

Jessie Watson
2 Chetwynd Villas
25 April 2025

Planning Department
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

Re: Objection to Planning Application for the Proposed Development
at Lamorna, Dartmouth Park Road, NW5

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development at the
Lamorna site on Dartmouth Park Road, NW5.

We understand that the stated aim of the proposed Lamorna
development is to increase the number of residential units in the
Borough. While there is an acknowledged shortage of housing—
particularly affordable housing—in both Camden and London more
broadly, this particular site is one of the least appropriate locations for
such development. It is extremely small, just 182 square metres, and
located within a conservation area.

The proposal is not suitable nor keeping to the type of area.
Brownfield sites can and should be developed sensibly. However,
constructing an oversized, high-end block on such a constrained site,
in a way that clearly disregards the character of the area and the well-
being of its residents, is not the right approach.

The site's limited size and its proximity to neighbouring homes mean
there is minimal opportunity to add housing without causing
significant harm to the surrounding properties. Any development must
be sensitive to the context, especially to nearby Chetwynd Villas, First

House, and the other properties along this part of Dartmouth Park Road. The developer's claim that the building aligns with the Victorian villas further east on Dartmouth Park Road is misleading and fails to acknowledge the true context of the site, which is framed by much smaller-scale housing on three sides.

Of particular concern is the impact on homes along Chetwynd Road. From the rear, the new development would appear bulky, overbearing, and block much of the sky view. The developer has incorrectly stated the orientation of the gardens belonging to the Chetwynd Villas houses as northerly, when they are actually north-west facing—meaning evening sunlight would be reduced for several homes.

Moreover, the proposal would decrease the back-to-back distance between properties from approximately 17.7m to 14.7m, while increasing the building's height to 15m. This would severely compromise privacy and result in an oppressive, over-scaled relationship with neighbouring dwellings.

In its current form, the proposal is grossly out of proportion with Lamorna, Chetwynd Villas, and First House, and fails to respect the modest, varied scale of this end of Dartmouth Park Road. The verticality and massing are at odds with the horizontal balance and rhythm of surrounding semi-detached houses. It is highly questionable whether this development satisfies the legal requirement to “preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.”

This proposal is a textbook example of overdevelopment—driven more by financial return than respect for local context. Approving it would set a dangerous precedent for similar inappropriate developments in conservation areas across Camden.

Finally, it's disappointing that repeated requests to meet with the developers before the application was submitted went unanswered. At the very least, this scheme must be significantly reduced in height—

ideally with several storeys removed—to lessen its visual and privacy impacts, and to better align with the scale and character of the neighbourhood.

Best,
Jessie Watson