

Chivers, Jennifer

From: English, Rachel
Sent: 14 December 2015 17:59
To: Chivers, Jennifer
Subject: FW: Planning application: 2015/ 6106/ P ; 22 Lancaster Grove

Rachel English
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1343

We want to hear your views on the changes we are proposing to how we consult on planning applications. To find out more and have your say visit www.camden.gov.uk/sci. Consultation closes on the 20 January 2016.

From: Philip Peacock [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 December 2015 17:53
To: English, Rachel
Subject: Planning application: 2015/ 6106/ P ; 22 Lancaster Grove

NB: Please pass this email to the relevant officer if you are not that person.

I wish to object to the latest application relating to this property:

1. The mass, scale and height of the proposed dwelling is out of all proportion to the houses along this side of the road, which in the main were originally built as compact mews houses to the large houses on Eton Avenue. The differing ground levels of the properties on either side of No 22 exacerbate this dominating effect. It is also a deceit to describe the proposed dwelling as having two storeys above ground when it clearly has three, thus accentuating the height and scale;

2. The size of the plot within which the design of the dwelling has been squeezed is completely inadequate for a property of this size, which would normally be set within its own grounds. To permit such a development would be wholly alien to the streetscape and the general aspect of this part of the conservation area;

3. I have two further concerns which should go on the record and which I consider relevant to this application:

(a) We have next door at 18/20 Lancaster Grove a deserted and an increasingly untidy building site caused by the developers of that property having demolished the previous building and now having apparently abandoned the building of the new dwelling for which they obtained planning permission. Quite apart from the inevitable feeling that the site has become derelict (with exposed damage to the boundary wall which is a distinct feature of this side of the road) and the detriment this causes to the conservation area, there will doubtless now be many months of inactivity and the loss of a perfectly serviceable dwelling that stood there before being demolished. I would therefore urge that some kind of conditionality be imposed on any permitted redevelopment of No 22 Lancaster Grove, such as a performance guarantee as a way of not permitting demolition of the existing building unless and until the permitted replacement is commenced which is then completed within a normal timescale. Having two virtually derelict sites next to each other for an indefinite period would be intolerable and rightly provoke strong condemnation from local people and the media;

(b) Since the specifications for the proposed dwelling at No 22 are so extensive and oddly conflict with the developers previous application (which was refused) to build four terraced houses within the same plot, I have a real

concern that the developer, having obtained permission for the current application, will then seek to amend the permission to allow the construction of two, three or even four terraced houses within the identical floor span. One of the major objections to the previous application for four terraced houses, for which permission was refused by the inspector, was the hugely inappropriate and distorted appearance such a configuration would give to the character of this side of Lancaster Grove with its distinctive line of detached mews houses. I would urge that this risk be noted by the planning officers with a view, if possible, to preventing or at least refusing this sort of amended application which to local residents would be regarded as reprehensible and which would certainly be strongly resisted.

For these reasons please refuse this latest application. Thank you, Philip Peacock. No 28 Lancaster Grove