

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2534/P	Toni Huberman	6 Lancaster Drive Flat 6 London NW3 4HA	15/06/2015 13:59:57	COMMEMP ER	<p>I would like to register my concern that you not grant planning consent for this application. The original request for retrospective consent was rejected and this new proposal goes nowhere near addressing the problem. The proposed extension is wholly out of proportion to the site: it takes up most of the garden, as does the existing (illegal) extension, and impacts on surrounding properties. 45 Lancaster Grove is in a designated Conservation Area and for this reason alone the application should be rejected: increased development of properties in the area diminishes the green space and endangers existing trees.</p> <p>Camden Borough has been very careful in preserving trees in the area; without adequate green space these trees cannot thrive. And reducing green space can cause flooding when heavy rain waters are unable to drain away. An over-developed property without adequate surrounding land to allow drainage can result in localised flooding, and this threatens neighbouring properties as well. With climate change and the increase in heavy rainfall we ought to be sensitive to such potential hazards.</p> <p>To grant this appeal would set a dangerous precedent and encourage similar developments in the area. It would encourage would-be developers to circumvent the rules by erecting extensions and then retrospectively seeking consent.</p> <p>Finally, can I quote a precedent. This regards a planning application in 1995 to erect a single-storey conservatory extension at the rear of No. 8 Lancaster Drive. The rear of this property overlooks 45 Lancaster Grove, and is separated from No. 45 by the space of a garden. This conservatory was also erected without planning consent, and was later required to be removed – which it was. The reason given for denying planning permission was, and I quote, “The proposed conservatory would have an adverse effect on the appearance of the rear of the building and the appearance and visual amenity of the Conservation Area by reason of its size, bulk, and detailed design.” The conservatory at No. 8 was a fraction of the size of the extension at No. 45 Lancaster Grove. Can I ask that the same criteria be used in this case. I urge you not to grant this appeal.</p>
2015/2534/P	Toni Huberman	6 Lancaster Drive Flat 6 London NW3 4HA	15/06/2015 14:00:19	COMMEMP ER	