/2017 22:10:23	OBJ	<p>I hereby object to the present application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of precious Open Space in an increasingly built-up area of London</li> <li>2. It constitutes over-development and is of excessive height and bulk – 82 luxury flats and 15 nursing beds in six-storey blocks, a private swimming pool and catering and nursing facilities amount to a large commercial complex that is entirely foreign and out of place in an otherwise residential and quiet area of London, and which will generate unacceptable levels of noise, traffic and pollution.</li> <li>3. Impact of the development on the houses along Sarre Road, which back onto the reservoir, has been ignored by the developer, even though these properties are some of the closest to the proposed development site. Once built, the proposed development will dominate over these small scale traditional family homes. During construction those same homes will be subject to levels of pollution, noise and vibration due to construction work and diesel traffic, that has been entirely ignore in the present application</li> <li>4. Destruction of urban wildlife habitat of protected and endangered species</li> <li>5. Destruction of views from the street and adjoining houses along the Western side of the reservoir. The street sights are currently and intentionally blocked by the unsightly hoardings erected by the owner in an apparent attempt to reduce the enjoyment that visitors and passers-by can have of the of the site</li> <li>6. Socially, the development constitutes a segregated, exclusive, self-contained and luxury development that is set apart from our community</li> </ol>
-------------	---------------	---------------	---------------------	-----	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	Mr N Jackson	42 Sarre Road nw2 3sl	13/12/2017 22:37:26	COMMNT	<p>I object to this application as a resident of Gondar Gardens who will be overlooked by this proposed building.</p> <p>My prime objections are:</p> <p>Loss of privacy in the rear rooms of my house and garden, due to the proximity and height of this development.</p> <p>the impact the development will have on traffic parking and congestion.</p> <p>The loss of local green space</p> <p>The loss of light especially on winter mornings</p> <p>the design particularly the windows is unattractive.</p> <p>I also endorse the comments made by the Fortune Green and West Hampstead NDF and GARA</p>
2017/6045/P	Heather Downham	Flat 2,66 Hillfield Road N.W.6 1QA	13/12/2017 21:15:08	COMMEM AIL	<p>I live in Hillfield Road.Wedo not need this luxury development with no social housing,adding greatly to the parking problems in the road,and the effect on our eco system is a disaster,we need our green spaces for wildlife,and for our health and wellbeing.This development is totally wrong for our area,we have very little open space in West Hampstead,let us keep this one.</p>
2017/6045/P	Michelle haig	45 Gondar gardens London Nw6 1ep	13/12/2017 09:08:11	COMMNT	<p>I have lived in the area for ten years. It is already congested with not enough parking. The top of Gondar is very narrow not allowing big vehicles through or heavy traffic. Gondar is a quiet road proud of its natural wildlife open space building a huge development will completely ruin the area. The chaos for the residents in the area would be awful, not just the noise, inconvenience of being blocked in by building traffic, the pollution, the loss of wild life so important in today's world. A huge development like this will ruin our community. We are already over populated imagine what a development like this will do to our local devices, police and fire which already struggle with the huge increase in population. In my mind this development is vast it is not what the area is about or what it needs. A huge luxury development is not in keeping of the area or residents. It is too big too high ruining not only the beauty and quietness of the area but ruining all wildlife and producing so much pollution in an already over crowded area. Causing mayhem to all while being built and once built. Imagine all the visitors coming and going all the staff and residents in an area where we already have trouble parking. Please please do not allow this through this will be the complete ruin of our homes and area.</p>
2017/6045/P	Sam Vaile	41 sarre Road London NW2 3SN	13/12/2017 23:26:57	COMMEM PER	<p>Please see email submitted today</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/6045/P	Lisa Zaidell	33 Newton Road	13/12/2017 17:40:41	OBJ	West Hampstead is undergoing continuous urbanisation (eg: West Hampstead Station redevelopment on west end lane, and construction of high rise flats), Mill Lane and surrounding roads have a very limited capacity for increased traffic. The proposed area for development currently provides much needed space to urban ecology and should be protected. This development will have a great impact on traffic and urban ecology. A development of this type (luxury retirement) is not actually needed over a proposal that would provide some sort of affordable housing for households in the area.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	clare durward	46 gondar gardens fortune green west hampstead london nw6 1hg	13/12/2017 17:09:38	OBJLETT ER	<p>I am writing this in order to appeal to whoever reads this to use their sound judgement and instinct to see this horrific application for just what it is - naked profiteering with no benefit to the area, the environment, the community or the wider stakeholders that love and nurture our local Fortune Green area. This scheme would have been very difficult to support even if there had been a proper, fair and acceptable element of social housing at play. But the notable and glaring absence of any such commitment, at a time when the Mayor of our city has set a target of developments delivering 50% social housing - and 35% if they don't take a public subsidy - as part of the London Plan, is absolutely risible. And let's not forget, as this planning application is lodged, that even the Tory Mayor Boris Johnson achieved an average of 13% social housing per development when he was in charge. For the Labour Camden Council to sell out to the sharp practices of the vastly profitable LifeCare Residences would be unthinkable. Following the horrific fire and outcome at Grenfell Tower, we need our London councils to have far more of an eye for the many and not the few. We have our own high rise building issues in Camden and to allow developers to build a vast empire of 82 luxury flats for high net worth elderly people at a time when the majority of Camden Borough's elderly cannot access the care and services they need would be insensitive in the extreme.</p> <p>Turning now to the development itself. Well first of all, I am puzzled as to how the council's own inspector could have designated the area of the old reservoir site an area of nature conservation importance when another developer was trying to build a similar number of units under a previous planning application but now a different planning inspector may feel that any of those dynamics that were at play then have changed. They haven't. And this is despite the way the site has been "maintained" under a series of different developers, where there appears to have been a tacit attempt to discourage, not encourage the wildlife. Next, the Neighbourhood Plan assured us residents that there was a requirement to retain open space and protect bio-diversity and wildlife. I can think of no justifiable reason why the council would now choose to not respect that assurance - not least because it will be the thin edge of the wedge with other, excessive developments having the right to claim that a precedence has been set. Moving now to the absolutely disingenuous nature of the LifeCare Residences comments on traffic, parking, disruption etc. As we have so many flats on Gondar Gardens, we already have a situation where there is massive overselling of resident permits versus spaces available. So how will this already severe problem be exacerbated and made untenable by an 82 luxury flat development, that suggests that as they're not applying for parking spaces, they will cause no impact to us residents? How many visitors will 82 flats - hundreds of residents - generate, alongside a raft of out sourced suppliers that wealthy elderly residents are likely to want to bring into their homes. Where will all the visitors to 82 flats park with their visitor permits? And it seems fair to assume that many of both the residents and their visitors may be blue badge holders, thereby adding to the parking armageddon that would ensue. Oh and that's before we even talk about the staff parking, as this development will be awash with staff tending to the every need of residents. I then read that although Camden Council only provides its residents with a weekly refuse collection, the wealthy residents of LifeCare Residences would make three times a week collections. Apart from the ghastly elitism of this, imagine the traffic implications of these collections. It's bad enough that health and education have a two tier system but what message does the permission for two tier rubbish collection send out to</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>ordinary people?One of the most shocking elements of the design is the way that it rides rough shod across the views and light of the houses and flats along Gondar Gardens. The development has not attempted to be sensitive to this issue and although "right to light and right to a view" are not a given, the very fact that the developers are making no attempt to address these real concerns of families and people who have lived in their flats and houses for decades, is a strong indication of what we have already seen from LifeCare Residences - an absolute disinterest in integrating or embedding into the community. They are making it clear that they will be their own luxury, gated, isolated luxury development and all that has gone before and been enjoyed by residents can and would be ridden rough shod over. But more importantly than any of these matters already raised, is the devastating impact that the loss of already rare and precious openness would have on us residents and our cherished environment? We love and value our green lung and it is a really key and special part of providing a sense of wellbeing. The views give the chance for so many of us to metaphorically breathe in this crazy city of ours. It seems perverse in the extreme that wealthy elderly, who are not vested in our community, who don't support neighbourhood watch, run the Jester Festival, look after the non-wealthy elderly in our community etc etc - can just sweep in and because of their money, enjoy the views that they will have stolen from us. Is this what social mobility really means to our local council? Please not.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	John Saynor	27 Kylemore Road London NW6 2PS	13/12/2017 23:31:31	OBJ	<p>I write on behalf of West Hampstead Amenity &amp; Transport (WHAT). WHAT is West Hampstead's oldest amenity group, having been established over 40 years.</p> <p>We have carefully considered this application and we strongly object to it, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposals contain no social or affordable housing, and the developer has opted to use a loophole in the law to avoid an obligation to provide affordable housing and thus maintain the exclusivity of this gated development.</li> </ol> <p>The developer proposes to charge purchasers for 2 hours of "nursing care" per week (whether or not it is used) to escape this obligation. 2 hours of nursing care equates to 17 minutes per day, and we would suggest that this negligible amount would be of minimal value to a person needing regular nursing care, and would not be taken up by most residents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The application claims that the local has easy access on foot to local transport and shopping facilities, and hence that car use will be reduced. However, the site is reached via a steep hill, and it is likely that many elderly occupants of the flats would be unable to leave the property except by car. Therefore, the applicant's claim that 40% residents will not travel by car lacks credibility.</li> </ol> <p>A considerable increase in vehicular traffic is likely. Also, as a result, the occupiers of the flats would be cut off from the local community.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The application fails to protect the open space and biodiversity of the reservoir site, without offering any corresponding benefits to local residents. This is a rare prime piece of open space with commanding views of London, and it should be respected as such.</li> <li>4. Visitors and residents would park in residents' bays (which only ban parking for a couple of hours per day at present) and generate additional traffic.</li> <li>5. The proposal does not offer local residents access to the facilities or green space developed - even though the applicant's documents wax lyrical amount the small amount of private green space that would remain. At night, it is a rare "dark site" and is frequented by bats.</li> <li>6. The density and height of the development is excessive.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	Ashley Vesty	Top Floor Flat 12 Agamemnon Road London NW6 1DY	13/12/2017 00:18:43	OBJNOT	<p>I object to the proposed works at Gondar Gardens Reservoir for several reasons;</p> <p>A luxury care home community is isolationist and will not add value or care facilities that are accessible to the vast majority of the residents.</p> <p>The chauffeured cars will add traffic and pollution into small streets which are not designed for such traffic. The staff, visitors and residents will add both noise and traffic.</p> <p>Most importantly, I am against the proposals due to the destruction of a site of significant natural value for London which offers habitats for several species of significant importance.</p> <p>Finally, I am highly concerned about the extent and height of the development. Light pollution, noise, loss of privacy and for no material benefit to the community.</p>
2017/6045/P	Miriam Jill Potter	27 Hillfield Road,  West Hampstead LONDON NW6 1QD.	12/12/2017 22:32:09	COMMNT	<p>I OBJECT completely to any development of this sight. It must stay as a sanctuary for wild life and FRESH AIR for this whole area of London. PLEASE PLEASE do not allow any building to take place. Thank you.</p>
2017/6045/P	Miriam Jill Potter	27 Hillfield Road,  West Hampstead LONDON NW6 1QD.	12/12/2017 22:32:26	COMMNT	<p>I OBJECT completely to any development of this sight. It must stay as a sanctuary for wild life and FRESH AIR for this whole area of London. PLEASE PLEASE do not allow any building to take place. Thank you.</p>
2017/6045/P	Vesta Curtis	4 Hillfield Road London NW 6 1QE	12/12/2017 22:31:27	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the building of an elitist scheme which will create a over crowding, congestion and will add to the already high level of pollution in West Hampstead. It will also kill the community spirit of the area. This is creating money for developers.</p>
2017/6045/P	Vesta Curtis	4 Hillfield Road London NW 6 1QE	12/12/2017 22:31:25	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the building of an elitist scheme which will create a over crowding, congestion and will add to the already high level of pollution in West Hampstead. It will also kill the community spirit of the area. This is creating money for developers.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	Michael Howe	1B Gondar Gardens West Hampstead London NW6 1EW	13/12/2017 22:32:47	COMMNT	<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>I would like to register my strong objection to the proposed development of the Reservoir at Gondar Gardens (Planning Application 2017/6045/P).</p> <p>First, the location is manifestly not suitable for a development of this size. Gondar Gardens is a narrow and very steep street, with a very tight junction at the bottom of the hill. It is therefore completely unsuitable for the kind of heavy construction traffic that a development of this size would necessitate. The construction of this development is therefore likely to cause very substantial disruption for local residents.</p> <p>Furthermore, these problems would not cease once construction was complete. Building a development of 80+ flats and associated social space in area that can only be accessed by what is - to all intents and purposes - a single track road is likely to cause a very substantial increase in traffic, as staff, residents and visitors come and go. It bears emphasis that many of the proposed (elderly) residents are unlikely to be particularly mobile, and will therefore be reliant on vehicular transportation to go out and return home. It is hard to imagine many elderly people climbing up the hill from Mill Lane. Current residents are therefore likely to be subjected to a constant stream of taxis and assisted-transportation vehicles coming and going from the site.</p> <p>Second, citing the development here would eliminate a valuable green lung from the area. It is important that our cities should not become concrete jungles. Living in a city should not require you to be deprived of green space, fresh air or access to wildlife. I understand that the reservoir currently provides a habitat for a number of rare birds and other wildlife. These green spaces and the habitats that they create need to be preserved for the benefit of current residents and for future generations.</p> <p>Third, the development does not serve a pressing social need. It is well known that those who really suffer from the current lack of housing in London are younger people and poorer families. Approving the construction of a large development aimed at wealthy pensioners while young people struggle to get a foot on the housing ladder is not an appropriate use of the available land.</p> <p>Fourth, approving this development would be contrary to the Neighbourhood Development Plan for West Hampstead, which envisages that all large-scale development in the area should take place in the corridor of land around the Jubilee Line, Overground and Thameslink stations.</p> <p>For all of these reasons, therefore, I respectfully suggest that the proposed development to be manifestly unsuitable for the proposed location. I urge you to reject it.</p> <p>I would like to add that I am not implacably opposed to all development of the reservoir. However, that development has to be sympathetic with its surroundings and take into account the concerns of local residents. Developing along the edge of the road (where</p>

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

currently there is nothing more than a metal fence), while allowing the remainder of the reservoir to remain undeveloped, would be in keeping with the rest of the area, would allow a densely-populated area to retain a valuable green lung, while at the same time increasing the housing stock.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Howe  
1B Gondar Gardens  
NW6 1EW

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	CJD Roberts	5 Snowdon Mansions Gondar Gardens London NW6 1ES	13/12/2017 09:42:57	OBJ	<p>I think that the worst aspect of this new development will be the huge amount of builder"s/constructor"s rubble [ thousands of metric tonnes] which will have to be taken away from this site and the amount of construction material needed to be brought to the site, . thousands of truckloads. No matter how "considerate" a construction company might intend to be it cannot avoid this. This site is on a hillside, these trucks will groan as they climb the steep hill; all the other streets are far too narrow for the volume of traffic . Think of all the disruption these trucks will cause: noise, dust, traffic jams, possible damage to personal cars parked in the street, danger to young children and elderly residents. It"s all quite unthinkable really.</p> <p>The next issue is that West Hampstead and Fortune Green are already very much over-developed, and lack the infrastructure needed to support an ever increasing population and the many people needed to service them. This proposed project adds no public amenity value to the area; it will serve no purpose for the existing residential population of Fortune Green. As a reservoir it supplied our water, now closed it supplies open space, a lung in our over-crowded, over-populated, highly polluted city: this is not a "Brown-Field" site, but a kind of "Green Belt" for West Hampstead. The proposed development gives nothing back to the people of Camden. West Hampstead and Fortune Green. We need other services, not this. The proposed development will completely take away the last remaining facility that this site offers local residents.</p> <p>An increased population will require an enlarged sewerage system and water supply. The existing sewers are already completely under strain. The roads all around this area will have to be dug up for years to come to provide these: yet more dust, more disruption.</p> <p>The proposal is essentially no different to any that which have previously been put forward by the owners of this site. None have been of any worth to existing residents. Far from bringing "added value" to the area. it takes it away. All they and their architects have done is re-arrange the deck-chairs on the Titanic.</p> <p>When judging the true value of this proposal I feel that the committee should be making this judgement on the basis of whether it meets the Good Neighbour criterion. A new Good Neighbour is always welcome if they bring and add real community value to the area into which they wish to come. This proposed development adds no such value for existing residents as far I can see, but only seeks to add further problems to our neighbourhood.</p> <p>I urge the committee to reject it.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	Barbara Lipietz	17 Sarre Road London NW2 3SN	13/12/2017 21:47:58	OBJ	<p>Dear Madam/Dear Sir,</p> <p>I object to the scheme as set out in the planning application because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed densification of the area is not in line with the known housing needs in London - that is the need for genuinely affordable housing. New developments and housing provision in the area are all of a 'luxury' standard and, combined, threaten the social mix of the neighbourhood. I object to this proposed development which would contribute to the creeping gentrification of the area. Such a development is further at loggerheads with the stated ambitions of the new housing Strategy and draft London Plan.</li> <li>2. The proposed development will put inordinate strain on the transport infrastructure in the area. This is especially the case given the mobility requirements of the proposed target population group on the site (i.e. unlikely to walk up and down what is a pretty steep hill).</li> <li>3. The reservoir is a valued green infrastructure in the neighbourhood. There have been numerous surveys that have identified its positive impact on the local biodiversity. In a context of catastrophic attack on our global biodiversity, surely local councils cannot be seen to be acting against this key dimension of sustainable development!</li> </ol> <p>I trust that you will take into consideration this objection to a mislead densification project.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Barbara Lipietz</p>
2017/6045/P	Catherine Allison	45 Achilles Road West Hampstead London NW6 1DZ	13/12/2017 09:42:50	OBJ	<p>I am concerned that the planned development will take away much-needed green lung which is beneficial for residents and wildlife. The road network was built for much less traffic than it currently has, and a new development of properties will overwhelm it. I am also disgusted that any development should be approved that includes no affordable housing.</p>
2017/6045/P	Catherine Allison	45 Achilles Road West Hampstead London NW6 1DZ	13/12/2017 09:42:39	OBJ	<p>I am concerned that the planned development will take away much-needed green lung which is beneficial for residents and wildlife. The road network was built for much less traffic than it currently has, and a new development of properties will overwhelm it. I am also disgusted that any development should be approved that includes no affordable housing.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	Josh Lawrence	59 Agamemnon Road 59 Agamemnon Road	13/12/2017 14:21:29	COMMNT	<p>I am writing to support the planning application.</p> <p>I like the idea of a retirement community in my neighborhood for several reasons.</p> <p>Our street has many older residents living alone at home; a scheme like this may make it possible for them to live locally even after they have additional care needs.</p> <p>Older residents also add a lot to a local community. I am a committee member for the group that supports the local park (Fortune Green) and can imagine that the new residents will bring a wealth of experience and time to help improve our park.</p> <p>The objections I have heard largely stem from local residents who do not want ANYTHING built on the site rather than a principled objection to this development. I understand why they would be personally upset about any development, but feel that the complaints about unique worms are really a cover for the fact that they don't want anything developed, not a newfound love of worms.</p> <p>I take a more pragmatic approach: this site will be developed, and a care facility in our neighborhood is a good use of the land.</p> <p>I also note much of the public comment seems focused on the fact that this is a "luxury" care home because it has a pool and people who can drive residents places.</p> <p>I find this upsetting, as my grandfather, who recently passed away at age 95, lived in a similar care home. He was unable to drive after about age 85, so having someone take him to a doctors appointment, for example, was hardly a luxury. Similarly he had exercise classes a few times a week, some of which took place in a pool because he was old and had achy bones and joints. Again, it seems very unfair to categorise these as luxuries when they really improved his quality of life. And what is the alternative: make old people live in lousy care homes?</p> <p>For the above reasons I support the planning application, and trust that you will see through the noise from local residents (and political organisations trying to assuage them) and follow Camden policy.</p>
2017/6045/P	Casey Martin	16 Kingsgate House Kingsgate Place London NW6 4TA	13/12/2017 21:09:07	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the new proposals. The new development is far too large, 0% affordable housing and destruction of the wildlife.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	Michelle haig	45 Gondar gardens London Nw6 1ep	13/12/2017 09:08:14	COMMNT	I have lived in the area for ten years. It is already congested with not enough parking. The top of Gondar is very narrow not allowing big vehicles through or heavy traffic. Gondar is a quiet road proud of its natural wildlife open space building a huge development will completely ruin the area. The chaos for the residents in the area would be awful, not just the noise, inconvenience of being blocked in by building traffic, the pollution, the loss of wild life so important in today's world. A huge development like this will ruin our community. We are already over populated imagine what a development like this will do to our local devices, police and fire which already struggle with the huge increase in population. In my mind this development is vast it is not what the area is about or what it needs. A huge luxury development is not in keeping of the area or residents. It is too big too high ruining not only the beauty and quietness of the area but ruining all wildlife and producing so much pollution in an already over crowded area. Causing mayhem to all while being built and once built. Imagine all the visitors coming and going all the staff and residents in an area where we already have trouble parking. Please please do not allow this through this will be the complete ruin of our homes and area.
2017/6045/P	Nicolas Cote	4 Sarre Road 1st & 2nd Floors London NW2 3SL	13/12/2017 01:36:27	COMMNT	I object to this planning application for a number of reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of green space</li> <li>2. Should the plans go ahead, the area will be more congested and cluttered</li> <li>3. Pollution levels (particle, exhaust and noise) as traffic will grow</li> <li>4. Parking is becoming a problem in the area. More traffic on neighbouring roads and need for coveted spaces is likely to overflow and affect my own road.</li> <li>5. Natural habitat loss</li> <li>6. Significant disruption during demolition and building, causing significant disturbance, noise and debris.</li> </ol>
2017/6045/P	Kuda Robinson	28 Sarre Road Flat B London	13/12/2017 22:33:40	COMMNT	I object to this proposal. The frontage design is too high, is unsightly, and will completely block the view both from our bedroom windows and for pedestrians from the street of the green space (which was visible from the street before the previous developers put up hoardings). The impact this development will have on parking will be frustrating to the local community. I can't see anything of value being added to our community by this development which is aimed towards wealthy retired and elderly couples.
2017/6045/P	Mark Stonebanks	45 Hillfield Road London NW6 1QD	13/12/2017 15:39:32	OBJLETT ER	Dear Camden planning I am sending in comments on behalf of the Hillfield and Aldred Road residents association by email.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	Shorai Robinson	28 Sarre Road Flat B London NW2 3SL	13/12/2017 22:47:08	COMMNT	I object to this application which will block the view from our bedrooms over the green open space - space which is protected and which is full of wildlife. There is no provision for social housing, the design of the development is ugly and out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood.
2017/6045/P	Dan Brod	33 Sarre rd	13/12/2017 14:46:54	OBJ	I object to this proposal as it does not meet Camden planning policy and because it appears to be badly designed, with inadequate parking solutions.
2017/6045/P	Dan Brod	33 Sarre rd	13/12/2017 14:47:08	OBJ	I object to this proposal as it does not meet Camden planning policy and because it appears to be badly designed, with inadequate parking solutions.
2017/6045/P	Celine Castelino	6 Fawley Road West Hampstead London NW6 1SH	13/12/2017 18:26:51	COMMNT	<p>Proper application of Camden's policies should mean the site remain undisturbed, with open views into and across the site from the street and from neighbouring properties. The loss of open space, disruption to the site, and the height and bulk of the frontage scheme will be detrimental to the local environment and residents. A more serious issue is the loss of the habitat and the impact that will have on endangered species</p> <p>The proposed conditions of the plan are not yet sufficient to protect and enhance our environment in the event of the planning application being accepted. Changes that must be made to minimise construction impact, and ensure the remaining land is properly protected with residents involved in its management.</p> <p>This development offers no benefit to the community but is yet another irresponsible get rich quick scheme for profiteering overseas companies. It will not alleviate the lack of affordable housing in an increasingly overcrowded area but will increase traffic and demands on local services. It is unlikely that wider society will benefit as profits will inevitably be expatriated to tax havens as appears to be common practice among similar companies.</p> <p>I protest most strongly to this development. Please stop it.</p>
2017/6045/P	Joanna Yass	28 Gondar Gardens London NW61HG	13/12/2017 10:16:57	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Growing up locally, the feeling of openness given by the views to central London over the green space of the reservoir was really important. These views and feeling of openness would be destroyed for future generations by the proposals.</li> <li>2. Ecological importance of the site: the green space is a habitat for slow worms and other protected species, and is a green lung in a built up area – the development would significantly reduce the size of the green space, and therefore destroy this habitat.</li> <li>3. Lack of affordable housing: particularly concerning as young Londoner</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	Ella Naef	33 Newton Rd	13/12/2017 17:32:31	OBJ	<p>I object to planning application number 2017/6045/P. The 82 apartments proposed are far too many for the area which will suffer congestion and parking issues on all the surrounding streets. Each of these 82 apartments are branded as 'self care' and have their own separate, lockable front door so these apartments should be classed as C3 (housing) not C2 (nursing home).</p> <p>There is NO affordable housing included in this plan. Camden's current housing scheme currently target 50% affordable housing. The existing approved plan is 35% affordable housing. This plan offers no affordable housing.</p> <p>This proposal is far denser and covers much more of the proposed site than the existing approved planning application. The apartments are unnecessarily large, compared to government guidelines for one, two and three bedroom flats. With this mind, if the apartments themselves had smaller footprints the proposal would not occupy as much of a footprint on this land.</p> <p>Most importantly the green space on this site is a vital part of the natural habitat of the area, and is inhabited by Camden's only known Slow Worms. Green space in London in general and west hampstead is shrinking all the time and it plays a vital part in the health and well being of an area. As well as playing a huge role in wildlife and the biodiversity of an area. You cannot recreate green space like this, when its gone its gone.</p> <p>The existing approved plan is for 28 flats, of which 10 would be for affordable housing. This plan is for 82 apartments, 15 nursing home beds, and far too many extra facilities. The difference in these two plans is staggering, and a development of this size would be detrimental to the people surrounding it and the wildlife that lives on the reservoir. It will degrade quality life for the all the existing residents of the area.</p>
2017/6045/P	Miriam Jill Potter	27 Hillfield Road,  West Hampstead LONDON NW6 1QD.	12/12/2017 22:32:28	COMMNT	<p>I OBJECT completely to any development of this sight. It must stay as a sanctuary for wild life and FRESH AIR for this whole area of London. PLEASE PLEASE do not allow any building to take place. Thank you.</p>
2017/6045/P	Miriam Jill Potter	27 Hillfield Road,  West Hampstead LONDON NW6 1QD.	12/12/2017 22:32:25	COMMNT	<p>I OBJECT completely to any development of this sight. It must stay as a sanctuary for wild life and FRESH AIR for this whole area of London. PLEASE PLEASE do not allow any building to take place. Thank you.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6045/P	Sebastian Kowalczyk	86a hillfield rd	13/12/2017 15:51:49	OBJ	to whom it may concern, i really don't know how you can even consider building such a massive constructions. the traffic on roads including hillfield, achilles is already a problem, with cars park on both sides and cars unable to pass each other. furthermore, the recent massive development opposite west hampstead tube station added to the number of daily commuters with only one extra gate at the station. what do you think another development like that will add to the quality of living in west hampstead? maybe oncew you could think about local residents and create more green spaces!
2017/6045/P	Abdul Aiq	94 Fortune green road Nw61ds	12/12/2017 16:38:28	COMMNT	