

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6948/P	Myra Farnworth	2c Lindfield Gardens	05/12/2014 20:16:37	COMMNT	<p>Regards this property, please particularly note:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 36C is the middle house in a row of 5 terraced houses, on an estate of 11 houses. All 11 properties [built in 1970] are of an identical external design, and remain largely uniform today. All were built of the same materials. Each house has its own back patio as open space. There are boundary wooden fences dividing the properties at the back. The estate, at the corner of Arkwright Rd and Lindfield Gdns, comprises 36A - 36E Arkwright Road, NW3 6BH and 2A - 2F Lindfield Gardens, NW3 6PU. The estate was designed so houses have open aspects, with views of considerable greenery. The back of the properties have no garden wall to aid the outlook. They are therefore totally open to public view from beyond the patios. Indeed a communal path runs right along the back of the patios all 5 houses. 36C is in the Camden Redington Froggal Conservation area. <p>My objections to the Conservatory development at the back of the house, and are as follows:</p> <p>Loss of light or overshadowing</p> <p>The proposed development would reduce the natural light within the two neighbouring properties. It is likely to rob the two neighbouring houses of some sunlight, both indoors and on their patios. 36B is likely to be particularly affected in the morning and 36D particularly in the afternoon. This results from the rendered block work walls to both sides of the proposed conservatory, coming to a height that is considerably higher than the current side fences. This is contra to the advice in Camden Planning Guidance CPG1, 4.24.</p> <p>Loss of amenity</p> <p>Resulting from the rendered block work walls as above, the development proposed at 36C is likely to cause a loss of amenity to the properties either side [36B and 36D], including daylight and sunlight as above. It is also likely to cause a sense of enclosure for 36B, and significantly alter its outlook. The proposed infilling of almost the entire patio of 36C detracts from the open character and garden amenity of the neighbouring gardens. This is contra to the advice in Camden Planning Guidance CPG1, 4.24.</p> <p>Loss of a reasonable size garden</p> <p>The proposed conservatory is planned to cover almost the entire patio garden of 36C. This is contra to the advice in Camden Planning Guidance CPG1, 4.24.</p> <p>Minimising the visual impact of the development</p> <p>According to Camden Planning Guidance CPG1, developments in rear gardens should have minimal visual impact and be visually subordinate to the host garden. Since the proposed conservatory would protrude beyond the current house line, and cover almost its entire existing patio garden, this development would not be visually subordinate to the host garden, or have minimal visual impact. This is especially so, since these houses have no wall at the back of their patios, and are fully open to public view. It is therefore contra to the advice in CPG1, 4.24. The proposed development is out of character with the other 10 houses on the estate, and would substantially alter the uniform appearance.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Use of materials which complement the host property and the overall character of the surrounding area. The boundary walls of the gardens between each house on the estate are of fence, and are largely of a uniform design. The proposed conservatory would result in a loss of the fence between 36C and 36B, and its replacement with a rendered block work wall. This is contra to the advice in Camden Planning Guidance CPG1, 4.24. Please note, as above, the back of the properties are not closed off with a back garden wall, like most houses. They are open to public view from a communal path that runs right along the back of all 5 houses.

Design and appearance

This development would set this house apart from the other 5 houses in the row in terms of design and appearance, and from all other 10 houses on the estate. It would significantly alter the appearance of the entire row of houses from the back, since all of them have open spaces [patios] behind their houses, and this one would have a conservatory covering most of its patio instead. The fact that unlike most houses the back of the properties are not hidden by a back garden wall means they are totally open to public view; see above.

Adverse impact on protected trees

There are a large number of substantial trees on the estate. A high proportion are protected by TPO's. Some of the trees are rare and some very old. Some of these are likely to be in close proximity to the proposed development. It is possible the foundations could impact on the root stock of these trees.

Ground stability and drainage

There is already subsidence under this property; this is possibly caused by a very large tree opposite the front of the house [this tree has a TPO on it]. Excavation work resulting from the proposed building development could impact on the stability of the surrounding properties, especially because of the subsidence at 36C, and because the houses are built on clay. The property is in close proximity to other large trees, and it is possible that some of the roots could impact on the foundations of the new development.

For the above reasons, I strongly request Camden Council reject this Planning Application.

2014/6948/P	Myra Farnworth	2c Lindfield Gardens	05/12/2014 20:16:15	COMMNT
-------------	----------------	----------------------	---------------------	--------
