



**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Kate,  
Hampstead CAAC Objects to aspects of this proposal on the edge of one of our Cas.

1. Although not in a CA, the application site adjoins Redington and Froggnal (Redfrog) CA and as affecting part of Hampstead area is therefore possibly for our consideration.
2. The application form states there is no affordable housing in this development consented on the basis of including affordable housing. If this is the case, should there not be enforcement ?
3. Is the application proposal contrary to the provisions and requirements for which the development gained consent ?
4. Has the flats' take up been sufficiently complete to show no demand for the consented residents' storage ? If that goes with the flats' leases, how are flats to be compensated ?
5. The plant use consented for the basement is said to be unfeasible. No explanation for this. Should flats seek individual plant facilities in the absence of a basement facility, they would be likely to be roof- or wall-based and in the mass generating considerable noise affecting neighbouring properties.
6. Also, given the proposed or supposed chase for carbon reduction in the very near future, should not the basement space be reserved for residential plant use after all ? Economy of scale would suggest a communal facility. Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the land and building ownership, little or no thought was given to this at application stage. Desirable to review this aspect in the original application.
7. The proposed operating hours of 0700-2300 are outside Camden's permitted working hours 0800-1800 in a residential area.
8. Bicycle use is proposed but with some mopeds use. There is the risk of mostly moped use – condition should be for electric mopeds only in any case with adequate on-site charging facility.
9. The pavement crossing for a large no. of bukes/vehicles is not welcome, potentially dangerous on this well-used footpath.
10. What is expected of the volume of material to be distributed – how does that fit with the proposed bicycle use ?
11. Is the projected limit of numbers of movements and timing for each (30 mins round trip ?) indicate the true staff and activity level ?
12. The application should include a business plan analysis ?
13. Truck use stated for delivery to the proposed facility – condition for no truck use for onward deliveries.
14. A truck delivering bulk supplies is a traffic and pedestrian hazard whether by standing in the road for side off-loading or manoeuvring to park on the forecourt of the block.
15. No other vehicles to be parked or stored at the premises.
16. The proposal and applicant may be relying on the proximity of the A41 arterial/motorway as the ambient covering this proposed use. Note that the noise levels from traffic should reduce as more vehicles become electrified.
17. What are the arrangements for control of waste including any food or liquid spillages ?
18. We would respectfully suggest the above matters be sufficiently examined before any consent is given, bearing in mind that they may already have been considered.

Best regards,  
John  
John Malet-Bates RIBA  
For Hampstead CCAAC,  
c/o Flat 6,  
4 Ferncroft Avenue,  
London,  
NW3 7PH

