

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/2515/P	Lucy Findlay	01/07/2024 12:19:33	OBJ	<p>As a neighbour of this address I would like to object to the design and size of the proposed outbuilding in this application.</p> <p>The D&A statement says "there is no planning history relating to Flat 2, 47 Compayne Gardens". This is not true - there have been recent approvals to (i) approve the felling of a highly visually attractive mature cherry tree (ii) extension of the basement, terrace, and patio areas further into the rear garden.</p> <p>Also notable are the precedents for "garden houses"/outbuildings etc in nearby properties - the D&A statement is remiss in mentioning that these rooms are all in gardens which are double the width of the garden at no.47 - which has been divided into two and is therefore half the width of the others listed. What is also a shame, but historic, is that the garden has been divided by ugly wooden panelled fencing and the divide between no. 47 and no.49 Compayne Gardens should be a brick wall as per the original conservation area but was replaced by a wooden fence sometime ago.</p> <p>The proposed design of the "outbuilding" is in contradiction to Camden policies D1 and D2 - it is not of the "highest standard of design" nor will it "preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area". Being screened by proposed planting does not negate the need for a higher standard of design.</p> <p>The use of the proposed "outbuilding" is also unclear - garden room, ancilliary residential use, kids den? Will it have plumbing and electrics? What will the colour of the cladding be? Why are there so few windows? If it is a garden shed it is too large.</p> <p>In terms of the scale of the building- it is too large for the half width garden and its height is beyond that which was approved for no. 43 Compayne Gardens. The outbuilding approved at no. 43 was reduced in height to below 3m - the same should apply for no.47</p>

Total: 4