

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|--------------------|--|---------------------|---------|---|
| 2025/1375/P | Steve Pares | 17 DARTMOUTH PARK ROAD | 22/04/2025 16:22:41 | OBJ | <p>- I have no objection to Lamorna being demolished as I have always felt it was an odd building for this area and something of an eyesore. However, it is at least relatively small and only accommodates one household; whereas the proposed new property seems about 4 times larger, would include 6 households, and in my opinion would be an even worse eyesore.</p> <p>- The artist's image looks to me totally out of keeping with the other neighbouring properties - I'd describe it as 'gaudy' - and the proposal for 6 new properties, while other properties here have no more than 4, is simply too many. This is clearly due to the developers trying to make as much money out of it as possible.</p> <p>- Aside from those objections, I am concerned that the demolition and construction process will be very long, cause much disruption in what is a very constricted area, and, worst of all, potentially impede essential services, esp ambulances. That end of DRP is effectively a cul-de-sac for all vehicles except for emergency services, so the numerous lorries etc will all have to both enter and leave the same way from the east; it is therefore hard to imagine that they will not create many issues and block the whole of the road for certain periods. That would present an unacceptable level of disturbance and risk.</p> <p>- For the above reasons I consider the proposed new development totally inappropriate and undesirable.</p> |
| 2025/1375/P | Giles Gavin Martin | 5c Cubitt Street Camden London WC1X 0LJ | 22/04/2025 11:36:41 | OBJ | <p>Dear Sir/Madam, I would like to object to this application in the strongest terms. I am an architect and Camden Resident, as well as a frequent user of all of the amenities of the local area including the nearby Heath. I am an admirer of the quality of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and the work Camden have put into preserving this over decades. The CA is praised for its consistency; In the conservation area Appraisal and Management Statement, only one building is noted for not enhancing the CA on Dartmouth Park Road, a fairly anonymous but sympathetically scaled 1960s block midway up. Surely Camden cannot consider this over-scaled and over detailed block as enhancing the CA? it is harmful, both in scale and detail. The area is known for its well considered Victorian villas, none of these stand out and shout 'look at me' and these contribute to the rare consistency of the area. The design is inconsistent with the character of the Conservation Area, represents over-development of a small constrained site, will cause over-shading and loss of daylight issues to the houses behind due to its height. The balconies to the penthouse levels, as well as being inconsistent with the area will cause an overlooking issue to all perimeter houses and gardens. Please don't consider this application for approval, the site is adequate only for a single family house which already exists. It would be unsustainable to demolish it just to build another.</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|---------|--|
| 2025/1375/P | Harry Raikes | 5 Chetwynd Villas Chetwynd Road London NW5 1BT | 22/04/2025 11:25:27 | OBJ | <p>I am writing as the resident of 5 Chetwynd Villas to object to the above planning application. While I do not oppose redevelopment in principle, I have serious concerns regarding the proposed building's scale, height, and orientation, which would have a significant and harmful impact on the privacy and enjoyment of my home and garden.</p> <p>The planning documents provide extensive analysis of the development's impact on Dartmouth Park Road and the Conservation Area. However, they largely overlook the effect on properties to the rear—my home included—aside from a basic daylight study. I have reviewed the drawings on the Council's planning portal and, with the help of my consultant, produced a plan illustrating the proposed massing as seen from the first floor of my property (image sent to Daren Zuk).</p> <p>The proposed five-storey building would tower over my garden. With windows on the second, third, fourth, and fifth floors facing the rear, there will be constant and intrusive overlooking into my private space. The existing two-storey dwelling to be replaced has a rear garden depth of just 3.8m. This modest separation will effectively be lost under the new proposal, reducing the back-to-back distance between properties from approximately 17.7m to 14.7m. Combined with the proposed height of 15m, this creates an oppressive and overbearing relationship that will severely impact the use and enjoyment of my outdoor space and undermine my privacy.</p> <p>The applicant's own Daylight and Sunlight Assessment confirms a 11.15% loss of daylight to our kitchen window—a significant impact for a room already naturally quite dark and heavily used. While the BRE guidelines suggest that losses over 20% are unacceptable, even smaller reductions can be materially harmful where existing light levels are already limited. Additionally, although the applicant claims sunlight will not be affected due to the garden's northerly aspect, our garden in fact faces north-west, receiving valuable evening light—particularly during summer months. This means the proposed building would likely reduce sunset exposure, further diminishing our ability to enjoy the garden in the late afternoons and evenings.</p> <p>Should the Council consider granting permission for this development in any form, we request that all rear-facing windows above the first floor be fitted with obscure privacy glass and made non-opening below 1.7 metres. This would provide a basic level of protection against intrusive overlooking and help preserve the privacy of neighbouring gardens and homes. While this measure would not eliminate the overbearing presence of the building, it is an essential mitigation step if the development is approved.</p> <p>In addition, a mature, protected hawthorn tree at the end of our garden is at risk from the proposed basement excavation. The application lacks an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and fails to detail how the tree's roots will be protected. Without clear evidence that proper root protection zones will be respected during construction, the tree remains vulnerable to damage or loss. This would not only be a loss of ecological and visual amenity, but also a breach of planning guidance relating to biodiversity and tree protection within a Conservation Area.</p> <p>The proposed building, is significantly taller and narrower than its neighbours, making it appear out of scale and visually intrusive. The Heritage Impact Assessment downplays this effect—for example, by referring to a “modest” top-floor setback, when the result is still a five-storey</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|---------|---|
| | | | | | <p>structure. It is difficult to see how a building of this bulk and height can be said to respond positively to the surrounding three-storey townhouses that define this part of Dartmouth Park Road. Unlike the more formal four-storey terraces on Highgate Road, this stretch of Dartmouth Park Road is modest and residential in scale.</p> <p>The proposal is inconsistent with the character of the Conservation Area, and its height and massing risk setting a precedent that could undermine the area's architectural integrity. This would be detrimental not only to the area's visual identity, but to its status as a designated Conservation Area.</p> <p>The scheme also conflicts with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), which requires development to enhance local context and respond positively to local distinctiveness in terms of layout, scale, appearance, and form. This proposal fails to do so, and instead disrupts the street hierarchy and character of the area.</p> <p>Furthermore, the application lacks a detailed Construction Management Plan, despite the significant works proposed—including basement excavation and a five-storey build. Without clear measures to manage construction traffic, noise, dust, and working hours, there is a serious risk of prolonged disruption to residents on and around Dartmouth Park Road and Chetwynd Villas. We would like to request that reasonable working hours be enforced during the construction phase, with no work taking place on weekends and bank holidays, to minimise disruption.</p> <p>The proposal includes mechanical plant, such as heat exchangers, but the accompanying Noise Impact Assessment is inadequate. It does not properly evaluate the potential for continuous or intermittent noise, particularly affecting neighbouring gardens and internal living spaces. Without robust mitigation measures and clear assurances that noise levels will remain within acceptable limits, this element of the development poses a risk of ongoing noise pollution, further impacting residents' quality of life.</p> <p>In terms of housing delivery, the scheme falls short of meeting Camden's strategic needs. It focuses on small units and fails to provide family-sized homes. The applicant's own Financial Viability Assessment also raises doubts about the delivery of any affordable housing, contrary to Camden and London Plan policy objectives.</p> <p>There is also evidence of insufficient community consultation. Despite requesting a meeting myself several times with the developers before the planning application was submitted, we received no response whatsoever. This lack of reply suggests that the developers actively chose to ignore local residents and proceed without any engagement. Effective consultation is essential to address concerns and incorporate community feedback into the design process. The failure to undertake this step undermines the legitimacy of the proposal and indicates a disregard for the views and wellbeing of the surrounding community.</p> <p>At a minimum, the proposal should be substantially reduced in height, ideally through the removal of multiple floors. This would significantly reduce the visual dominance and overlooking</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|------------------|--|---------------------|---------|--|
| | | | | | impacts, restore privacy, and better reflect the surrounding building scale. It would also make the construction process less disruptive and reduce the potential for environmental damage. A smaller, more respectful scheme would demonstrate sensitivity to local heritage, ensure protection of important trees, and help maintain the character of the Conservation Area. |
| | | | | | Unless all of the above issues are addressed—including a meaningful reduction in building height —this application should not be granted planning permission. |
| 2025/1375/P | lindsey Anderson | 9 Woodsome Road London NW5 1RX | 22/04/2025 16:48:03 | COMMNT | This is clearly a case of over development in a conservation area, it doesn't seem in keeping with the local architecture and instead would dominate that part of the road. The disproportionate height looks to overshadow already tall buildings and I believe it would be unsympathetic. |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|---------|---|
| 2025/1375/P | Michael Pawlyn | Top Floor Grove End House 150 Highgate Road NW5 1PD NW5 1PD | 22/04/2025 19:16:44 | OBJ | <p>I object to the Lamorna development on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Excessive / inappropriate scale for a Conservation Area 2. Negative impact on Listed Buildings 3. Negative environmental impacts / weak sustainability commitments <p>I can substantiate these as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Excessive / inappropriate scale for a Conservation Area It is totally inappropriate to place a 5-storey tower between a 3-storey building and a 2-storey building in a Conservation Area. It is common for developers to first submit something absurd (5-storeys) in order to then compromise by taking one level off. The Lamorna development should be 3-storeys and no more. There are a lot of inconsistencies in the documents about heights of buildings (for instance p26 in the Design and Access Statement) which describes many surrounding buildings as higher than they are in terms of storey heights. This creates a misleading impression of the development's impact. Most of the surrounding buildings are 3-storeys or less. 2. Negative impact on Listed Buildings The Heritage statement is incorrect when it states on p16 "There are no other designated heritage assets close to the Site that are likely to be impacted by the proposed replacement of the existing building". Grove End House is Grade II listed and will be negatively affected by this new tower development. The whole of Grove Terrace is also listed. 3. Negative environmental impacts / weak sustainability commitments The sustainability commitments are weak and in some cases contradictory. The report makes no commitment to zero carbon; only an evasive comment that "the development proposals will be capable of being zero carbon". This weak statement is undermined by the fact (confirmed in the application form) that all units will be connected to gas. The location of 6 ASHP's within an acoustically rated louvred enclosure will either create substantial noise impacts on First House or, if they are acoustically contained, they will be operating at low efficiency because there will not be the necessary through-flow of air. ASHP's need to be in the open air to operate at anything approaching optimum efficiency. The use of ASHP's does not come with any commitment that they will not be used for cooling. In cooling mode the 6 ASHP's would result in serious overheating impacts on the adjacent property (First House). The statements about biodiversity are similarly weak. The sustainability report states that "Additional habitat could be created above ground level such as the provision of bird and bat boxes" but there is no commitment to actually do so. Overall, the development will result in significant negative impacts and is not consistent with the quoted definition of sustainability which is "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." The weak commitments to energy, biodiversity and materials on this development are consistent with a mindset of 'mitigating negatives' which will definitely compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. <p>For the above reasons this application should be rejected and redesigned as a 3-storey scheme with stronger sustainability commitments.</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|---------|----------|
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|---------|----------|
