

10/12/18

LOWER GROUND FLOOR FLAT, 31A DENNINGTON PARK ROAD, LONDON, NW6 1BB
(PLANNING APPLICATION REF:- P2018/5125/P)

Introduction

- I am the owner / occupier of [REDACTED] Dennington Park rd, and would like to submit representations in respect of the above planning application, currently pending consideration by the Council.
- We wish to object to the application in the strongest terms, on the basis that the proposals do not satisfactorily accord with the relevant Development Plan policies or National Planning Guidance.
- A summary of my objections is outlined below.

Design and Impact

- Local Plan Policy D1 (Design) requires development to consider the character, setting, context, form and scale of neighbouring buildings.
- In this case, there is no other similar form of development within the immediate row of terrace properties of which the application property forms a part, which would justify the scale, width and depth of the extension.
- The proposal projects beyond the existing built footprint of the host building, with significant works proposed to the rear garden.
- It has not been possible to assess the full impact of the proposals given the limited drawing information provided.
- The Applicant has failed to provide any existing sectional drawing material, and it is therefore difficult to properly establish the full extent of excavation that may be required.
- The design of the extension would contrast uncomfortably with the prevailing pattern of development, to the detriment of the character of the host property and the wider area.
- The use of materials do not reflect those of the existing building which would add to its incongruous appearance. The development would also be readily apparent in views from neighbouring properties.
- We note the previous approval for a summer house at the back of the garden (reference 2011/4119/P). When this application was considered, the Council had concerns about the size of the garden that would be retained, and the same considerations apply now. Furthermore, if both proposals were advanced there would be serious overdevelopment concerns.

- Overall, the proposed rear extension by virtue of its design, materials and scale would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building, and the wider area, contrary to policies D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and the objectives of the Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1 and 6).

Residential Amenity

- A review of the application material confirms that the size and detail of the proposed extension has the potential to harm existing levels of amenity enjoyed by neighbouring properties.
- The Council's guidance is clear within Policy A1 that the amenity of Camden's residents will be protected, by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered.
- It seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers by only granting permission for development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight.
- The application proposal would lead to an un-neighbourly form of development contrary to these objectives.

Loss of Privacy / Outlook

- There are serious concerns regarding the impact of the proposed extension when viewed from the ground floor rear habitable room windows of the above property.
- There is an intimate relationship between the two properties, and the resultant bulk and scale of this extension would be visually obtrusive and overbearing when viewed from rear windows.
- The proposed extension would create an unacceptable privacy breach between the properties. The extension sits immediately below the window cill to the ground floor flat, and the roof material is entirely glazed, thus affording direct overlooking of the proposed kitchen and dining areas.

Insufficient Information on Daylight Impact

- The Applicant has failed to provide any professional assessment of the impact on daylight to any of the neighbouring properties.
- The application drawings also lack any meaningful context (either in plan or elevation) to accurately depict the positioning of adjacent windows, which may be adversely affected by the proposal.
- For the above reasons, the proposal would result in detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, contrary to policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and Camden Planning Guidance (CPG 6).

Trees

- There are mature trees in the garden and to the boundaries of the neighbouring gardens, and it would appear that the proposed development and boundary treatments may be located within their root zones.
- The existing trees are an important visual amenity, which also increase biodiversity. Their protection is therefore desirable, and full aboriginal implications need to be reviewed as part of any assessment.

Drainage

- The proposals include a sizeable reflecting pool water feature which runs almost the entire width of the property immediately adjacent to the proposed rear wall and building foundations.
- No technical detail has been provided with respect of the proposed overall drainage strategy for the property, particularly how this feature is to operate in such a sensitive area for the wider building.

Construction Impacts

- Notwithstanding and without prejudice to the above fundamental points of objection, the application proposal would give rise to a host of unacceptable construction impacts.
- There is no detail on the proposed construction methods, nor do they detail proposed methods of ensuring the safety and stability of neighbouring properties throughout the construction phase.

Conclusions

- For all these reasons, we consider that the proposals fail to meet the objectives of the development plan, and as such the Council are respectfully requested to refuse planning permission accordingly.
- We would be keen to discuss these matters with you as the application is progressed, and ask that Officers arrange to visit our property to see matters first-hand.
- We look forward to your formal acknowledgement and request that the Council contact us prior to any formal decision on the application.



6/12/2016