

Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Forum

Evidence Base

Comments made on the proposed final draft plan issued on 9/1/2013.

These are the shorter comments. Comments running over one page are listed separately

9/1/2014 from Brian Wernham

I strongly reinforce the view that traditional red bricks should be used, and that grey bricks (such as used on the Sager building next to Fortune Green and for the Emmanuel Primary School in Mill Lane) should be disallowed.

Encroachment on building frontages right onto the boundary of pavements (such as happened with the Paramount building opposite the Overground station) should be rigorously monitored and stopped

Pavement Clutter from advertising obstructs pedestrian movement and is potentially dangerous. It should be stopped using existing powers

An Area of Special Control of Advertisements should be declared to control and restrict the use of outdoor signage,

Pedestrian interchange between the three train stations is already at capacity during the rush hour. The Thameslink service is planned to increase in capacity and frequency soon.

There needs to be a plan for wider pavements & underground interchanges (at least at peak hours).

10/1/2014 from Clare Craig

Thank you for working so hard on this.

There is one change I'd like to see. The document currently says there is a need for a secondary school by 2031. I have not seen any data that would back up such a late date for a secondary. Do you know where that date was from? It would be much more sensible to keep it open saying something like "a new secondary in time to match the increasing demand for places".

11/1/2014 from Michael Zucker

Re: Neighbourhood Plan. The report proposes that new properties in the area should not be "starkly modern". Why not? Some of the most visited iconic properties Hampstead Village are starkly modern buildings. We need to encourage well designed modern buildings not just poor quality pastiches of Victorian ones.

The attraction of West Hampstead is partly in its diversity and incongruous aspects and this should be encouraged. The report seems to indicate a desire to remove any non-conforming uses. I consider that there is too much emphasis in the document on making West Hampstead a homogenous area by having even more retail units and even more cafes and by encouraging infill development to fit in with existing buildings by replicating existing details. In fact, replicating the scale, rhythm and bulk of neighbouring buildings is far more important than incorporating period details into a new building which is too large for its site. There are already several developments out of scale with neighbouring buildings (such as Alfred Court) and the school in Mill Lane and further ones need to be discouraged.

The document states that the area is not suitable for large scale high rise developments and that views need to be protected along main routes. It therefore seems ironic that one of the most recent developments in the course of construction at 187-199 West End Lane consists of 7 blocks of up to 12 storeys high. It is also suggested that as much space is provided in front of the development as possible. Since Town Planning has already been granted for the scheme there seems to be very limited scope to alter what is already planned.

There are several vacant retail units in West Hampstead and a vast number of cafes and restaurants. The potential of increasing the number of retail units in the area even further within a possible future re-development of the O2 centre car park and sites in Blackburn Road and to encourage yet more cafes in Mill Lane seems perverse. It is suggested that there should be more commercial units on a future redevelopment of the Fortune Green Road Police Station when units in the over-developed Alfred Court have remained empty due to their secondary location.

The designation of further Conservation Areas tends to have little effect in that they are usually in respect of areas which are unaffected by unsympathetic development anyway. The Greek roads to the north of Mill Lane have similar houses to those roads to the south of Mill Lane, such as Solent Road and Narcissus Road which are equally deserving of their character being maintained. The report proposes that there should be "high quality design" for sites particularly close to Conservation Areas whereas I would prefer high quality design and streetscape to improve all areas not to encourage an attitude of preserving the character of Conservation Areas whilst allowing other areas to be damaged by unsympathetic alteration of existing buildings.

Unless one accepts that a village now means any area of London with shops and defined centre I believe that use of the word "village" in the context of West Hampstead, which is very recent, is absolutely wrong and its definition as such is based on estate agents' sales details. There are virtually no buildings remaining from the original hamlet of West End and very little that is more than 150 years old. West Hampstead is a thriving highly populated area with much diversity but it is no village.

12/01/14 from Highways Agency (Statutory consultee) –

No interests in the area, by email

16/01/2014 Jenny Frew Decentralisation and Neighbourhood Planning Department for Communities and Local Government

I spotted that the draft neighbourhood plan for Fortune Green and West Hampstead has been published for public consultation. I know that you have been publishing drafts as you go along, but am I right in thinking that this is the formal 'pre-submission consultation' draft? If it is, congratulations on reaching this stage, as you may know only one other plan in London has reached this stage to date.

I asked one of the planners in our team to have a quick look at the plan, thinking in particular about any pointers which would help ensure that the plan meets the Basic Conditions which the examiner will be looking at, based on our experience of working with a number of plans in the run up to the examination stage. She had the following suggestions, which I hope are helpful. However, as I'm sure you will appreciate what's set out below doesn't represent the views of DCLG; it is not formal advice/guidance; and is not a substitute for your own professional/legal advice.

Overall:

It's a well written plan and it's clear that lots of work has gone into it.

It would be useful to include a map to clearly illustrate the proposed allocations

I know that planning officers in Camden have seen and commented on previous drafts. For some sections – for example those relating to projects or recommendations - where it would be helpful to be clear whether these have been costed and if Camden have been

involved in discussions about them and are supportive. This will help demonstrate that the plan is deliverable.

Policies

These are generally clear and it's helpful to have them in boxed text to clearly delineate them. The section could be restructured along the lines of intent – policy – justification. This would help the examiner see (1) what you are trying to achieve (e.g. in plain English), (2) how that is encapsulated in a policy, and (3) the evidence base etc that supports that policy.

Some of the Policies don't add value over the existing Policy framework and in some circumstances may water down Local Plan policies e.g. safeguarding and enhancing Conservation Areas and heritage sites. Brian or Jennifer at Camden will be able to advise further.

Evidence base: you could set out more clearly how the policy relates to the evidence base e.g. in the case of Policy 1, spell out that this is based on evidence from LB Camden, and what that evidence shows.

Policy 2: could this be linked to a design guide? There is a reference to 'high quality design' but what does this mean in practice? Point x refers to 'a presumption in favour of protecting the views across the area.' What are the important views that should be protected – are these mapped? If you can be more specific then the policies are more likely to be binding – loosely drafted policies could be talked down by developers.

Policy 5: Other sites – some of the wording could be clearer. This is quite a long 'wish list' which may not all be achievable for every site e.g. support community facilities, public facilities, provide new pedestrian / bicycle links. Camden officers might be able to advise on this from their experience of negotiating with developers.

Policies 7 and 8: Transport policies aren't specifically land use policies and it is unclear what specifically is hoped for e.g. Policy 7 'development shall allow for the smooth and safe movement of traffic on roads in the Area and allow for a reduction in car use.' How will this be delivered? E.g. could the policy address provision of cycle storage in new developments etc? Policy 8 doesn't add any value to existing Policies and may water them down e.g. Local Plan policy seeks to increase the availability of cycle parking and enhancing cycle links whereas the NP as drafted allows for improved provision for cycling and to encourage cycling.

Policy 10: are these deliverable? Do you have ideas of possible locations or capacity for such developments in the area? Has the policy been discussed with the LPA and associated departments e.g. health service providers, education etc.

Policy 11, 12, 13, 14 – Camden's Local Plan is likely to have policies to cover employment and retail. These may be stronger than the draft NP policies which do not appear to link to a specific evidence base. E.g. Policy 13 'A presumption against the conversion of ground floor retail / business space into retail use – LP likely to have caveats e.g. if premise has been vacant for x period of time change of use may be supported in order to prevent a row of derelict shops which can reduce viability and vitality of retail centres. 'A presumption in favour of improving and restoring the look of shop fronts' – it would be helpful to refer to specific design criteria.

Policy 16: this includes reference to development in private gardens, but presumably the intention is not to prevent all home extensions, and some of these are covered by permitted development rights in any case. You might find it helpful to look at the Norland plan which includes a policy on development in back gardens (<http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/planningandconservation/neighbourhoodplanning/norlandneighbourhoodplan.aspx>, see policy N3)

Policy 17: Trees – Again, it would help to be more specific. For example, for protecting existing trees, do you want to prioritise trees in particular locations? In making provision for new trees, as drafted a developer might argue compliance with the policy by committing to planting two trees whatever the size of development.

Appendices

Basic conditions statement: this could be a lot more thorough – have a look at examples from other plans that have successfully passed examination, e.g. Exeter St James (<http://www.exeterstjamesforum.org/>) or Thame (<http://www.thametowncouncil.gov.uk/index.php?Itemid=148>). Remember that the role of the independent examiner is to test compliance with the Basic Conditions, so this is your opportunity to really demonstrate that the plan does this.

SEA: obviously you will need to reach an agreement with LB Camden about this.

I hope these comments are helpful, I'd be happy to discuss them further if that would be useful. I'd also reiterate the point made at the beginning – it's a well written plan, and I know it's based on lots of good local consultation. I'm copying this email to Brian O'Donnell for information.

22/10/2014 from Environment Agency (Statutory consultee) –

Comments on surface water flood risk, see letter
<http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/55responseenvironmentagency.pdf>

22/01/2104 from Charles Marks Comments on the NDF Maps

I would consider naming/titling or numbering the actual maps – it will make it easier to refer to them for others. On a number of maps in the key you show the railway line but they are not included in the maps (map 2 and 5 for example). I personally cannot see the difference in colour between a secondary and tertiary road on the map. On the last map I have no idea what the orange "Planning" on the key means? Is this applied for? Granted? Rejected?

Hope this is of some use.

24/01/14 From The Coal Authority (Statutory Consultee) –

No comments, see letter
<http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/55responsecoalauthority.pdf>

22/01/2014 From Charles Marks

I would consider naming/titling or numbering the actual maps – it will make it easier to refer to them for others.

On a number of maps in the key you show the railway line but they are not included in the maps (map 2 and 5 for example).

I personally cannot see the difference in colour between a secondary and tertiary road on the map.

On the last map I have no idea what the orange "Planning" on the key means? Is this applied for? Granted? Rejected?

Hope this is of some use.

27/01/2014 from Jody Graham

Finished reading the plan and it is very good. Can't say I agreed with 100% and no one will. I would say I approve of 85% and that is damn good. Once again well done.

27/01/2014 from Michael Poulard representing GARA

Please find [attached our comment](#) on this draft.

The document is reading ever better and more professionally – thanks very much for your hard work.

However, there is a serious inconsistency in how the Reservoir site is being described. The separately circulated maps show it correctly as open green space but the text of the report & Map 3 call it a Potential Development Site – it isn't – it's Private Open Space.

Do note, however, that the Open space designation doesn't go all the way to the street – there is a strip of White Land. To my knowledge Linden Wates has not requested that the white land alone is included on a list of Site Allocations – and their earlier requests to put the whole site on a list of potential development sites has been rejected.

27/01/2014 Andrew Parkinson

The phrase "there shall be a presumption for/against" is used a lot in the first half of the plan. It might be helpful to clarify what this means.

Normally, where this phrasing is used in plans, the policy states that there will be a presumption for/against, unless particular criteria are met. E.g. "there will be a presumption against any development that involves the loss of a sport, recreation or play facility except where it can be demonstrated that there is an excess of provision."

Here, the plan doesn't say when the presumption doesn't apply, which might provide a loophole for developers to argue that it doesn't apply in their circumstances. If it is intended that the presumption will apply in all circumstances, then it might be worth just saying this. E.g. for views (policy 2(x)) "A presumption in favour of protecting the views across the Area" could be changed to "new development must protect existing views across the area."

Often the text is more restrictively worded than the policy, and some of the ideas in the text do not make the policy. E.g. A11 (infill developments), A9 (HMO – sets out restrictions that do not make the policy, such as sufficient storage space for waste and recycling bins).

The text helps interpret the policy, but it will be the policy which is applied. E.g. going back to 2(x) on views ("A presumption in favour of protecting the views across the Area") – the text sets out at A5 the views of particular importance (e.g. to Hampstead). It might be worth putting these in the policy.

The text before Policy 4 sets out a number of proposed uses for specific sites (e.g. 14 Blackburn Road, O2 Centre Car Park. These do not form part of Policy 4, and are not cross-linked from the policy. It might be worth making it even clearer that these are not policies in the plan, but are intended to be taken into account by Camden in preparing its Framework

for the Growth Area (I think this is the intention?)

Policy 4 could be strengthened by transferring some of the text to the policy. E.g. high density development being exception not norm, growth area not suitable for high scale, high rise development.

4(iii) – affordable housing: intended to be more than in CCS?

Policy 5 – again might be worth making clear how the policy links to the detailed text for each site. Paragraph C says “this Plan therefore seeks to provide detailed guidance for how these locations are developed”, but the text isn’t part of the policy. As I read it, at the moment, the text at C1-C11 doesn’t have the status of policy under the plan – is that intended?

Policy 10 – I think the purpose of this policy could be clarified. In part it seeks to prevent development on/near existing community facilities - this could be clarified. The policy doesn’t allocate particular spaces for a school/nursery/primary care health facility – and doesn’t require development (e.g. in the growth area) to provide sufficient space for these facilities. Therefore, it might be also worth thinking about how this policy would bite on an individual planning application. Is it intended to affect all planning applications?

Policy 6-8 & 11– I think it would be helpful to clarify what is meant by the phrase “development should allow for”.

28/01/2014 from Bradley Brown, Member of WEGCAAC.

Thank you for chairing the very good meeting yesterday evening, and of course for bringing the Plan so far forward.

On reflection, and arising out of one person's comments at the meeting, I am concerned about the possible conflicts between Policies in the Plan.

This is what lawyers look for and feast upon. Should there not be something in the Plan that clearly states what are the priorities when Policies conflict? I am not sure what the priorities should be, but think that we should be making clear what they (or it) are (or is).

28/01/2014 from People's Centre for Change (Shoot up Hill)

Please see letter at

<http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/55PeoplesCentreNDFletterjan14.pdf>

29/01/2014 from Simon Burrows

My comment is that there should be a requirement that any new buildings on West End Lane in the interchange area should be set further back than the current building lines. Over the long term this will help with the congestion, safety and amenity issues with the narrow pavements.

I'm not sure whether the following is appropriate for the plan, but I do think there should be encouragement that shops with large forecourts in front should be primarily considered as cafe/restaurant premises.

06/02/2014 Richard Milestone

I have a couple of comments:

Paragraph 7.9: Fortune Green Play Centre: I wondered if there was any mileage in going further than stating that the site should be retained for community use and actually stating that it should be for educational/children’s use. We are regularly told about the shortage of

appropriate sites for schools and at the same time that there is a shortage of school places. Development on that site to create a local primary school would presumably be of benefit, not just to local residents in need of more primary school places but also because the play centre could operate out of the site after school for pupils there and from other nearby schools. Presumably the play centre would get the benefit of new facilities as well.

Paragraph 8.5: this paragraph talks about seeking measures to increase footfall and then goes on to talk about industrial units, small workshops, serviced offices, high technology and high skill firms which would benefit from the area's well-educated population. At the end of the day, anything which fills up the many vacant premises along Fortune Green Road and the Sager building is obviously a good thing, but the two parts of the paragraph seem slightly contradictory: as local residents, we use shops that sell things we want to buy (primarily thinking about Tesco), occasionally use the restaurants along that strip and we might occasionally go into one of the businesses- e.g. hairdresser or estate agent. It is possible that small workshops and high tech companies might be selling things we want to buy but I would have thought that (a) this is less likely than more usual retail/services and (b) is likely to be on a one-off basis- I might visit a workshop manufacturing something that I need at a given time but this is likely to be the sort of purchase where I look on the internet to find a curtain manufacturer to discover that there is one at the end of my road, rather than going off on a trip to Fortune Green Road to see if there happens to be one. On that basis, I'm not sure that these types of businesses would have the desired effect of increasing footfall.

One other point regarding vacant premises: I'm not sure to what extent the NDF plan can impact on the layout of existing premises etc... but it is clear that the reason the two vacant units in the Sager building have been empty for so long is that they are too big. Splitting them up into smaller units would encourage businesses to take premises and might lead to the sort of spaces you describe below. There may be a shortage of space for open-air markets in Fortune Green, but the large premises that run along the side of Fortune Green could be transformed into 4-6 smaller spaces that would be ideal for cafes, permanent retail businesses, and to the extent that premises remained vacant, pop-up shops. In any event, it is certainly something to bear in mind for any future developments: businesses have little interest in leasing very large sites because they are just too big to fill up.

06/02/2014 From English Heritage

Nick Bishop | Historic Places Adviser – London

[Please see response here](#)

18/02/2014 From Ross Alexander

I have only come across the work of the NDF on the development plan and wanted to make a few comments while this is still possible

My main concern is Policy 7. I do not understand how the points contained in the plan support a policy of smooth traffic flow. If anything the comments made in the consultations point to the opposite: the area is dominated by traffic and existing calming has been ineffective. The impact of this traffic is to detract from the area's key "village feel" value.

I would therefore expect a much more robust policy 7 to drive the reduction in car use by residents and those travelling through the area. This would be consistent with many other parts of the plan (encouraging public transport, pedestrian realm improvements and allowing cycling). I would like to see the plan enabling and encouraging a policy that removes

rat runs and forces non-bus traffic to Kilburn High Road and Finchley Road (TfL main routes) where it belongs, rather than West End Lane.

On a related note, I was surprised to see no explicit mention of the cycle superhighway scheme. My understanding was that TfL and Camden planned to run CS11 from West Hampstead through to Hyde Park. This document is an ideal place to shape this and ensure that this offers the greatest benefits to the area. Perhaps this can be used as a stimulus to remove non-essential traffic from West End Lane and direct the CS11 through the area onto Mill Lane

Otherwise this seems a very thorough and well researched plan.

20/02/2014 From Peter King

We attended the meeting on Wednesday 19th and found that nothing was said about protecting small open spaces. Little bits of land open spaces, gardens (the lungs of West Hampstead) from being sold off by the Labour Council for short term money gain. The council seem hell bent on packing in as many people as they can into every space, no matter what and quality of life can be damned. More people, more pressure, more stress, more violence-antisocial behaviour. Loss of light, loss of breathing space and air, and we will all be pushed a bit closer to the edge.

22/02/2014 From Janet Crawford

Just a few brief comments on the NDP:

1. D8 Chiltern National Rail Route: This is not a suggestion, just a comment. If a new station on this route were to be linked with WH tube station, this would massively increase congestion at the station and in the trains themselves.
2. D9 Buses: I think there should be something about putting bus shelters at as many bus stops as possible in the area, and as many as possible of these to have an LCD display of waiting times. At the moment, bus stops are just portrayed as a nuisance in the plan with nothing about the comfort or convenience of bus users.
3. G11 Trees: I think there should be a general presumption against the felling of trees in public places or on building or other developments. Proposals to fell trees should be specified more clearly in applications for planning permission and owners should have to justify the felling of trees.

With thanks for all your hard work

24/02/2014 From Vicki Bick

I have had a quick read through the proposed final draft of the NDP. In section 4 (policies) , A12 (page 7) , it states : A12. "Garden developments : in order to protect the Area's green/open spaces, the development of new dwellings in private gardens should be avoided. If any developments are approved, they should maintain a much lower profile than existing housing stock, preferably one-storey."

If Camden is party to the NDP, why have they just allowed the developer of 16 Fortune Green Road, NW6 1UE planning permission to fill his private garden with an extension which will fill the garden almost completely, overshadow the ground floor flat of No 18 completely and tower over the neighbouring gardens ?

The owner of No 16 has repeatedly made applications for roof/garden/sideways developments over the last 20-odd years, and has always been refused.

Now, it seems that Camden has taken a backward step and not acted in the spirit of the ndp it claims to be a supporter of, by permitting this development on a private garden.

Secondly, A21 - signage. The street where I live (Lymington Road) - is littered by multiple signs of estate agents. The only time they disappear is when residents themselves remove them. It would be so easy for the council to automatically remove them with other rubbish; or to fine the estate agents who do this.

Lets hope that the ndp may mean progress on the above matters, and much more !

24/02/2014 From Ms L (name withheld on request)

I wasn't able to attend the meeting on 19th Feb but read your Plan with much interest. I am most grateful to you for representing West Hampstead on our behalf and for trying to help the area, particularly with reference to improving the quality and suitability of the architecture of new developments, increasing the amount of green space, improving the walkways to make them safer and cleaner and reducing the amount of ugly signage along West End Lane and generally trying to make it a more pleasant place to live.

I must say I find it particularly depressing to see the graffiti on the walls on the buildings facing the platforms within the tube station and also the litter and general fly-tipping along the walkway from Blackburn Road to the O2 centre. Anything that can be done to help resolve these issues would be greatly appreciated as I think they contribute to an air of neglect and thereby encouraging crime.

Thank you again for all that you are trying to do for us.

25/02/2014 From Fordwych Residents Association

The consultation process has been thorough, detailed, sustained and extensive, seeking to engage all sections of the local community throughout the drafting and development of the Plan via the use of conventional meetings and printed literature along with more innovative social media and internet technology-based methods.

25/02/2014 From Jane Evans

Firstly, may I congratulate you on the proposed final draft, and thank you all for your immense dedication and hard work over the past two years or more on this ground-breaking project on behalf of the local community.

The Plan is far-reaching in its aims, which I fully support. I note that in Section 5, the Delivery Plan, the observance and implementation of the majority of the Objectives & Policies falls significantly upon the Camden Council Planning Department and developers.

I was very gratified to see, at Point 5.2, a clear expression of the concerns we have about the "seemingly opaque and secretive way in which Planning Agreements (such as S106 agreements) are (it actually says 'were' - perhaps this should be amended ?) drawn up between Camden Council and developers, and how "...The Plan sets out proposals for a far more open, transparent and accountable process...."

In Recommendations iii., iv. & v. for Policy 1, Housing, I was also pleased to see a wish to impose certain specified conditions on planning approvals.

With those points very much in mind, here are a couple from me:

AFFORDABLE or SOCIAL HOUSING (Policy 4 - Point A6):

We remember what happened at the Mill Apartments about the "affordable/social" housing element. The development was "sold" to the community on the basis that it would provide significant "affordable/social" housing, but as matters progressed, the designated original percentage of this accommodation was deemed by the developer to be unrealistic and undeliverable, and it was significantly reduced to a level that the developer considered deliverable. I got the impression Camden's Planning Department was apparently grateful to get any "affordable/social" housing at all.

Attention is needed to prevent this recurring. It surely cannot be left to a negotiation between the Planning Department and a developer to make a purely economic calculation as to how much "affordable/social" housing is deliverable within a given development. There needs to be a policy on it - I'm sure there are probably a multitude of them - but a policy that cannot be diluted and that can provide for the levels needed of this type of housing in the area - as a condition of a development.

Getting more control of the detail on this could at least slow the trend that we're seeing in this area and indeed all over London, where the overriding goal and achievement of development is profit for developers and land-owners like Network Rail, while homes in the area become ever more out of reach of all but the very rich.

NETWORK RAIL-OWNED LAND IN THE DESIGNATED AREA OF THE PLAN (Policy 16 - Green/open space):

Point i. of Policy 16 refers to the railway embankments and how they must be protected from development.

As we know certain sections of this land offer significant potential for development - the land at No. 1 Mill Lane and the Ballymore site on West End Lane are the notable examples so far.

As the custodian of these precious local resources, Network Rail apparently has 'carte blanche' freedom to contract with private developers, invariably leading to the sell-off of these green spaces for private profit, without any accountability to the local authority or to the community it serves. I remember one of our local councillors commenting on the sale of the site at 1 Mill Lane that "Network Rail is a law unto itself" . This urgently needs to change.

These valuable community resources make a significant contribution to the quality, outlook and flavour of our local environment. They should not continue to be regarded as the private property of Network Rail to dispose of as it wishes without prior consultation with the Council and the community.

The Council may well prefer to duck this and say that it's a matter for government legislation on the responsibilities of Network Rail, but in seeking to shape planning and development policy in our area, a more specific reference to this concern in the Plan's recommendations would be a first step in the right direction.

25/02/2014 From Dorothea Breitzter-Kings

My husband and I attended the meeting on Wednesday, 19.2.2014, in which the proposed final draft of the Neighbourhood Plan for West Hampstead was being discussed. Unfortunately, there was no mention at all of the proposed sell off of small local spaces,

which local Labour councillors, especially Julian Fulbrook, are very keen on, but which is very unpopular among local residents who do not want to lose the last remaining gaps in this already heavily built-up area, which offer some relief from the increasing loss of light and air that threatens us all, due to more and more buildings being crammed in on expense of our quality of life.

We have been campaigning against Mr. Fulbrook's plan to sell off for development a small garden, for instance, which borders onto ours, and which is highly precious, not just to the tenant who uses it (she has a small child), but also to the residents of about 6 or 7 houses in Hemstal Road, for whom that small gap provides the only chance of sunlight to their otherwise dark and dismal flats. Several of these residents have health issues and depend on their small gardens to recover in, and if that last remaining gap at 27-33 Dynham Road was lost and built upon, it will have serious consequences for all of us who live around it, and they would be irreversible. A few gaps and breathing spaces are necessary for the physical, as well as the psychological health of the community, and we do not want to lose them!

During the last 3 weeks, a large-scale repair program has begun in Hemstal Road, and the small garden at 27-33 Dynham Road was in constant use as it is the only remaining open space through which scaffolding and building materials can be brought to both the backs of the houses of Dynham, as well as Hemstal Road. No doubt, this space will be used continuously, as it has been before at times of repair work, during the upcoming works. If Camden Council floggs off every possible nook and cranny, there will soon be no space left to manoeuvre. In our campaign to save this little garden, we have met and talked to many local residents. We have found absolutely none who were not against the Labour policy of asset-stripping at the expense of us who live there and do not want the area, which is already full enough, to become even more built up and crowded.

We want to see open spaces, green spaces, trees preserved. Such commodities benefit members of the community of all ages! Why does every open spot have to be built onto? Why do even the small parks have to be crammed full with facilities, when a park ought to be a green space where people can connect a bit with the natural world while living in the city? Kilburn Grange has become a cluttered, noisy place. When the Plan talks about improving Maygrove Park, it means installing a Cafe. There are enough Cafes, almost shoulder to shoulder, of West End Lane already. We would like to see more green, peaceful spots preserved and created, to offset the commerce all around us. We don't want more of the same in our parks.

At the meeting on Wednesday, we noticed that the hall was full of people, who did not wish for West Hampstead to become more developed. Why then are these plans being forced on us, when the people who live there are against losing the light for the construction of more and more tall buildings, and don't want the area to become more crowded? It is all very well to present a plan, and a referendum, but that only means that building will go ahead anyway already, and we only get a say, and if that, concerning minor details. Why must all this developing and overpopulating be forced on us residents when we do not want it?

26/02/ 2014 From Dr Tobias Wood

I think the plan is generally good, sensible and moderate so I am happy to support it. I am, however, one of those who think that describing West Hampstead as having a "village feel" is a bit silly.

Comments on particular points:

A4 - I heartily agree with the suggestion that the height of new developments should match the existing roof line, as I feel this leads to pleasant and attractive street-scapes. I am not opposed in principle to tall/taller buildings where appropriate (e.g. in the Growth Area).

C1 - I am glad the Council are building a new school and disagree with several of the objections listed in the Plan.

E3 - Just to comment that there are currently no nurseries within the Area that take children under 2 years of age. While there are 2 (in Kilburn Grange Park and Acol Road) just South of the Area, these have a very limited number of places. Another nursery taking very young children would be a welcome addition to the area.

Many thanks for your hard work,

28/02/2014 From Councillor Gillian Risso-Gill

I have supported the Neighbourhood Development Plan for West Hampstead since its inception. I have attended as many meetings as I have been able to and have heard the strong views and concerns of local residents about the intensive development planned for the area.

I have been impressed with the efforts of the NDF team that have worked hard to engage all sectors of the local community and have brought in professional advisers when needed.

I am confident that the final Plan will be realistic in what it can achieve whilst representing the local community's views and aspirations and hope it will meet the requirements of the statutory authorities to move to a Referendum in the foreseeable future.

28/02/2104 Yvonne Klemperer

I would just like you to note at this stage that there are ongoing issues regarding the care of the visiting public in terms of health and safety in the site of Hampstead Cemetery which have been under-addressed, shrugged off and pushed under the carpet in previous meetings - i.e. the taboo subject of the dire lack of loo facilities there for residents and other visitors. People still tend the graves of loved ones (myself included), travel considerable distances from outside London and cannot understand why Camden has continually refused even to share the existing toilets for the workforce with the visiting public. We have all too often been forced to curtail our visits because of the absence of toilet facilities. It is a disgrace as there are no sensible alternatives and those which have been suggested (Tesco and the public loos at the end of Fortune Green Road - 2 stops away from the cemetery) are much too far for anyone frail, disabled or just plain needy. My complaint for myself (when I became ill in the cemetery last Summer) and on behalf of others I have met is now under investigation by Camden Council Complaints Division (so hopefully there will be a sensible solution); otherwise it will simply be referred on to the Government Ombudsman. This situation has gone on for far too long, years in fact, and so many visitors I am sure are discouraged from visiting an otherwise beautiful and historically fascinating site. There has been an admirable input of projectwork by Bernard Heymann Chairman of Friends of Hampstead Cemetery and others on the Committee and it is absolutely lamentable that Camden/Islington have been unable to resolve this issue between them so that the visiting public can make an event of any visit they make to this particular cemetery and feel secure to tend the graves of family and friends at their leisure. I would add that WC facilities for the public exist and are managed competently in cemetery sites in Barnes, Barnet, Golders Green and Westminster and Hampstead cemetery is faced with exactly the same problems that they have to contend with. Let me add that The Department of Constitutional Affairs

which handles the legislation over cemeteries and burial sites is not at all happy about this state of affairs either.

This is just to put you in the picture. I shall let you know what transpires.

28/02 from Helena Paul

See document <http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/55helenapaul.pdf>

28/02/2014 Mel Barlow-Graham Senior Surveyor Dron & Wright representing London Fire Authority

See document <http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/55dandwlondonfire.pdf>

28/02 from LB Camden , Brian O'Donnell

See also document <http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/55lbcamden.pdf>

Please find attached the Council's comments on the consultation draft of your plan, the basic conditions statement and the draft consultation statement. And well done to the Neighbourhood Forum for reaching this stage and for all the work put into date.

These comments build on previous comments and discussions and we hope they will help you produce a plan that is clear and effective in delivering the neighbourhood's objectives and meets the statutory requirements and basic conditions.

While the majority of the comments suggest how the effectiveness and clarity of the plan can be improved, there are some more fundamental issues, discussed with you previously, that could create risks to the successful progress of the plan through independent examination if not addressed; in particular:

- consistency with the NPPF, in particular on deliverability / viability - a number of the sites identified in the plan have a sizable number of requirements attached which appear unlikely to be viable for a single site to provide. Our comments suggest that potential amendment to address this.
- the inclusion of 'recommendations' alongside the planning policies - we suggest these should be taken from the main body of the plan and moved into an appendix, as per recent examiner's reports, and that it should be made clear where there has been no commitment to meet or fund them.
- consultation with landowners - you will need to ensure that all landowners likely to be affected by the plan have been consulted (or at the very least reasonable steps have been made to contact them). Not doing so could leave you vulnerable to legal challenge if a landowner considers they have not had fair chance to influence a plan that affects their property.
- the consultation statement needs to explain how you have taken the views and comments expressed during consultation activity into account in the plan. Engagement with landowners (who you have contacted, when and how you have taken their views into account) should be covered in the consultation statement.

We hope you find our comments helpful. Please feel free to contact us if you would like to discuss any of the points raised.

28/02/2014 From Virginia Berridge WHAT (West Hampstead Amenities and Transport)

Please see document <http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/55whatcomments.pdf>

28/02/2014 From Ed Britton GL Hearn Limited on behalf of Land Securities

Please see document <http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/55landsecurities.pdf>

28/02/2014 From Emmy van Deurzen (New School of Psychotherapy and Counselling)

I read the entire document once again and feel it is a great vision for the neighbourhood, which I hope will make considerable impact on the Council's policies.

I am delighted to find that it is entirely compatible with our own D1 change of use application for 63 Fortune Green Road, which went into the Council last week.

We had an information meeting at Alfred and Joan Court last Tuesday and hope to have been able to reassure those who had concerns about parking implications that The Existential Academy is a very good bet where parking is concerned as our staff and students are generally extremely green-minded and are committed to using public transport or cycles. We feel that our organisation would be an asset to the local community and hope to be able to offer our main classroom for local meetings, as requested by some people. We are currently checking that this would be acceptable to the landlord (Sager).

We were urged to do even more leafletting (in the Greek Streets) and have prepared a further leaflet for this purpose, which I can send you if you would like to see it.

Thanks again for doing a sterling job for the community.

28/02/2014 from Timothy Cakebread of Colliers International on behalf of Volkswagen UK

Please see document <http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/55volkswagen.pdf>

28/02/2014 from Vanessa Long

Welcome the provision for more playgrounds (pocket or otherwise) on derelict open space. However, ages of children have to be taken into account. 0-5 year olds are catered for (Fortune Green, Mill Lane Open Space) but older children 6+ to early teenage years are neglected. Equipment at this park has not been updated for nearly 20 years and it's poorly designed and utilised. The football court dominates to the exclusion of children who aren't invited/able to join in. The climbing tower is dull, a nod to physical challenge and stands alone – not very exciting. Sumatra Road playground could be a fantastic space for older children – those who are desperate to become independent of parents but who need a facility close to home - a hub for local older kids to congregate and hang out. An adventure playground would be just the thing. Please think about diverting funds from West Hampstead Growth Area to this forgotten play space.

28/02/2014 From Harry Stobart

I fully support the aspirations of the Plan but wonder given all the proposed new developments in the area whether Transport for London is being fully appraised of the

increased traffic implications which are going to arise in the future especially as traffic flows are likely to be pushed further westwards when the HS2 project gets under way. TFL needs to be informed of our concerns.

27/02/2014 From Stuart Drummond Travis Perkins

Thank you from TP for all the excellent work you and your committee are putting into the NDP. I suspect the main challenge going forward will be to protect the views of the community as much as possible from the almost inevitable attempts from Camden Council, the development community and possibly others to dilute it under the guise of "compliance". I have been struck by the community input you have engendered and the fact that residents are not against change. As I said yesterday evening, I think it is a very good piece of work indeed- a balanced plan that seems to genuinely reflect the views of the community.

I have been through the draft again and set out a few comments which you'll hopefully feel able to take on board:

1. Policy 4 criterion iv. Change to "Retain and provide space for business and employment uses" to reflect the rest of the policies in the Plan, and in particular to be consistent with Policy 5 viii and Policy 11;
2. Policy 11. We wholeheartedly support this policy which, as we have discussed, is entirely consistent with Camden's own policies. We would suggest an additional point ie that new business, commercial and employment developments should seek to secure apprenticeships for local residents. Camden were keen to impose an apprenticeship condition on TP at St Pancras Way which we happily accepted offering a wider community benefit;
3. Para B3. A small point, but you might want to add employers and employees to "the NDF, residents...." etc in the penultimate line;
4. Para B6. We support all 9 of the initial bullet points in this para (though see point 5 below), but would suggest removing the final point re a new bridge over the railway line. Since the provision of a bridge would require the compliance of third parties, it is not necessarily within the power of the landowner/developer to provide it. The broad principle is nevertheless established under Policy 9. The reference to a platform etc under the 2nd of the two subsequent bullet points is acceptable as it is an option to be considered and not a "requirement/need";
5. Para B6. Replace "flexible commercial / retail space" with "flexible replacement employment space". The retail point is picked up in the following bullet point;
6. Para B8, first bullet point- remove/amend the final few words in the final sentence so that it reads "Any redevelopment should be primarily residential (with appropriate affordable housing) with employment use on the ground floor". It would then be consistent with the employment policies in the Plan and avoids any confusion vis business use/ commercial space (per B6)/ retail (retail is not classed as business use).

28/02/2014 From Jeanette Murch

Regarding POLICY 17: Trees

"Development shall protect and provide for the maintenance of existing trees."

In order to support and strengthen the above policy I would like to suggest that the following is included in this section of the NDP:

All planning applications for development of sites where trees exist should include a valuation of the trees using CAVAT, or a similar method. In the event that planning

permission is given and mature trees are cut down to enable development to proceed the CAVAT value should be paid to the Council as community compensation for the loss of the benefit which the trees provided.

28/02/2014 From Flick Rea Local Councillor

As Councillor for Fortune Green since 1986, and with a longstanding interest and experience of planning, I highly commend and support the final draft of the NDP. I have lived in the area for over 40 years and have seen many changes, some for the better and some for the worse and I believe this is exactly the right moment to produce the NDP. My fellow councillors and I are hugely impressed by all the work that has gone into the making of the Plan ever since the formation of the Neighbourhood Development Forum in 2012, and the huge amount of consultation through the many drafts and are happy to give it our wholehearted support.

07/03/2014 From Sue Measures for Maygrove Friends Group

The Maygrove Friends Group and indeed Sidings Community Centre would like to object to the specific proposal in the plan which refers to a footbridge from Broomsleigh Street over the railway as the only feasible landing place would be in the Peace Park. This would have to be in the space in between the pitch and the community centre. We are objecting as this would result in the loss of vital green open space.

As the bridge would also have to have heavy foundations, we should also point out that the Peace Park has played an important role in assisting with local flooding issues, as there is an excess floodwater tank, measuring 30' wide by 60' deep, in the middle of the space where the footbridge would land. For structural reasons, this would discount such a heavy construction being built so close or indeed on top of the edge of it.

Additionally, we believe that these plans were abandoned when the railway lines had electric cables erected and this in fact led to the creation of Wayne Kirkhum way as an alternative route up to Mill Lane.

We therefore strongly object to, and indeed point out that this proposal is not possible for the reasons stated.

We would however, put forward the suggestion (also made by some of Sidings youth members) to consider expanding the newer footbridge over the Thameslink lines, to connect with the footpath (think it's the Black Path) - which would provide better north/south pedestrian routes from Mill Lane and neighbouring roads with direct access route across the Thameslink station and interchange taking some pedestrian flow away from the busy narrow stretch of WEL Thameslink bridge. It would also create a good new route for school children crossing the railway line to Beckford and Hampstead schools.

Could this be considered for some S106 funds???

The Maygrove Friends Group and Sidings CC have also registered their requests for expansion to the Maygrove Peace Park on the western end of the Liddell Road site to open up the wooded area at the far end of the pitch and also create additional extra space for sport, play and physical activity as part of the Liddell Road site development, and would also urge the replanting of any trees and greenery destroyed as a result of the Liddell road build.

We would also like to consider approaching Network Rail to open up the wooded green space on the corner of Iverson and Maygrove Roads to create a “green flow” corridor effect from Maygrove Peace Park, through Liddell Road to Iverson Road.

07/03/2014 From West Hampstead Business Association

- The West Hampstead Business Association broadly supports the final draft of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and would like to thank the NDF committee for all its hard work in putting this plan together over the past two years.
- With respect to the policies concerning the economy and employment, we agree that developments in West Hampstead should provide viable business, commercial and employment space. Where commercial use is removed through a redevelopment, we fully support Policy 11.3 and 11.4, and would like to see the NDP assert in as robust terms as possible that such use should be replaced with at least as much viable and appropriate commercial space within the vicinity as part of a coherent plan for the area. We support the NDP’s push for flexibility within different classes of commercial property while seeking to retain a broad mix of employment use overall – even as the share of different uses may fluctuate over time.
- We would push the NDP to strengthen the wording of Policy 11.5, which seeks to provide additional business space and would encourage them to look at how it’s possible, within the planning framework, to push for this growth with a focus on viable and appropriate commercial use. One benefit of increased employment is more weekday daytime trade for existing businesses. Declining employment in the area would lead businesses to be increasingly reliant on evening and weekend trade, which risks creating a vicious circle of failing businesses. Here, one could argue that the type of employment is less relevant. However, keeping a mix of employment types in the area makes the area more attractive for new businesses looking for premises. Being able to offer a range of business-to-business services in the local area should encourage a virtuous circle of growth and contribute to the vitality of West Hampstead. Without this, there is a risk of consigning West Hampstead to becoming a dormitory suburb of commuters.
- We therefore propose that in certain circumstances, commercial space could be provided as an alternative to affordable housing in terms of contributing to a mixed and vibrant community.
- We support the call for a range of unit sizes, in order to encourage smaller businesses to set up in the area. We are not against larger businesses, which can bring more substantial employment benefits, but recognise that a diverse commercial base strengthens the community.
- Regarding policies 12, 13 and 14, which focus on the West Hampstead Town Centre and the two Neighbourhood Centres of Mill Lane and Fortune Green, we would suggest that more clarity is given on what is meant by the “character” of these commercial centres and thus what exactly it is that the NDP seeks to protect/enhance.
- Beyond the specific economic policies, we would also like to comment on Paragraph D.12 of the plan, which refers to parking.

- Although the WHBA accepts that West Hampstead is well served by public transport, this does not preclude the fact that many people, especially those living just outside the area, still use cars to get around – the lack of short-term parking is a major challenge for local businesses and makes West Hampstead less attractive for customers who might otherwise use it as a town centre during the day.
- We would encourage the NDP to assert that where commercial use is created, or redeveloped, that parking is included both for employees and customers, and that provision is made for this parking to be available to members of the public on a short-term pay & display basis outside of normal trading hours.
- Where any residential parking is permitted as part of a development (and we recognise that Camden pursues a car-free policy at the moment), there should be a mix of pay & display bays and permit bays. The shared-use approach does not work and does not benefit local businesses.
- Where a redevelopment includes commercial use that requires loading/unloading we strongly suggest that the NDP proposes that loading bays are built into the redevelopment plans. The problems of lorries loading/unloading presently not only affects the flow of traffic in the area, frustrating residents, but the lack of suitable bays puts off retailers from locating here at present.

We look forward to seeing the final plan and supporting the NDF as the plan moves

21/03/2014 From Transport for London

Please see document at <http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/55tflresponse.pdf>

12/05/2014 From Abt Architecture & Planning (Representing Hampstead Asset Management, owners of the Builders Depot site.)

Further to our correspondence of 30 April, my clients ask to convey their sincere thanks to you for your late acceptance of their submission which I'm now pleased to attach.

They would like to endorse my compliments to your Forum for the enormous amount of work carried out so far. Having gone through the Plan very carefully with them, we hope our comments will be accepted in the positive light intended. Our objective, like yours, is that the Plan should be judged to be sound.

Please see the attached document at <http://www.ndpwesthampstead.org.uk/55hamresponse.pdf>