Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	Camron Aref-Adib	Camden Town Hall	02/05/2025 09:56:11	COMM	As a local ward councillor for Highgate, I would like to share my support for some of the concerns raised by residents regarding this planning application. My primary concerns relate to the potential loss of light and privacy for neighbouring homes—particularly those on Dartmouth Park Road and Chetwynd Road. The proposed development, especially the rear elevation, raises the risk of overlooking – and I ask that planners look closely at such risk, seeking the appropriate mitigations. Local people are concerned about the height of the building in comparison to the neighbouring terrace and I recognise their concerns. In addition, there must be clear and robust assurances that the proposed basement excavation will not compromise the structural integrity of adjacent properties. I am also concerned about the disruption that may arise during demolition and construction. I urge planners to seek strong commitments to mitigate the impacts of dust, noise, and general disturbance on local residents throughout the construction period. Finally, I seek assurances that the developer will commit to the highest possible standards in minimising carbon emissions during demolition, and to high standards of energy efficiency and environmental sustainability in the proposed new building.
2025/1375/P	Caroline Bloch	9, Grove Terrace NW5 1PH	02/05/2025 11:15:23	OBJ	I object to this planning applicaation on the grounds that: -It is a considerable over-development of a small site -A modest family house is to be replaced by a building to accomodate 20 people -The balconies and terraces will overlook neighbouring houses and gardens -Such a tall building is completely out of character with the local conservation area -The drainage plans show that very old drains at the rear of nos 1-5 Grove Terrace are to be used. These date from the first half of the 19th centuery and are unlikely to be able to accomodate all the extra water, causing flooding to the basements of those houses. Local people believe that the council will ask for a few modifications and let the plan through. This is ver disheartening.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	Anthony Nichola	1 Dartmouth Park Road	03/05/2025 11:29:57	OBJ	This scheme is a large imposition in what is and has been a tranquil, characterful residential thoroughfare for over a century. The immediate area is also densely populated and there are other areas within the borough that could and should be redeveloped. This scheme is so tall, it blocks out both sunlight and daylight. It's not in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. By virtue of scale, mass, positioning, height and materiality. Furthermore, it is unsustainable to knock down an existing building and drilling below ground level screams negligence for the surrounding foundations. To think this is fair and reasonable to do, is negligent. If all the above is not enough. They have the audacity to incorporate windows up the side of the building so that residents within this towering obstruction can overlook not just my garden, but almost the whole street. It makes no sense. This scheme would be detrimental to what is a peaceful London location. As noted above. There are other better suited locations where the council can meet their affordable housing, amenity space and biodiversity requirements instead of forcing a grossly overdeveloped plot.
2025/1375/P	Caroline Jacobs	56 Croftdown Road Nw51en Nw51en	02/05/2025 15:15:26	COMMNT	I oppose this application. The proposal is a gross overdevelopment of the site. Six household units in place of one. This will bring a big increase in noise and traffic for neighbours. The proposed new building is too bulky and too high. It will block light from adjacent properties and lead to overlooking for them. The design is not in keeping with the Dartmouth pk conservation style or character.
2025/1375/P	richard j murphy	10 Boscastle Road NW5 1EG NW5 1EG	03/05/2025 15:23:23	COMMNT	OBJECT The design fails to preserve and enhance the character or appearance of the Dartmouth park conservation area due to is height, bulk and mass. The scheme represents overdevelopment of this small site and would result in an unsympathetic and dominant addition to the conservation area. It would cause overlooking, loss of daylight and noise impact to neighbouring properties and may precipitate the sale of surrounding large Victorian houses to developers triggering an irreversible change in the character of the area.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	Jerome Gautrais	5 Chetwynd road NW5 1BX London 5 Chetwynd road NW5 1BX	03/05/2025 17:12:08	OBJ	Objection to Planning Application 2025/1375/P — Lamorna, Dartmouth Park Road NW5 Dear Planning Officer, I write to object strongly to Planning Application 2025/1375/P for the redevelopment of Lamorna, Dartmouth Park Road, NW5 1SU. This proposal would cause significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents, undermine the special character of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, do not comply with multiple policies of Camden's Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and Conservation Area principles. I respectfully request Camden Council to refuse this application for the following reasons: 1. Overdevelopment: Excessive Mass for a Small Site The site area is small 9one of the smallest in the area), yet the proposal seeks to insert a five-storey plus basement block containing six flats leading to a gross overdevelopment. Camden's Local Plan encourages higher densities only in designated growth areas like Camden Town or West Hampstead, not in sensitive conservation areas like Dartmouth Park. The existing house already covers around 75% of the site - greater than most homes in the area - demonstrating an over-utilisation. The applicant's claim of "brownfield" regeneration is misleading; Lamorna is a well-functioning family home, not derelict land. 2. Overbearing Bulk and Dominance The building's height and mass far exceed the two and three-storey buildings nearby. It would significantly reduce back-to-back distances with Chetwynd Villas, breaching Camden's good practice standard. It would cause severe loss of sky visibility, diminished privacy, and an oppressive presence for neighbours over all Chetwynd road. Late afternoon and evening sun into rear gardens would be permanently blocked. 3. Daylight and Sunlight: Misleading and Inadequate Assessment The submitted Daylight and Sunlight Report ignores key properties, notably 5 Chetwynd Road. The orientation of gardens is incorrectly described as "north-facing" — in fact, they are

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response

northwest-facing, relying heavily on evening light.

Even the developer admits that the proposed basement flat fails to achieve daylight standards.

Camden's guidance requires the 25° daylight rule to be met; the proposal fails this test and has not been amended despite pre-application warnings.

4. Harm to Dartmouth Park Conservation Area

The proposed building disrupts the balanced urban grain of Dartmouth Park, introducing a massively disproportionate height and inappropriate modernist façade. It would erase historic rhythms of gaps, greenery, and detached forms that define the Conservation Area.

National and Camden policies require all developments in Conservation Areas to preserve or enhance - not harm - their special character.

Approval would create a dangerous precedent, undermining Conservation Area protections borough-wide.

5. Additional Environmental and Social Harms

Many additional harms can be listed:
- Noise pollution risks from six external heat pumps close to living spaces.
- No arboricultural survey provided, risking damage to protected trees.
- No affordable housing delivered, despite the scale of disruption and impact.
- Two years of disruption expected from extensive basement excavation, harming resident wellbeing.

The scheme fails to contribute positively to the borough's social or environmental sustainability goals.

Final Conclusion

This application offers no public benefit to outweigh its many harms. It is a clear-cut case of inappropriate, excessive development that fails at every planning test.

In the spirit of Camden's commitment to protecting its built heritage and residential communities, I respectfully urge you to refuse Planning Application 2025/1375/P.

Yours sincerely,
Jerome Gautrais
5 Chetwynd road
NW5 1BX London

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	Jeremy Cave	27 Dartmouth Park Road	03/05/2025 18:45:54	OBJ	Objection to Planning Application 2025/1375/P – Lamorna Development I strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of Lamorna on the grounds that it represents significant overdevelopment and is wholly inappropriate for its setting within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The proposed scheme is excessively tall, bulky, and dense, bearing no resemblance to the modest scale of surrounding properties, and entirely out of keeping with the architectural character of the area. The development would cause material harm to neighbours by breaching daylight and sunlight standards (including Camden's 25-degree rule), introducing severe overlooking due to inadequate separation distances, and visually dominating adjacent heritage buildings. The design is unsympathetic, incorporating incongruous modern elements such as oversized windows and arches, and fails to preserve or enhance the conservation area as required by local policy. Moreover, the application is misleading in its presentation of surrounding building heights and justifications for the scheme's financial viability. The proposal prioritises profit over appropriate, sustainable development and would set a dangerous precedent for further erosion of conservation area protections. I urge Camden Council to reject this application.
2025/1375/P	A Evans	47 Dartmouth Park Hill NW5 1JB	04/05/2025 23:22:29	OBJ	I object to the proposal. This is a heavy-handed over-development of a small site, towering above the neighbouring buildings and gardens. The design is intrusive, bulky and bears no relationship to the local architecture. The enclave at the lower end of Dartmouth Park Road / Chetwynd Road (ie Chetwynd Villas, Lamorna and First House) is one of 2-storey dwellings with pitched / curved roofs. To maintain this consistency, any replacement building should be limited to the same. This proposal is wholly inappropriate and would make a mockery of the Conservation Area.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	Neil Aberdeen	13 Dartmouth Park Road NW5 1SU	04/05/2025 09:47:43	OBJ	I object to the proposed redevelopment of Lamorna on the following grounds: 1. Mischaracterisation of the Site The applicant's claim that Lamorna constitutes a "brownfield site" is factually incorrect and misleading. The property is currently a fully habitable, high-value four-bedroom family home — described in the owners' own marketing materials as a "stunning residence" commanding circa £5,000 per calendar month in rent. To categorise such a property as brownfield is a gross misapplication of planning terminology and appears intended to obscure the true nature of the development. 2. Contradiction of Sustainability and Conservation Principles The demolition of a structurally sound home for the purposes of constructing a block of luxury flats is neither sustainable nor in keeping with the principles of conservation. Sustainability in planning should prioritise the reuse and improvement of existing buildings wherever possible. The wholesale replacement of Lamorna would result in significant embodied carbon loss and sets a troubling precedent for similar speculative redevelopments. 3. Overdevelopment and Negative Precedent The proposed scheme represents an overdevelopment of a constrained site. The scale and bulk of the proposed structure would dominate its setting, disrupting the character of the surrounding area. Such development risks contributing to the broader erosion of London's architectural and social fabric — a pattern already visible across many boroughs. 4. Alternative, Genuine Brownfield Opportunities Exist If the applicant's intention is truly to promote sustainability and housing delivery, there are actual brownfield sites in the immediate vicinity that would be far more appropriate. One such example is the recent and successful redevelopment of the former petrol station on Highgate Road, now transformed into The Arches — a model of appropriate infill development. 5. Willingness to Support Modest, Sensible Development I would not object to a thoughtful refurbishment or modest extension of Lamorna, provided its fundamental footprint and character are preserved. However, the current proposal far exceeds what could reasonably be described as sympathetic or proportionate. For the reasons outlined above, I urge the planning authority to refuse this application and uphold its commitment to genuine sustainability, architectural integrity, and responsible development.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	Kim Roper	Flat C 12-14 St Albans Road London NW5 1RD	04/05/2025 18:33:40	OBJ	Dear Members of the Planning Committee, I object to the proposed development within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, which falls significantly short of Camden's planning policy requirements. Developments in this area must preserve or enhance the character and appearance of their surroundings. This proposal does neither. The scheme proposes a five-storey building with a basement on a highly constrained site between two existing residential properties. The scale/size is entirely out of keeping with the area, creating an overbearing structure that would block natural light and dominate neighbouring homes. The plot is simply not suitable for a development of this size and intensity. The inclusion of six ground-level heat pumps near adjoining residences raises serious concerns about long-term noise pollution. The basement element fails to meet Camden's guidance for daylight and sunlight access and could pose a potential flood risk. In addition to its failure on design and environmental grounds, the proposal would place further strain on already overstretched local infrastructure. Introducing six new dwellings in one building will increase pressure on local services, including waste management, water, and transport networks. Parking, in particular, is already at a premium in the area, exacerbated by the high number of houses in multiple occupation and the constant influx of visitors to Hampstead Heath and Highgate Cemetery. Adding further residential units without any consideration for parking provision or mitigation will significantly worsen the situation for existing residents. Equally troubling is the lack of any social or affordable housing component in the proposal. Camden continues to approve private developments that do not reflect the urgent local need for social housing. This application offers no benefit to the wider community and only deepens the imbalance between market-driven development and community-focused planning. In summary, the proposal is inappropriate in scale, design, and impact. It fails to meet conservation area guidelines, contributes nothing to local housing needs, and threatens to overwhelm already pressured infrastructure and amenities. I respectfully urge the committee to reject this application in the interests of the community and the long-term integrity of the area.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	Benedict Cumberbatch & Sophie Hunter	29 Dartmouth Park Road London NW5 1SU	02/05/2025 17:13:43	COMMNT	OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 2025/1375/P FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE OF LAMORNA ON DARTMOUTH PARK ROAD NW5 BENEDICT CUMBERBATCH AND SOPHIE HUNTER APRIL 2025 We are objecting to the planning application for the redevelopment of the site of Lamonra on Dartmouth Park Road for several reasons. The proposed redevelopment is out of keeping with the architectural style of the area and will disrupt the aesthetic of the street but will be directly in opposition to the nature of a conversation area, due to it's size, as well as it's architectural details. You only have to look at the adjacent properties to see the difference in style, materials, colours and feel to the local area. Another concern is over development on a site that is too small and does not have the infrastructure to cope, especially with strains on local resources. There is already limited parking on the road and the traffic can be heavy. We want this to continue being a road that has awareness for it's more elderly residents and also children and by adding this development, the roads will not be as safe. This is before you start to address the issues with dust, noise, light, pollution and security hazards and risk this introduces to the area. We are also concerned about privacy on the road it faces but also Chetwynd Roads residences that it will tower over as it is at a point where Dartmouth Park Road and Chetwynd Road narrow to a closer proximity, hence the current Lamorna building is considerate of those conditions. The new development will dwarf houses on both roads, this will have an effect on the residences rights to privacy in their gardens and the interior of their homes as they are overlooked at several heights and angles. The proposed building goes well above and beyond the existing height of any property in the area. The windows and balconies will proceed to look directly onto adjacent properties and gardens. Furthermore, due to the height of the proposed building, this will affect daylight and sunlight that residents currently receive in their homes and gardens. The daily life of the existing residents will be impacted because of the additional services now required to serve this property. New electricity, water and drainage works will be required which has not been considered. Plus, the location of the rubbish and recycling is not defined which is a major concern for this very clean road – where will the bins for six flats be located. The approval of this planning would also set a precedent for the area. For example, could I now demolish my property and replace it with flats and not require the same extensive planning approval. Or worse, the properties that are located behind this proposal on Chetwynd Road could apply to be demolished with an even bigger property that this proposal being submitted to form a MEGA development.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	A Carolan	Dartmouth Park Rd	04/05/2025 08:01:35	COMMNT	This application should be rejected as an inappropriate design for the surrounding Conservation Area. Proposed plan is too close to road, unlike existing properties which all have front gardens the setting houses back from street. The proposed building is too high for its position - the proposal wrongly suggests it's in keeping with surrounding houses but it will have more floors with the basement included. Existing homes have light wells to their basements due to the front gardens, which this design does not. Looking up Dartmouth Park Rd towards Highgate Rd the street view will be vastly altered - instead of tapering gently down the building heights will jump up, changing the rhythm of rooflines and view of sky, feeling oppressive and blocking out light. Sight lines through to the backs of Chetwynd Rd, which are part of the Area's charm, featuring as it does semi detached villas, will also be lost. It would have an effect on surrounding properties in terms of light, especially neighbours in Chetwynd Rd who back on to the property. Too many flats are designed to squeeze within the footprint: high volume housing is not in keeping with the area and will cause noise and parking problems, particularly being so close to the emergency ambulance route close by. Given that the development is not even providing affordable housing but seemingly designed purely for the profit of the developer, it should be rejected by Camden in order to preserve the valuable and particular character of the Conservation Area. This design would surely set a precedent for further future erosion of the special historical architectural characteristics of this unique part of Camden .

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	Sharis Nickols	9 Dartmouth Park Road NW5 1SU	04/05/2025 10:09:02	OBJ	The open character of the Conservation Area is mainly secured by the distancing of all building lines when the land was reclaimed. The intention from the very beginning was to avoid typical speculative back-to-back areas. Within that structured openness each road contributes to the heritage significance and open feel of the area. In the case of Dartmouth Park Road, all the main buildings were built on low ground beside the raised road. All these buildings are set back from the road, first to allow for front gardens and secondly to allow for light wells for the ground or garden floor level. The arrangements are mirrored on both sides of the road. The effect of this is to create an impression that the road is wider than it is in fact. Lady Dartmouth took advantage of this to continue planting her large plane trees in the road, something she had started in front of the Georgian terrace when she enclosed the land. The openness of Dartmouth Park Road is further reinforced by the fact that the mirrored pairs of villas are detached with wide gaps between the paired villas. This has the effect of sharing the long spaces behind the houses. Through these gaps, it is possible to see the backs of the distant line of houses. In the case of the applicant site, the open land behind the road slopes away downhill to the south and west. Viewed from the modest terrace in Chetwynd Road, itself an unharmed good example of positive building in the Conservation Area, the land slopes upwards, meaning the applicant building is on top of the slope and would be unacceptably oppressive to its neighbours. The applicant’s building would be contrary to the whole purpose of the initiative of separate building lines. Dartmouth Park Road is broadly typical of the Conservation Area roads; for example, in the next road, Boscastle Road, the houses are similarly situated back behind gardens. So strong a feature is this setback and adjacent opening between buildings that even in the site created by Mr Hitler's bombing in Dartmouth Park Road it is respected. Particularly at this time of year, the front gardens are a riot of colour from blossom trees and from flowered shrubs and from the wisteria creepers which soften the facades of buildings. The current site for the application building already contains a set back and garden, it is just that the developer has chosen to develop over it. In the one exception to the mirroring of the set back building line and gardens, we find instead the long garden of the Grove Terrace buildings. These stretch back the length of the terrace and the length of Boscastle Rd and explain why number 1 Dartmouth Park Road is the first house on that side of the road. The open land behind the houses and gardens continues to perform its traditional functions of being a soakaway for rainwater and is also host to further trees. Taken with the large plane trees, these trees and the trees in the small front gardens mean that the conservation area is as described in the Neighbourhood Plan as “open and leafy” and has a density of trees more typical

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					of forests than urban areas. Neighbourhood cats allowing, it is a haven for insects, birds and other wildlife. I strongly object to the proposed development, which would cause serious harm to the character, appearance, and heritage significance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The area was deliberately designed with open spaces, generous building setbacks, and detached villas separated by wide gaps, creating a distinctive and spacious environment. This openness is a defining feature of the Conservation Area and contributes to its “open and leafy” character, as described in the Neighbourhood Plan. The application site currently respects this pattern, with a garden and setback that the developer now proposes to build over. On Dartmouth Park Road, all main buildings are set back from the road to allow for gardens and light wells, enhancing the streetscape and ensuring visual and physical openness. The proposed development would build to the edge of the pavement, disrupting the consistent building line, eroding green space, and undermining key characteristics of the area. Furthermore, the site sits on a slope and would tower over neighbouring properties on Chetwynd Road, creating an oppressive presence and contradicting the original design intention of maintaining openness through staggered building lines. This part of Dartmouth Park is particularly sensitive, surrounded by listed buildings and providing vital pedestrian and ambulance access to local schools, public transport, and hospitals. The disruption from major excavation and building in this location would negatively affect access and infrastructure. The proposed scheme reflects neither the architectural style nor the social intent of the original villas, which continue to provide family-sized accommodation in line with local planning policy. Unless the development offers exceptional public benefit—such as a large proportion of social housing—it should be refused. This application is inconsistent with both the Local Plan and the Council’s legal obligation to protect and enhance the Conservation Area. I urge the Council to reject it.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	Drew Stevenson	9 Twisden Road London NW5 1DL	05/05/2025 16:17:30	OBJ	I am writing to object to the current proposals for the development of Lamorna, Dartmouth Park Road, on grounds of gross over development; of worsening (as opposed to enhancing) the environment in the Conservation Area; and on inaccurate information regarding the impact of the development. Gross over development. When considering proposals at the pre-application stage, the officers said that “the roof level should be further reduced”. The submitted application says that “an amended roofline has been proposed to soften the appearance of the top floor.” ‘Softening’ is not the issue; the simple fact is that the height was, and remains, too great. As can be seen from Drawing P3789/05, the proposal is completely out of the character of the surrounding area. In practice the minor proposed amendment would make the impact of the roofline even greater, since it would introduce a modelled profile that is atypical for the area. Conservation Area policy. Policy D1 of the local plan says that “any development is required to improve the function, appearance and character of the area”. By continuing to rise to an inappropriate height, the proposed development intrudes upon and worsens, as opposed to improving, the scale and character of the Conservation Area. The developers do not even claim to meet the policy requirement, they merely say that the design “will maintain good levels of amenity for existing residents” (Para 4.41). That is not good enough to meet the clear requirement of the policy. Inaccurate information. The applicants’ case is not helped by including inaccurate information. In Table 2 of their report, in response to neighbours’ comments that the “height and massing of the building is unacceptable”, Maddox state that “The height of the proposed building is either the same height, or lower in height than neighbouring buildings”. According to information in the applicants’ own reports, this is demonstrably not true. In submitted drawings the Long Elevation (Drawing 214) and the North Elevation it can clearly be seen that the proposed development is twice the height of the immediate neighbour at First House and, at parapet level, is considerably higher than its other immediate neighbour at 1 Dartmouth Park Road. Drawing P3789/05 in the Daylight and Sunlight report clearly shows these discrepancies, and puts measurements to them. The application is for a building that has a roof level of +65250 front and back, compared to +63575 at the very top of the central ridge on its neighbour at 1 Dartmouth Park Road. Either the statement in Table 2 of Maddox’s report is inaccurate, or the drawings are wrong. In either event, in my opinion, it is not reasonable to conclude that the proposal is anything other than a gross over development. I strongly urge the Committee to refuse the application.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	Joanna van Heyningen and Birkin Haward, founding partners of van Heyningen and Haward Architects	1c Laurier Road London NW5 1SD	03/05/2025 10:24:25	OBJ	We strongly object to this planning application. As others have said, this proposal is too tall for its context, too deep, too close to the houses to its south and east, provides poor living standards for its intended inhabitants, and ignores the requirement for bio-diversity net gain. The one façade that is adequately illustrated shows a naïve architectural response that attempts to be contextual by aping some of the proportions of neighbouring buildings, whilst completely failing to respect them. However, it is not impossible to design an appropriately sized high quality modern building in a conservation area. I would like to cite two of ours, within the same part of the Dartmouth Park Conservation area as Lamorna. One is 24a York Rise and the other is 1c Laurier Road. Both have received multiple awards. They are modern, and they respect their context. Amendments to the current design of this application would not be sufficient to make it acceptable. We ask that this application be refused planning permission.
2025/1375/P	Elizabeth Bailey	10 Grove Terrace Highgate Road NW5 1PH NW5 1PH	02/05/2025 23:29:34	OBJ	This proposed development is out of character in this conservation area. It is too big in terms of height and mass and consequently would cause loss of light and allow others to be overlooked. With so many proposed dwellings noise would also be an issue.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1375/P	David Higgs	53 Dartmouth Park Road	04/05/2025 20:05:40	COMMNT	I am not an architect or latter-day Pevsner BUT I don't need to be either to see how completely inappropriate and over the top these development plans are for the Lamorna site in Dartmouth Park Road. The size and style of the development. 5 storeys high with a basement the proposed building is extremely tall and brutal. There are other tall houses in the neighbourhood, but none have 5 floors and a basement and none have such an unremittingly bleak appearance. Like a Mediterranean hotel complex dropped into Dartmouth Park Road – all apartments with sea views, no less. The proposed building towers over its Chetwynd Road neighbours and although the blurb says that light deprivation will be minimal this goes against common sense. You cannot construct a building on these monumental lines without effecting the light. Originally Dartmouth Park Road was built to provide good quality houses set within spacious gardens that included landscaped layouts and street trees. Still today this ethos prevails with the street seemingly wide and the houses set back behind verdant and highly prized front gardens. In the Spring these gardens are teeming with insect life and the smells of different blossoms. How does this development fit in with the street as it is? There is hardly any garden space, the proposed house is virtually on the road and the front of it is undiluted window space. The development is crass and should be downscaled and changed to fit in better with the neighbouring houses on Dartmouth Park Road and Boscastle Road. The planning document makes a big to do that, "the present Lamorna house is not a listed building, nor is it locally listed as a building that makes a positive or negative contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area". But how does this proposed development make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area? It does not. It is not in scale and seems to have the making of money as its prevailing intent. Why do so many dwellings have to be squeezed into such a large building occupying such a small area? It is a nonsense.
2025/1375/P	Margaret Riddle	7 Dartmouth Park Road Dartmouth Park 7 Dartmouth Park Road, Dartmouth Park 7 Dartmouth Park Road, Dartmouth Park	04/05/2025 18:34:12	COMMNT	The application seems to ignore the fact that the existing building sits within a conservation area and the plans submitted for a 6 storey building ride roughshod over the reasons why the Dartmouth Park area is protected . The footprint of the proposed structure is excessive and overbearing. The application should be rejected.