

2 Dartmouth Park Road

London NW5 1SY

2nd May 2025

Dear Sirs,

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2025/1375/P FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE OF
LAMORNA ON DARTMOUTH PARK ROAD NW5**

We have lived at 2 Dartmouth Park Road for almost 40 years and are very disturbed by the proposed new development at Lamorna.

We have wide reaching concerns in regard to the impact of the over development of the road - situated in a conservation area - resulting in a significant harm to neighbouring amenity through the proposed development's general lack of relation to its immediate context. There are also clear technical omissions evident in the application - which could result in a worsening impact than calculated in the application - and financial 'gaming' within the viability assessment.

Together, we consider that the development - if permitted - would sit outside Camden, the GLA and national planning policy and ultimate result in severe harm to neighbours and the conservation area being caused as a consequence.

To assist the council with their review, we have set out our principal concerns below. Notwithstanding this, we have a number of other more minor concerns but instead have focused on the areas most damaging to the streetscape and posing the gravest threat to our amenity:

1. Design & Conservation.

The proposed design is incongruous with the balance of the street with the only buildings of comparable height being twice the width and not immediately adjacent. Furthermore, the natural vernacular of the streetscape and building height shifts downwards and this site should reflect that. As such the proposed building is narrow and overbearing, not reflecting the streetscape or drawing from its context.

The council and the DRP have identified this in their written feedback, uploaded on the planning portal - recommending a meaningful set back (or removal) of the uppermost floor. The developer states that they have done so, however when reviewing the design evolution as set out in the DAS, this doesn't appear to be the case - instead, the developer offers very minor modifications that do not extend to the recommendations of the DRP or Camden as the LPA. This rejection of the advice provided demonstrates that the proposed development sits outside of the LPA's position on the building in design and conservation terms. This position is reaffirmed by the proximity of the development to Chetwynd villas - sitting outside of Camden's good practice guidelines.

Whilst the existing building is not attractive as such, we are supportive of its development generally. That said, the proposed development does not respond to the local context, is totally overbearing and thus will cause harm to neighbours and the conservation area as a whole.

2. Omitted technical detailing resulting in further harm.

The application plans propose plant on the ground floor and a lift shaft rising through the building.

In respect of the plant areas on ground floor, in practice, it is improbable that this will be the case and I question if the plant areas have been correctly calculated for the proposed building scale - especially given the further mechanical demands brought about by a proposed basement. This would suggest it would most likely result in being located on the roof - despite little to no roof parapet being allowed for to properly enclose such equipment - exposing neighbours to this impact without protection. Furthermore, no allowance has been made - and in fact omitted from the sections and elevations - for a lift overrun space on the roof.

We understand that a lift overrun (and the plant allocation) can be quite extensive - thus resulting in further height and therefore further harm being brought about by the proposed development when the building is advanced through detailed design, condition discharge and further variations.

The LPA should challenge the developer in this regard prior to considering this development as submitted as we would otherwise expect further height enhancements post its determination.

3. Basement Impact Assessment

The applicant's proposed basement is accepted in principle to enable further density without the resultant harm to neighbouring amenity that the upper most floor creates. However, the Basement Impact Assessment set out is light touch and whilst it creates the appearance of considered development doesn't actually grade the impact of the development in terms of anticipated soil movement and impact to neighbouring amenity. This has the potential to cause further harm to the conservation area and us as immediate neighbours if not addressed properly. We would accept this being clearly conditioned if the developer is confident of minimal impact however would ask for protections from the LPA in this respect.

4. Affordable Housing

We are generally pro development and supportive of the recent changes to the NPPF that enable development in complex areas so long as the developer is bringing forward affordable housing. The current proposed scheme - and its accompanying viability assessment makes a mockery of this intention through its assumptions.

The assessment demonstrates depressed sales values at £900psf (far below the expected level for existing housing - before applying any new build premium) and the increased Profit on Cost assumption (reducing the land value) of 25% - which in our understanding, post planning consent should be 17.5%-20%.

On a qualitative level, it is also worth considering why the developer would be bringing forward affordable housing development - at huge expense - if it was indeed unprofitable to the degree set out.

This is gaming of a system designed to support local people, and we implore the council to interrogate this further. Notwithstanding the policy position, if the development is brought

forward on this basis, we would suggest an overage be applied to catch up a PIL in the event the developer exceeds the sales values set out in the appraisal.

In summary, the principle of development is accepted but the site's location in a conservation area, the incongruous and juxtaposing nature of the development to a clear context within the streetscape and the lack of detailed analysis around its impact - resulting in the risk of it increasing in height, noise impact and soil movement; when coupled with the developer not responding fully to the LPA and DRP requests to reduce the building mass demonstrate its severe impact on the conservation area and neighbouring amenity.

Finally, this development will affect us significantly as it will block sunlight in the morning and this is self-evident if you care to visit the site.

Correcting mis statements in the application, our house is 3 storeys not 4.

We request that the developer withdraws the current plans and works with the local community and a heritage team to reconfigure this application.

Yours faithfully

Peter and Antonia Leach