

28 August 2016

Nora-Andreea Constantinescu
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

Hill House
Bowstridge Lane
Chalfont St Giles
Bucks
HP8 4QN

Dear Ms Constantinescu,

Objection to planning application 2016/3495/P - 1 Elsworthy Terrace NW3 3DR

I am writing to OBJECT to the above referenced application. I spent my childhood at 2 Elsworthy Terrace and I am acutely concerned about the harm that would be caused to my parents at 2 Elsworthy Terrace, as well as existing and future generations of residents in the area, should planning permission be granted.

1. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise *Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.*
2. The principle of development on this site is clearly contrary to Camden's Development Plan and Policies, including the adopted Elsworthy Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy.
3. No material considerations that outweigh policy have been forthcoming from the applicant or others.
4. There are no grounds on which the proposals could be considered as 'Sustainability Development' as referenced in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and approval would be contrary to both plan-making and decision-taking principles.

I request that this application is refused on the principle that the garden of 1 Elsworthy should not be developed and in a way that will not prompt the applicant to submit a reduced development scheme on the site, or appeal the refusal.

Officers may find helpful the attached view from a well-respected planning professional who acts both for and against high profile cases of basement development in sensitive locations. You will see that he is categorical in his opinion that the development proposal brought forward by the applicant has no merit.

Yours sincerely,
Alex Bach

Attachment to Objection Letter (Alex Bach dated 28/08/16)

Summary Points of Objection:

1. This is a very bad example of backland development, both in principle and in detailed design terms.
2. Reference to the former garages at no.15 is wholly inappropriate, with the conservation area policy statement making clear that the only justification was to redevelop brown field land - not to develop green field land as in the case of this application. That statement in itself makes clear this land is not suitable for new development of any kind.
3. This proposal is entirely the wrong location for an additional dwelling to be squeezed in to this historically important area, the character of which is of large houses in appropriately large gardens.
4. The application site is one of these historically important spaces, providing the setting for the large dwelling at No.1 Elsworthy Terrace, which in this case is of enhanced importance because of its "corner site" location, with the size of the original dwelling in relation to it clearly apparent from both the public realm as well as from views from neighbouring properties.
5. To attempt to insert a new dwelling against the side of an adjacent private rear garden is totally unacceptable, flying in the face of all long established principles of good urban design.
6. The result of this unacceptably intrusive proposal would be to harm precious existing residential amenity in terms of:
 - a. adverse visual impact
 - b. adverse noise generation at the very part of the gardens where tranquillity can most be expected
 - c. adverse privacy impact, not least when the proposed green roof is maintained.
7. there is no satisfactory confirmation that the requirements of Policy CPG4 Basements have been satisfied, without which the application should be refused directly, the onus being on the Applicant to have demonstrated its total acceptability with regard to the criteria of Policy CPG4.
8. In detailed design terms. This building is wholly out of accord with the special character and appearance of the Victorian villas in the conservation area - form, hierarchy of floors, materials, exposed double basement with deep light wells - all are alien in this proposal.
9. The double storey lightwells are very harmful visually, both during the day and perhaps even more apparently so at night, impacting adversely on the character and appearance of the conservation area.
10. In broad summary: **This is entirely the wrong building in entirely the wrong place.**