

[REDACTED]

From: Teo Lasarte [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 May 2025 20:02
To: Planning; Daren Zuk
Subject: application 2025/1375/P - object

[REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Zuk:

I strongly object against the Lamorna proposal for a multi-storey development (application number 2025/1375/P. I am the owner of 3 Chetwynd Villas, and the development has a direct and very negative impact on my home.

The proposal would have a very negative impact both on the immediate neighbours and the entire Dartmouth Park Conservation area. The benefits in terms of additional housing would be very limited.

I, along with other neighbours, believe that this proposal goes against the Camden Local Plan, Camden Planning Guidance (CPG's) and Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal Statement in relation to preserving and enhancing the special significance of the historic buildings and spaces within the Conservation Area.

The council would be ignoring all this planning regulation if it were to approve this project. I believe the Council has a legal obligation to follow them. If it does not, we would like to understand if the Council is disregarding all these planning regulations and, if it does, what does this mean for the Conservation area from a legal perspective.

We asked for a meeting with the developer, the planning consultant (Maddox) and the PR company that represented the developers (Concilio). This was before the application was submitted, to make our concerns heard. We were ignored.

Issues of planning

There is several issues on the planning side, namely the scale, height, the overlooking and the impact on the privacy of Chetwynd Villas. The density of this development, a five storey plus basement block of flats, in a small plot of land is ridiculously high, particularly for a Conservation area. Under quantitative measures, such as the Density and Coverage area calculations, this development is completely out of scale with any buildings in the area.

Critically, there is also a lack of distance is also an issue for 1 Darmouth Park Road and First House. The minimum distance between Chetwynd Villas and the new building is being violated, which in this case given the huge difference in height between the Lamorna development and Chetwynd Villas should be much more than 18 metres.

Point 2.5 of the Camden Planning Guidance on Amenity (2021)

To ensure privacy, it is good practice to provide a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of habitable rooms in existing properties directly facing the proposed (either residential or non-residential) development, assuming a level topography. In instances where building heights, design or topography mean that opportunity for overlooking would be increased, it is advisable to increase this separation distance. The 18m should be measured between the two closest points on each building (including balconies).

Also, incredibly, we are in the dark about how exactly this development would look from the rear. We have only been presented with vague diagrams To this point, the Design Panel, in their second communication, specifically make the following points:

The panel thinks that the rear elevation feels significantly less resolved than the front elevation. The visualisations do not convey the building's material qualities well, for example in relation to obscured glass in the bathroom, so it is difficult to understand how the building will actually appear. Further visualisations should be developed.

The panel emphasises the need to represent the relationship between the new building and its neighbours clearly. Sections should be produced to show the scheme alongside neighbouring properties.

The sunlight and daylight assessment presented by the developers does not account for the fact that some of the houses, namely those such as 5 and 7 Chetwynd Road would likely be impacted from a sunlight point of view. The developers state that these houses would not be affected. I would dispute that.

We also note that the developers are proposing heat pumps installed near our property. The developers should show what would be the impact on noise for the neighbouring properties.

Importance of consistency

In terms of consistency, which planning policy aims to be, this Lamorna development goes completely against other precedents in the neighbourhood, when much smaller proposals were rejected.

We note that for the Lamorna house itself, a proposal to build an extension over the side was rejected in 2007 (see 2007/1042/P). Among the reasons cited:

The proximity to the neighbouring property would result in a cramped form of development.

The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area –

Impact on the Conservation Area

If Camden were to approve this project, it would be disregarding the Council's responsibility to pay special attention to enhancing the character and appearance of conservation areas under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act. The proposal significantly damages the conservation area framework while having a minimal impact on growth targets for Camden.

The proposal goes completely against the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area plan, and sets up a very dangerous precedent for more development in the conservation area. The Dartmouth Park

plan clearly points out the the semi-rural character of the area, and openness. This development, which is extremely dense for such a relatively small plot, goes completely against this principal.

In the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal Statement, some of the defining characteristics of this particular part of the neighbourhood are:

7.31 There are views of the rear of Chetwynd Villas through the gaps between houses.

The small but significant gaps between buildings and between parallel rows of house-backs provide important views of greenery and backs of houses.

These would be very negatively in the case if the Lamorna development were to go ahead.

With reference to the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan, the Lamorna proposals clearly go against the following principle:

where subject to planning control, resisting fencing or other boundary treatments that would obscure views of houses or gardens (including views between properties to back gardens) or disrupt the existing streetscape (page 70)

Problems with the Consultation process

In addition, we were upset in how the whole process was handled. The developer has been speaking to Camden for over two and a half years. We, as residents of the area, barely have a couple of weeks to comments.

In the informal consultation, the developer distributed few fliers (I dispute the claim that a certain area was targeted). In addition, in their material, the developers said that the Independent Design Council was very supportive of the project. When we finally saw the documents, the response from both reports from the Design Panel was actually very mixed. The developers chose to ignore a lot of the points brought up by the Council.

Nevertheless, the developer paid absolutely o attention to local residents, despite claiming that that they had. The plans they presented in an informal consultation in October are the same plans that were presented in the final submission.

I hope these points are considered.

Best,

Teo