

Attn./Kristina Smith, Camden Council Senior Planning Officer

Re Objections to proposed development at no. 30 Glenilla Rd, NW3

From N [REDACTED]

Dear Kristina

You kindly allowed me an extension to the April deadline for presenting objections—here they are..

1. In general the proposed replacement of the current house with another much bigger and deeper one with a basement has serious flaws.

First of all it is much too big and bulky for the site, is an overdevelopment quite out of keeping with the area;. It will adversely affect neighbours' wellbeing as it will overshadow them, cut out light and space and is both out of scale and in contradiction to the stated aims of our Conservation Area. It really does not fit in with the architectural heritage of the area. It also has an additional storey which will cut out light and add to the bulk.

It will dwarf other buildings, reduce light, unbalance the visual amenity of those nearby: A much smaller, lower alternative should instead be designed that would fit the current quite small site

This proposal also extends much too far back, not only overshadowing the conservatory at no. 28 but is considerably deeper than the usual rear and acceptable building line for Glenilla Rd.

This will have a severe negative impact on houses nearby, both including my own home at the back of the development in Belsize Park Gardens.

The proposed garden room at the back should not be allowed as it will involve destroying trees and overlook neighbours, destroying their privacy.

It is very important for those at the back that the trees be retained as a visual barrier: It is not clear that this is the case. Already one big, mature sycamore is earmarked for destruction—on the alleged grounds it is diseased. It actually looks pretty healthy to me (green leaves and no obvious signs of problems) and I recommend if feasible an independent assessment of its viability. !(Hopefully proposed pollarding of the other should permit its survival.)

The proposed "new 1.8 meter fence" sounds a bit flimsy as does the proposed hornbeam hedge. A substantial screen is required. Camden initially said: "Concerns were raised around the removal of the trees along the rear boundary to facilitate the construction of an outbuilding". I remain concerned.

The outbuilding should NOT be built and the trees should remain. I think the original objections were entirely valid and I am NOT convinced by alternative new proposals..

Groundwater and the risk of flooding

The information in the application shows a watercourse running through the site

Because of the planned basement and other proposed developments, I remain to be convinced that these will not increase the risk of flooding—to which the area is susceptible(application should show level of surrounding gardens.)

Anecdotal evidence from long-term neighbours in Belsize Park Gardens(which is lower than Glenilla Rd, is that there has been flooding from Glenilla in the past (apparently around nos. 24/26). Water recorded in the site investigations at 0.73 below ground level and the area around the watercourse (noted at no.32) is susceptible to flooding so this is a serious concern.

Camden Borough Planning Policy guidance states (para 7.49, 2017)) that “the council will resist the total or substantial demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to a conservation area unless circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention. Admittedly the current house is not of special architectural merit—but the case for demolishing it has not been adequately made since its replacement is considerably worse, being far bulkier, taller, losing half the garden and far less in keeping with the surroundings than the current building. This contravenes Camden’s own planning guidelines.

So too does the reduction of the garden to half its size: Policy D2 of 2017 Camden Planning Policy guidance states it will: “preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character and appearance of a conservation area”.

In para 7.55 it says: “development will not be permitted which causes the loss of trees or garden space where this is important to the appearance of a conservation area”. This is clearly true here—so this development should NOT proceed in its current form—and a Court would surely rule against Camden because the garden shrinkage and the building of a garden room contravenes Camden’s policies.

Finally, the proposed development will adversely badly affect those of us living nearby and degrade our surroundings—rather than enhance them. Again the planned development appears to contradict Camden’s own planning guidelines (2017), paras 6.3 and 6.4: “protecting amenity is a key part of successfully managing Camden’s growth and ensuring its benefits are properly harnessed. The council will expect development to avoid harmful effects on the amenity of existing and future occupiers and nearby properties”.

For all these reasons I recommend that the proposed development in its current form be rejected.

Kind regards

§
[Redacted signature block]

