

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6891/P	Adam Driscoll	15 Oval Road NW1 7EA NW1 7EA	25/05/2017 12:00:41	OBJEMPER	<p>Re: 1 Centric Close, London, NW1 7EP 2016/6891/P</p> <p>This note was written to be presented to the Planning Committee when this application was first slated to be put before that committee in May 2017.</p> <p>The Committee Report was subsequently withdrawn but the notes below make reference to the numbering that was detailed in the document in relation to the Centric Close scheme.</p> <p>I am owner of and resident at 15 Oval Road. I co-own the Freehold of the building (which comprises 15, 15a, 15b and 15c Oval Road) with 2 other people.</p> <p>Further to my comments made on 20th March and having read the Committee Report assessing the proposed scheme I wish to make the following additional representations for the attention of the Planning Committee Members.</p> <p>The report fails to fully assess all material planning considerations against the relevant planning policies in this instance, namely planning policy as set out in CPG 6 in respect of overlooking, privacy and outlook as well as daylight and sunlight. Failure to fully assess the proposal against the policies of the development plan would be contrary to the requirements of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which requires that proposals for development must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Not only does the report not fully assess impact it fails to detail the material considerations that indicate why the clear conflict with policy is acceptable in this instance.</p> <p>I have set out my arguments in detail below and further to those arguments I would add that in not visiting my property to fully assess the likely impact of the development then, as a party likely to be impacted by the proposal, I consider this to have disadvantaged me in the process. If this continues to be the case then I will escalate any necessary action via the relevant Local Authority complaints procedure and, if necessary, involve the Local Government Ombudsman in the process.</p> <p>In my previous comments I explained my concerns regarding properties on Oval Road likely to be impacted by the proposal. These concerns have, again not been fully addressed in the committee report and I would draw the Members' attention to the following points;</p> <p>Camden have an adopted 'development policies' document and Policy DP26 refers specifically to amenity and how this will be given consideration in the planning process. The Policy (DP26) refers to a 'Supplementary Planning Document' - CPG6 which provides more specific assessment of impact on amenity. I would like to draw the committee's attention to the policies outlined on page 37 that deal directly with privacy and overlooking.</p>

Section 7.4 specifically states in relation to Overlooking and Privacy:

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

Development should be designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree.... The most sensitive areas to overlooking are:

- Living rooms;
- Bedrooms;
- Kitchens; and
- The part of a garden nearest to the house.

The 4 storey building at the Southern Elevation of the development has windows and balconies that overlook all of the areas detailed above. My property will be overlooked into the living room, kitchen, 3 bedrooms and the garden. This overlooking is more pronounced from the higher floors of the new development.

In addition the 4 storey building also has a proposed play area on its rooftop – effectively creating a view from a virtual 5th floor. The already unacceptable degree of overlooking would be further compounded by this playground giving additional opportunities for overlooking.

These objections have also been noted by The Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee as detailed in section 4.3 of the report to the Planning Committee.

Section 14 of the document presented to the Planning Committee looks at the Impact on Residential Amenity.

Item 14.2 notes the properties most closely located to the development. This includes my property while 14.48 notes that my property needs to be given consideration with regard to Overlooking and Privacy. However, the remainder of that section and the following clauses make note of the likely impact on other properties that fall within the scope but make no further reference to my property. This is surprising given that there is clearly a new visual impact being imposed upon my property and that there are overlooking issues from the new flat windows and balconies that are being proposed at the southern end of the development.

Therefore the conclusion given at 14.52 that the proposed building is not overbearing and does not lead to undue overlooking or loss of privacy is incorrect. The developer has not, at any point in the planning case, assessed the visual impact from the back of my property or looked into any of the privacy and overlooking issues that arise.

On that basis the Conclusions drawn in sections 24.3 and 24.4 are also erroneous. The disregard for overlooking issues given in relation to neighbouring properties is also surprising given the clear consideration that was given regarding similar issues within the internal scope of the development itself which are noted in item 10.16 of the planning report.

In conclusion, it is disappointing that the developers seem to be choosing to disregard the impact of the 4 storey development on neighbouring properties both in regard to overlooking

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

and privacy in relation to my property and in reduced light levels in some of the other affected buildings on Oval Road. These problems could probably be ameliorated if the developer made that proposed building one level lower. If the developer had submitted plans for a block of reduced height in that way then my objection to the development could be addressed, although other property owners on Oval Road may well continue to have concerns about their impacted daylight levels. The planning committee should therefore give strong consideration to recommending the planning subject to a lower height building on the southern side of the site.

Yours

Adam Driscoll
