

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0026/P	Michael Lowndes	25b Rona Road	13/02/2018 10:35:54	OBJ	<p>It is regrettable that these proposals have been brought forward without any pre-app engagement and are not properly supported by any form of DAS / Planning Statement.</p> <p>This objection relates to the quality of design proposed; the impact upon the character and appearance of the conservation area and to the impact upon the amenities of adjoining neighbours. In these terms it is contrary to the policies of the Local Plan (D1; D2; A1) and to adopted SPD"s (CPG Housing and CPG Amenity) as well as to the Mansfield conservation area management strategy.</p> <p>Specifically the loss of soft landscaping and associated tree to the front garden and its replacement by hard surface paving is unsustainable in climate change terms and will cause the loss of important visual amenity and biodiversity of the street frontage. Similarly the further erosion of the rear garden will detrimentally impact upon the openness of the wider rear garden area. These proposals are contrary to the CA guidance which says that "Front and rear gardens within the residential streets make an important contribution to the streetscape and character of the residential area. The Council will resist the loss of soft landscaping...". These proposals are not in accordance with the requirements of D2h.</p> <p>Through the further loss of open rear garden space the proposal fails to respect local character (D1a) which is characterised by green and attractive rear gardens rather than by built footprint (beyond the main rear building line) and small and enclosed patios. This increase in built form and in the height of the extended rear outlier is contrary to D1b;D1k and D2e.</p> <p>Further the additional built form; the associated increase in height of the existing freestanding garden room in very close proximity to the boundary with 25 RoRo will lead to an undesirable increase in sense of enclosure and overshadowing to the garden of 25 RoRo and the associated loss of outlook. Accordingly neighboring amenity will not be protected (A1a; e and f)).</p> <p>All these issues can be resolved by a more considered design that properly meets the high standards set by Camden policy. However as the proposals currently stand I would urge you to recommend refusal.</p>