

Derek John RIBA (ret) & Sue John

15. Boscastle Road NW51EE  
London

Planning Dept  
LBCamden  
Town Hall WC1H 8ND  
att. Mr.Ian Gracie

9<sup>th</sup>. March 2016

**Planning Application ref. 2016/0758/P  
Proposed new house on garages and garden at**

**17. Boscastle Road NW51EE.**

Dear Mr. Gracie,

We write, as owners of the adjacent property, to strongly object to the above planning application for a house in the rear garden of No.17 Boscastle Road.

We have lived at No.15 for over 40 years and enjoyed the wonderful amenities that the gardens of Boscastle road and Grove Terrace provide. The privacy, the openness and the sense of community that the area and the Mews offers to all local residents. This quality of life will be eroded for us 'and all future owners' if this application is granted. This quality is one of the fundamental points made in the Governments **'Planning Practice Guidance' Achieving sustainable development Para 17.**

Our objections to the application are:

**Heritage & Conservation Matters.**

These matters are well covered by other objectors.

Our objections are specific to:

- 1 Application form.
- 2 Planning & Heritage Statement
- 3 Design & Access Statement.

1)Application form.- incorrect information.

#### **Section 16.Trees & Hedges**

a)The application form says 'No' to 'any trees or hedges on adjacent land' this statement is incorrect. There is a large Bramley apple tree in the garden of No15 Boscastle Rd. 0.6m from the new wall adjacent to our garage. The new wall will ruin the 'root ball' of the tree.

b)There is a massive London Plain tree 25m high on Grove Terrace Mews approx 12m. from the proposed development. The branches extend well over the proposed development and the root ball will undoubtedly be damaged with the foundations. The overhanging branches are not shown correctly on the application drawings.

**The form should say 'yes' to section 16 and a tree survey undertaken.**

c) The Design & Access statement does not indicate the true distance from the proposed house to the public road in front of Grove Terrace, it is 72m.

#### **2)Applicants Planning and Heritage Statement**

##### **Part 6.0-6.12 .Land Use and Principal of the Development.**

**6.2-6.5** This section makes the case that, as the Applicants are now elderly, with Mr. Gladstone suffering from dementia and restricted mobility and a wheelchair soon to be needed. They claim the proposed development will meet his future needs and retain local community connections.

At present Mr. Gladstone opens the front door and with a few paces is at their car, with neighbours walking past. **This will not be the case in Grove Terrace mews:**

Access to the Mews from Grove Terrace is through a 2.0m gap of which the first 18m are uneven and slippery cobbles. The new house is 72m away over rough shingle (see photos with application) Any journey by wheelchair to get to the public highway is virtually impossible.

There is no street lighting from Grove Terrace, along the Mews, to the proposed house.

There is no parking for any car or visitors cars. There is no access to the mews for emergency vehicles – an important factor bearing in mind Mr.Gladstone's future prospects. There are no neighbours apart from one other house in the mews built in the 50's and a long way in Mr. Gladstone's wheelchair to friends and old neighbours in Boscastle Road.

### **Section 8.22 'Lifetime Homes & wheelchair access'**

**Policy DP6 states** *Criterion (2) Approach to dwelling from parking.*

“The distance from the car parking space ..... to the dwelling entrance (or relevant block entrance or lift core), should be kept to a minimum and be level or gently sloping. The distance from visitors parking to relevant entrances should be as short as practicable and be level or gently sloping.” **As a result we do not believe the application meets any of the Gladstone's future needs and does not comply with Policy DP6**

We sympathise with the need for Mr and Mrs Gladstone to live in accommodation that is suitable for their needs and mobility requirements. They are in the very fortunate position of being able to fund the development of an entirely new house in the garden of number 17. There is no reason why they are not able to use those funds to, instead, modify the ground and first floor of their home to make it more suitable to their needs (selling off the top as a separate dwelling if needs be) or, instead, move to ground floor accommodation in the area. Although their house has five bedrooms the top floor has been let as a 1- 2bed flat for over 20 years.

**We therefore consider the application does NOT meet the criteria of Para 49 of the NPPF or Policy 3.4 of the London Plan 'Optimising Housing Potential'**

### **3)Section 7 Design & Heritage.**

- a) We consider the architectural solution to be totally out of context with the garden environment it occupies. The roof height at 3.5m is unjustified over a hall, bathroom and bedroom and as our patio and sitting area is 1.0m lower, due to the slope of the garden, it will loom 4.5m in our view.
- b) Camdens preferred brick is London Stocks. This brick has been used for our garage and both garden walls. The applicants choice of brick as a roofing material will be a much lighter color than all surrounding area and weather to a sad green colour due to the surrounding greenery. It will contrast with our garage and garden walls and run halfway down our garden.
- c) The photos on pages 21&22 of the Design & Access statement show the full horror of what we can expect if this application is approved.

It should be noted that LBCamden have been successful in recent planning appeal, the ASF garage site on Highgate Road, that is in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area where the importance of the Grove Terrace environment has been challenged by new developments.

**Section 7.11** of the Statement explains why this development ' has very limited potential to set a precedent for similar developments' as it is only No 15 Boscastle has an exceptionally wide plot. **This is not the case at all!**

There is a double garage with a large forecourt adjacent to No17 to the north, the plot size is 22m x 8m. Next to that is another large garage belonging to 1.Grove Terrace Mews that has another plot to the rear. **A total of 3 other plots that could immediately apply for permission if this application is approved.**

The other 7 houses in Boscastle Rd. all have a garden width of 8-9m and there are 7 existing garages. All properties therefore have the capacity for a small housing plot. Grove Terrace has 17 properties with access to the Mews and there are 15 existing garages. Therefore, a total of 24 properties with access to the Mews, each with plots of between 8-10m and suitable for a housing plot, let alone the potential of 2 or 3 houses combining to create a much larger site for development in the mews.

**This is the one of the critical reasons why the application should be refused.**

If it is granted the whole Dartmouth Conservation area and particular Grove Terrace and Boscastle Road will come under pressure for development.

Applications further away have been refused by Camden and upheld at appeal because of the importance of these areas and this application is in the heart of that area.

### **8.Amenity**

#### **In respect of 15. Boscastle Rd. the intrusion is immense.**

The existing garages are 2.3m high but the proposed roof line of 3.5m will be moved 16m closer to our property. The nearest roof line (bedroom) to our house, is 3.5m high and our garden slopes another 1.0m to our patio. A total height of 4.5m.

The new boundary wall to the south protrudes 4.5m beyond the building line of our garage and will ruin the root-ball of a wonderful Bramley apple tree 0.6m away from the wall.

As there is no lighting to the rear gardens of Grove Terrace or Boscastle Rd. we have a pitch black outlook at night, a very rare amenity so close to London. The design includes 3 large roof lights which will produce a substantial light pollution for all houses that surround this 'backland'

In respect of the disruption due to construction:

**Section 9 of the Design & Access statement 'Construction'** indicates 'special cases of delivery' will need access via The Mews.'

The Mews is a private road and the solicitors acting for the freeholders of Grove Terrace Mews Ltd. have stated in their objection that no construction traffic whatsoever will be allowed via the Mews due to the weak structure of the entry and its narrowness. This means all excavations, delivery and removal of materials and plant machinery will have to come through the side passage of no17.

The side passage is approx 0.7m at the narrowness point so It means that all deliveries and removal of excavations will end up in Boscastle Road.

There is no '**Construction Management Traffic**' plan for this problem and No 17 is opposite a 'T' junction on a busy local road.

**We therefore consider the assumption that para 17 of the NPPF & policy CS5 & DP26 are complied with is, totally incorrect.**

### **10. Sustainability**

This part of the report sets out case that the design meets 'sustainability' and therefore should be approved, we totally disagree.

We consider the design wasteful of materials and energy, due to the excessive ceiling heights throughout the design.

Our consultants calculate the excessive roof height of the design add 22-25% cubic meters to the proposal compared to the room heights recommended for residential development by the **Royal Institute of British Architect publication 'AJ. Metric Handbook'**.

-The ceiling height in the hall, bathroom, bedroom is 3.25m (2.60m recommended)

-This design will therefore require:

-Excessive use of materials

-Excessive use of energy to heat and light the rooms

-Increase light pollution.

**All these factors are specifically against the recommendations of PPG para7 . and therefore the proposal does not meet the criteria of 'sustainability' and should be refused.**

**11. Conclusion.**

We do not consider the Planning & Heritage statement in respect of compliance with PPG to be correct, or meets the criteria of 'sustainable development' on many matters.

**Therefore the 'presumption in favour of development' is invalid and the application should be refused.**

Yours sincerely,

DG & SB JOHN