

Appeal No: APP/X5210/W/19/3225173

(Planning application 2018/3829/p London Borough of Camden)

511 Finchley Road.

The Fortune Green and West Hampstead NDF objected to this scheme when it was rejected by LB Camden. Our objections then are contained in LB Camden's documentation.

The Neighbourhood Forum has recently been redesignated as the body representing local planning, having completed 5 years of attempting to protect West Hampstead and Fortune Green against unsuitable development and supporting good quality sustainable development. Our remit is to ensure implementation of the Plan and on that basis we strongly object to this and similar applications and request refusal of this appeal.

We would like to add further comments for consideration for this appeal.

1. This is the third application for a "telephone kiosk" on this site. All three were rejected by LB Camden. (In fact all applications of this type have been rejected within the NDP Area have been rejected). The second application was also refused on appeal. APP/X5210/W/18/3211508. This third application appears almost identical to the previous applications, except that the kiosk is blacker, wider and taller than the previous proposals. Nothing has changed on the site which remains adjacent to a Conservation area, and is still within the Area of the Neighbourhood Plan.
2. The appeal documentation references several appeal decisions relating to similar applications in different areas, which allowed the appeals. For the record we would remind the examiner of the recent appeals which rejected similar applications in the LB Camden, of which we are sure he is already aware. See attached document A which lists some of them. Of these, three are within the Fortune Green and West Hampstead NDP Area and are surely are more relevant to this appeal. Indeed as noted in para 1, one rejection applied to an almost identical application on this exact site so we are very surprised that the applicant has resubmitted given the previous ruling.
3. In the most recent applications relating to this site the applicant failed to provide photographs of the site which would have showed that the pavement is not nearly 9 metres wide but in reality is, by our direct measurement, 2.98 metres. There has never been a photo-montage provided of the site post installation of the kiosk so we append pictures we have prepared of the site before and after installation.
4. One of the previous appeal judgements used by the appellants APP/X5990/A/12/2187244, 348 Harrow Road, the examiner notes that the council was concerned by the possible future use of the kiosk for advertising, but the examiner states that the courts have decided that there are other controls to manage advertising. However, we note that the examiner went on to say that he had specified in his decision that the kiosks should be painted black and maintained black for their lives. In the event of approval of this appeal we request a similar condition.
5. We, and apparently most Borough Councils in London, including specifically, Harrow, Camden and Westminster believe that it is completely clear that Maximus' sole purpose for these kiosks is to use them as advertising stands. Given that the applicant insists that they are there as telephone kiosks we cannot understand why they are so large and thus we object to them on the basis of their sheer unnecessary size and lack of transparency. Two

screen prints of the first page of Maximus' website (www.maximus-networks.com) are included.





