

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0417/P	Penny Crawford	8a Woodsome Road London NW5 1RY	07/03/2017 16:15:24	COMMNT	I think this erection is really ugly, too big, and not at all in keeping with the conservation area's aesthetics. I walk along Dartmouth Park Road every day, and always feel disappointed when I see this structure looming above the garden wall. It sets a dangerous precedent too if allowed to remain.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0417/P	Tony Harriss	Lamorna Dartmouth Park Road London NW5 1SU	08/03/2017 08:16:34	OBJ	5th March 2017

To whom it may concern

In May 2016, we returned home from a long weekend away to find that our new back neighbours at 5 Chetwynd Villas had put a note through our door. The note informed us that they were renovating two gardens sheds, making them safe and waterproof with a new roof, that the work would start on 23rd May 2016 and that it shouldn't take too long. For the sake of transparency, we include a scan of that note. We thought nothing more of it as we took their note at face value, and believed that the "renovation" was well within permitted development. Unfortunately, this was not true. The new building, completed in July 2016, bore no relation to the existing shed(s) and was clearly outside of permitted development. It was only after over 6 months of enforcement action taken by the diligent team at Camden Planning that the applicant was forced to apply for planning permission. It is to that application, and to the building that was put up beforehand, without regard for the planning process, that we strongly object.

As long-term local residents (we first moved in to York Rise in 2002), we are extremely supportive of families extending their homes and being able to stay in the neighbourhood. Indeed, we ourselves have benefited from obtaining planning permission to convert a garage to living accommodation and build an extension in our garden. However, we achieved this through the planning system at significant time and expense, as should properly be the case in a conservation area. We feel it unfortunate that the applicant chose to build the new structure without proper consideration for the planning process, and unfair on us, as neighbours, that the structure is now up and in use without consent having been granted. If we had been given the opportunity to consult on the building prior to construction it is likely we could have found a compromise solution, as we have no objection in principle to the erection of an appropriately sized garden room at 5 Chetwynd Villas.

We object to the application on the following grounds:

1. Tree – There is a hawthorn tree sited on the north-west corner of the new building. The tree has a Tree Protection Order on it and any application must include a statement from an arborologist. This application does not. We assert that the tree is in significant danger from the work that has already been carried out, and that the structure and its 180mm foundations should be removed immediately to protect the tree.
2. Effect on the conservation area – Whilst this huge new building cannot be seen from Chetwynd Road, it is highly visible on Dartmouth Park Road, rising 1.1 metres above the existing garden wall. It blights the Dartmouth Park Road streetscape with its looming blackness and bunker-like windows. It also mars one of the few views from Dartmouth Park Road through to the gardens and houses of Chetwynd Road behind. These occasional open vistas through the gardens add a sense of space and beauty to the neighbourhood. We assert that any impact on the streetscape of one of the conservation

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

Comment: **Response:**

area's most beautiful roads should be closely considered.

3. At over 3m high as measured from neighbours' gardens (and not the level that the applicant has subsequently raised in his own garden), the building is well outside of permitted development, and contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

4. The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area states that garden buildings should not detract from the open character and garden amenity of the neighbouring gardens and the wider surrounding area and development in rear gardens should ensure building heights will retain visibility over garden walls and fences. (4.23 Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement). The shed projects above the back and west garden walls by 1.1 metres, cutting out daylight to our garden. This represents a serious loss of garden amenity.

5. At nearly 200sq feet, the structure is too large in a small area of gardens, with too much loss of soft landscaping, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

6. The design, at least as it pertains to the view from Dartmouth Park Road, is poor and not in keeping with policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

7. The size, scale, and poor design of a building only 4m from the living accommodation at Lamorna, Dartmouth Park Road represents a serious loss of visual amenity for us. We have lost visibility over the garden wall and through to the planting and trees in neighbouring gardens. It is an overbearing structure that cramps an already small back area, increasing both actual, and the sense of, enclosure.

8. The plans submitted by the applicants are misleading in places:

a. One statement on the drawing says that the new building is on "existing solid 180mm thick concrete base". However, the previous buildings were two much smaller sheds that did not project significantly above the existing garden wall and certainly did not occupy the same footprint as the new building, so it is unclear why such a large base would have existed.

b. The drawing submitted for planning permission shows the top of the shed as being the same height as the adjoining garden wall. This may be accurate on the east side where the garden wall is unusually high for a garden wall, but not at the back or on the west wall where the height of the building dwarfs the walls.

c. The site drawing submitted shows the garden shed occupying a very small proportion of the garden. The actual building occupies a much greater proportion of the existing garden. According to the DPCAAMS 4.23: Development in rear gardens should ensure the siting, location, scale and design of the proposed development has a minimal visual impact on, and is visually subordinate to, the host garden.

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

Comment: **Response:**

Because of these inaccuracies, the planners need to insist on accurate site plans of the former sheds and the new building in the context of the whole garden, to appreciate the impact of this development.

9. If approved, this application would set an unwelcome precedent, which might allow our back neighbours (some of whom have supported the scheme) to build similar structures in their gardens.

We therefore strongly object to this application. Further, we hope that, if planning permission is refused, this building will be removed as quickly as it was erected so that others are not encouraged to put up structures to be used for their benefit (possibly for a number of years) before they are forced to take it down.

Kind regards,

Rebecca & Tony Harriss
