Good evening,

I am taking this opportunity to register my objection to the proposed demolition and subsequent development of the Lamorna site.

My family and I live at 1 Dartmouth Park Road, and after thoughtful consideration believe that this development will have a negative impact on the Dartmouth Park Conservation area (residents, wildlife and the environment in general).

We as a family cannot see how this development will be a positive step for the neighbourhood. The development in question will most certainly not be used for affordable housing, plus on reviewing the proposed plans stands completely out of line with the existing building in the immediate vicinity, it will not enhance nor maintain the character of the area.

Please see below further points to support mine and my family's objection:
1. previous owners of Lamorna had submitted plans to Camden Council to have an extension above the garage (ie. an extra bedroom), both times Camden Council rejected the plans. Camden council needs to explain as to why small extensions were rejected, however, a large development is now being favourably considered. An example of a submission is: 2007/1042/P Lamorna Dartmouth Park Road London NW5 1SU Erection of an extension on top of existing garage to create a habitable room to single family dwelling house (C3).

2. the construction of the proposed structure will cause environmental damage to the conservation area, in terms of construction (vans/trucks, builders, obstruction to pedestrians - which will take around 2 years). There will also be noise pollution from the building works taking place. All this will have an impact on not only humans but wildlife in the area as well.

3. the proposed structure will be comprised of 6 apartments. That's 6 new sets of sewerage works, 12 new refuse/recycling bins and the potential for more cars to be in the road (be it visitors or vehicles belonging to the apartment).
4. mine and family's privacy will be negatively impacted by this structure being built.
5. the structure isn't in alignment with the conservation area (put it this way, to my knowledge in order for me to change my sash windows I have to consult with the council to ensure that I put in the correct type of windows to confirm with the conservation area).

Other points to consider:

* the developers have largely overlooked the effect on properties to the rear (Chetwynd Road side)—aside from a basic daylight study. They have also stated that the Chetwynd Villa gardens are northerly facing, when in reality they are North-West facing. This means the proposed building would likely reduce evening sunlight for multiple houses on Chetwynd Road
* The existing two-storey dwelling being replaced has a rear garden depth of 3.8m.

Under the new proposal, the back-to-back distance between buildings would shrink from approximately 17.7m to 14.7m. Combined with a proposed height of 15m, this creates an oppressive and overbearing relationship that would severely compromise ours and our neighbours privacy
* 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
* We have a mature, protected hawthorn tree at the end of our garden that is at risk from the proposed basement excavation. The application lacks an Arboriculture 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. I know that our neighbours have a large Ginkgo tree as well that would most likely be affected
* The proposal also includes a mechanical plant/several heat exchangers which would cause on going noise pollution for us and our neighbours
* A meeting with the developers has been requested several times before the planning application was submitted, no response was given.

When describing our buildings they include basements (and loft spaces) as storeys. They therefore call our houses 5 storeys.

Yet when describing their proposed building they exclude their basement as a storey, calling theirs 5 storeys too.

So, by using different metrics to suit their purposes, they describe their buildings as 5 storeys, and our buildings as 5 storeys. This makes it feels reasonable and comparative.

However the reality is theirs is a 6 floor building. And ours are 5 floors (with one of those floors being an eaved loft with restricted head heights for the most part - so not useable as an apartment as their top floor is to be).

I await to hear Camden Councils thoughts on this issue.

Regards,

N. Nichola