

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6106/P	Mrs Anjum Sethia	C/O Agent 114-116 Flitcroft House Charing Cross Road London WC2H 0JR	17/12/2015 10:07:26	COMMNT	<p>Dear Ms Chivers,</p> <p>RE: LETTER OF OBJECTION AGAINST THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 22 LANCASTER GROVE (LPA REF: 2015/6106/P)</p> <p>I write on behalf of Mrs Anjum Sethia of 18-20 Lancaster Grove to formally object to the proposed development at 22 Lancaster Grove (LPA Ref: 2015/6106/P) as submitted to the London Borough of Camden (LBC) in November 2015.</p> <p>This objection is submitted in the context of the previously refused planning application for development at the site (LBC ref: 2014/2037/P) and the subsequent appeal (PINS ref: APP/X5210/W/15/3004790) which dismissed the proposals. For the purposes of clarity this objection is structured as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistencies within the application submission; • Comparison of the proposals against the appeal proposals; • Assessment of the proposals against the Development Plan; • Impact of the proposals on neighbouring properties. <p>Inconsistencies within the Submission</p> <p>A review of the planning submission has revealed a number of inconsistencies between the submitted documents which gives rise to some queries about the robustness of the submission.</p> <p>Firstly the Planning Statement prepared by DP9 Ltd, both at page 3 and at page 20, refers to the application providing 3 new homes; however the description of development on the planning application form states a single family dwelling. Similarly the Design and Access Statement prepared by INK Bespoke refers to a 9 bedroom dwelling whereas the description of development refers to a 7 bedroom dwelling.</p> <p>A similar inconsistency exists with car parking numbers. The previous planning submission (LPA ref: 2014/2037) stated the existing property has 6 car parking spaces, to be reduced to four as a result of the proposals. The current application refers to 5 existing car parking spaces which conveniently relates to the 5 car parking spaces now being proposed, which in itself is greatly in excess of planning policy requirements.</p> <p>Comparison with the Appeal Proposals</p> <p>It is noted that the Inspector's decision, issued in relation to appeal reference APP/X5210/W/15/3004790, accepted that the height, width and design of the front elevation would not appear out of place in the street and the reinstatement of the front boundary wall would enhance the Conservation Area. For this reason the comparison between the current application proposals and the appeal proposals is focussed primarily on the depth and bulk of the building, albeit that it remains our opinion that the proposed development is too large as a whole and adversely affects the streetscape.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the forward protection of the building has been reduced slightly the depth of the building is still considered to be too great in the context of the surroundings. Indeed, whilst the eastern flank of the building has been pulled back by circa 2.7 m the western flank is imperceptibly reduced. As such it remains uncharacteristically intrusive in the street scene with the full depth and bulk of the proposal being apparent from neighbouring gardens and especially so when seen from the lower</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

ground to the west.

In this context it is considered that the Inspector's view is still of relevance and the proposed development, by means of its overall bulk and rearward projection, materially detracts from the spacious character of the south side of Lancaster Grove, including the area at the rear of the buildings. In our opinion on this ground alone the application should be refused.

Assessment of the Proposals against the Development Plan

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 9 (as amended) states that where regard is to be had to the Development Plan, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (subsection 1) states that in the exercise of any functions with respect to any buildings or land within a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

On the basis that the current proposals materially detract from the conservation area, as detailed above, it is considered that the development is in direct conflict with Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010 which requires heritage assets to be preserved and enhanced. In this context the proposals are also considered to be contrary to policies DP24 and DP25 of Camden's Development Policies 2010 which seek to ensure that all development is well designed and maintains the character of the Borough's conservation areas.

Whilst these policies pre-date the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) their objectives are consistent with the general approach adopted by the Framework. They thus should carry due weight in any assessment of this application.

In the context of the NPPF the development is considered to cause harm, albeit 'less than substantial'. Notwithstanding this the development offers no public benefit sufficient to outweigh that harm and as such the application should be refused.

It is also noted that the proposed development provides a significant area of car parking to the front of the property, as well as an integral garage, with the application documentation purporting to provide 5 car parking spaces for this single family dwelling. In the context of Policy DP18, which states development should not exceed maximum standards, this is considered to be a significant over provision which results in an excess of hard surfacing on what is already an overdevelopment of the site.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties

As noted above the proposed development will sit significantly back from the established building line to the west. Not only will this impact on wider views from within the conservation area but it will also significantly impede the amenity of 18-20 Lancaster Grove through its overbearing nature and subsequent impact on outlook and privacy.

There is also concern regarding the significant take up of the rear garden and how this not only impacts on this important feature of the conservation area, but also on the established relationship between the properties on Lancaster Grove and Eton Avenue.

In summary the material supporting the application is inconsistent and the proposals are considered to represent a gross over-development of the site, causing harm to the conservation area and also to the amenity of neighbouring residential properties. The application has failed to address the points made by

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>the Planning Inspector in assessing the last scheme and does not comply with the relevant development plan documents, as outlined above. For these reasons the application should be refused.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Anna Snow Director</p>
2015/6106/P	Timothy Crowe	57 Lancaster Grove NW3 4HD	17/12/2015 23:51:06	COMMNT	<p>We wholeheartedly support the detailed comments presented by Barrie Tinkel in his objections and in particular, in drawing upon relevant comparison data contained in the Inspection report by Louise Crosby, on the planning Approval at 18/20 Lancaster Grove. In this document formal reference is made to key concerns which apply equally to the proposed building at 22 Lancaster Grove: the size of the footprint the height and depth of the building structure and the extent of open garden area at ground level. All are equally important considerations as causes for objection to the proposals at 22 Lancaster Grove. In addition, removal of the proposed gable ends would achieve a more consistent roof-line which would relate to adjacent buildings and enhance the contextual quality of an existing spacious, tree-lined aspect on the south side of Lancaster Grove.</p>