

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5372/P	Peter Woodley	03/01/2020 16:52:21	JUST	<p>To: Camden Planning Department.</p> <p>Reference: Planning Application 2019/5372/P</p>

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing on behalf of the owners of the following properties comprising the residential flats above the shops numbered 268 to 280 West End Lane regarding the planning permission application number 2019/5372/P relating to the rear of 268 West End Lane.

We, the undersigned, have studied the plans and submissions made by the owner of No. 268 West End Lane in regard to how we feel we will be affected by this proposed development.

The land in question directly faces some of the front doors of the flats situated over the shops, and any increased use of the thoroughfare would affect all of the owners of properties that at present use this means of access.

So, our questions to the planning authorities are as follows:

1. What is the proposed use of this space? Cleverly it is not specified in the planning application, merely being described as a "work unit". Although Business Use Class B1 covers a wide spectrum, we as interested parties, do not know whether this might result in manufacturing, or storage, or general office use and more crucially whether this is to be used as a part of the existing shop premises at No.268 West End Lane (also owned by the applicant), or as a separate business.
2. What guarantee do we have that if planning permission were granted for B1 use there would not be an automatic right to change that to Residential Use in the future, without re-applying for planning permission.
3. If the use is connected to the adjoining shop, or is in some way only to be used as an office space or storeroom, then why do the plans include the provision of kitchen and a large toilet area. This hints at possible future use as living accommodation. In addition, Question 20 on the application form has not been answered, which we interpret as a need to obscure the actual use.
4. Mention is made in the plans submitted as part of the application, that attempts have been made to avoid any danger of "overlooking", or light spill, from the roof lights to the first floor windows of the flats opposite. However, these plans are not complete, as they have omitted to include the second floor windows which would be able to see in through the roof lights, and would be subject to light spillage from those.
5. If the purpose of the proposed building is as a work unit (i.e. office space) then why is the structure built so tall. The internal ceiling height at the rear of the building would be 5 metres, and the windows directly facing the passageway are 2.4 metres high. The size of these windows increases the risk of forced entry being made as there seems to be no apparent definition given to the provision of any security measures.
6. Why is it felt necessary to have industrial sized waste bins for both general waste and recycling. The

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

leases on the premises which define the handling of waste materials (and this parcel of land is covered by the Leases appertaining to Nos. 264 and 266 West End Lane according to the Title Plan No. NGL22870 at the Land Registry) state that waste material to be collected must be placed at the front of the shop concerned, at the edge of the pavement. To our collective knowledge no dustbin or commercial waste collection service is allowed along the length of the passageway at the rear of the shops. We as a group of residents are considering having bollards placed at the road end of the passage to deter motorcycle delivery people using the space, and if this were to happen there would not be access to the proposed waste bins.

7. If the plans that get passed by the planning committee still include drainage connections to the foul sewer, that would mean digging up the passageway at the rear of the shops. We, the residents and owners of the adjoining properties spent several tens of thousands of pounds having new drainage put in to the passage, and a new surface laid. There is no mention of the disturbance, upheaval and reinstatement that shall be needed to this new surface.

8. At present there is no mains water, electricity, gas or communications connections to the site. To provide these without unsightly overhead wiring or pipework would involve the digging up of the passageway. Again, this has not been mentioned. Also additional external lighting is included in the proposal. We, as connected residents installed lighting along the length of the passageway, and can see no need for any additional lighting to be provided. Indeed it would only add to the general light pollution in the area.

9. Turning to the details contained within the Construction Management Plan. It appears that the only provision for community liaison regarding this project is after planning permission is granted. We are asking for consultation, representation and involvement in the application so that problems can be resolved before permission is granted.

10. Within the CMP a delivery plan for site traffic is detailed (Page 22). Within this there are mentioned two things that give rise to concern. The first is the use of a mini excavator weighing 3 tonnes. The newly laid surface of the passageway, along which this vehicle would have to travel, does not have the structural strength to withstand such a weight. It was built to accommodate foot passage only, and the use of any mechanical vehicles would result in the breaking up of the tiled surface, and possible damage to the substrata below.

Secondly, Stage 6 of the delivery plan refers to the deliveries for residential fit out. This adds weight to the argument that this development may be a thinly disguised residential unit.

11. There is no mention of where the building materials, once delivered for this project, are to be stored. The passageway is narrow, and in constant use. It seems likely that some disruption will occur if materials are not contained within the site itself.

12. Why has there been no effort on the part of the applicant to make use of the piece of ground that is part of the garage area of Harvard Court Mansions to enable loading and unloading of waste and materials for this project. The site bounds this space and using this would avoid the need for on street parking, and the potential

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

Comment:

Response:

damage to the existing passageway.

13. Lastly in the past the site suffered from an infestation of Japanese Knotweed. Has there been any evidence submitted that this nuisance has been completely eradicated to the correct standards before any development takes place.

Submitted on behalf of those parties representing 264 -280 West End Lane, NW6 1LJ

22nd December 2019
