

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0417/P	Marlene Wild	23 Woodsome Road London NW5 1RX	08/03/2017 17:20:12	OBJEMPER	I object to this over-sized, unattractive garden shed. It is too large and high above the garden wall. Its poor design is noticeable when walking on Dartmouth Park Road. Additionally, it seems to be crowding a tree on the corner of the property.
2017/0417/P	Mrs Jessica Justice	6 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PH	08/03/2017 18:40:36	OBJEMPER	We are writing to object to the size and scale of this new outbuilding. It is oversized and blocks views through the gardens and houses of Chetwynd Road.
2017/0417/P	A. D. T. Macdonald	Flat 2 3 Dartmouth Park Road Kentish Town Greater London	08/03/2017 21:46:12	OBJ	<p>I object to the retrospective planning application on several grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is not simply a replacement shed. In contrast to the previous structure, the new construction is oversized; now also visible from Dartmouth Park Road. It's design is out of keeping with other buildings in the area; no consideration has been given to the fact that the construction of this permanent structure - in a conservation area - should have been put out to proper consultation prior to construction. 2. The construction has the potential to impact on immediate neighbours - for example, in relation to deprivation of light into garden space (due, primarily, to the fact that the shed's roof has been elevated to a level much higher than was previously the case). 3. Approval, in this instance, could set a dangerous precedent. <p>Fundamentally, there is an obvious risk that such approval will serve to alert other opportunistic individuals nearby to the possibility that they may be able to get away with further planning violations that directly undermine the basic standards laid down in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The draft now submitted by the applicants appear to be misleading, showing a shed in occupation of an area far smaller than would appear to be the case in reality.

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:
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Rebecca & Tony Harriss</p>
2017/0417/P	Johanna Rosendaal	9 Laurier Road London NW5 1SD	08/03/2017 17:28:35	OBJEMPER	The garden shed at the back of 5 Chetwynd villas is very high above the garden wall. It crowds the sense of space and blocks views through to the gardens of Chetwynd road from Dartmouth Park Road.
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.
2017/0417/P	J-J Lorraine	The House Lissenden Gardens NW5 1ND NW5 1ND	08/03/2017 12:08:42	OBJ	I object to this structure as it would crowd the sense of space and block views through the gardens and houses of Chetwynd Road.
2017/0417/P	Matt Born	27 Dartmouth Park Avenue NW5 1JL London	08/03/2017 17:56:38	OBJEMPER	The outbuilding in the rear of the garden at Chetwynd Villas is unsightly, and overly large. It impacts on the views from neighbouring houses. In addition, the proper planning procedures should have been followed at the outset.
2017/0417/P	Mark Lamb	25 Croftdown Road London NW5 1EL	08/03/2017 16:24:11	OBJ	I strongly object to this over-sized, unattractive and unauthorised building that completely destroys a natural garden environment and horribly crowds the sense of light and space. This overbearing addition abuts neighbours unfairly and will add significant light pollution, interfere with essential ground water drainage, whilst destroying a much needed sense of separation between the houses. This sets a very dangerous precedent in a highly valued conservation area. Please ask them to remove this horrible building immediately.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0417/P	Peter Leach	2 Dartmouth Park Road NW5 1SY NW5 1SY	09/03/2017 08:11:18	COMMNT	I object to this over sized garden shed which crowds the sense of space and blocks views through the gardens and houses of Chetwynd Road . From Dartmouth park road It is very unsightly, too high and not in keeping with the conservation area
2017/0417/P	Nicholas nichola	1 Dartmouth Park Road NW5 1SU NW5 1SU	08/03/2017 12:27:46	COMMNT	Good Afternoon. I object to this structure, as it appears to be oversized and not with keeping of the character of the neighbourhood, plus there was no notification of it's intended build. It also appears to block the natural view and light through the gardens of Chetwynd Road.