

7000/08-1906DS01

26 June 2019



By email emilywhittredge@camden.gov.uk

London Borough of Camden
5 Pancras Square
London
N1C 4AG

FAO Emily Whittredge

4 Underwood Row London N1 7LQ
t 020 7324 2662 f 020 7324 2663
e info@metropolispd.com
w metropolispd.com
w metropolisgreen.com

Dear Ms Whittredge

FLAT 1, 37 DENNINGTON PARK ROAD, LONDON, NW6 1BB
(PLANNING APPLICATION REF:- P2019/1643/P)

We act on behalf of the owner / occupier of Flat 2, 37 Dennington Park Road, and have been instructed to submit representations in respect of the above planning application, currently pending consideration by the Council.

We wish to object to the application, on the basis that the proposals do not accord with the relevant Development Plan policies. Our client's concerns are summarised 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 wider row of terrace properties, which would justify the scale of the extension.

The adjacent extension on which the Applicant relies is of a different context given its corner plot position, particularly as this end of terrace property forms the return to Sumatra Road where there are entrances. Furthermore, by comparison the height of the rear extension to the adjacent property is lower in height on the rear elevation (given the contrasting window arrangement), and to the shared boundary fence.

The proposal projects beyond the existing built footprint of the host building, with significant works proposed to the rear garden. The design of the extension would contrast uncomfortably with the

metropolis pdg ltd
Registered in England No 8441629
Registered Office as above

trading as
metropolis planning and design
metropolis green
metropolis architectural studio

directors
Greg Cooper DIP TP DIP UD MRTPI
Paul O'Neill MA (Hons) MKITPI

prevailing pattern of development, to the detriment of the character of the host property and the wider area.

The extension would also be clearly visible from the adjacent public realm within Sumatra Road, as detailed in the annotated image below.



The proposed development, by reason of its scale, and detailed design, would be visually dominant and incongruous resulting in harm to the host building, wider terrace and the local area, contrary to policy D1 of the Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

The Council's guidance within Policy A1 stipulates that the amenity of Camden's residents will be protected, by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered.

The policy 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.

The application proposal would lead to an un-neighbourly form of development contrary to these objectives.

Loss of Privacy / Outlook

There are concerns raised regarding the impact of the proposed extension when viewed from the rear habitable room windows of our client's property above.

As depicted on the application drawings, and as Officers will see on site, there is an intimate relationship between the two properties, and the resultant scale of this extension would be overbearing when viewed from rear windows.

The proposed extension would also create a privacy breach between the properties. The extension sits immediately below the window cill to the ground floor flat, and the roof plan denotes the inclusion of 3 large roof lights, thus affording direct overlooking of the proposed kitchen and dining areas.

The size of the roof lights and their proximity to our client's rear windows raises additional concerns regarding light spill and light pollution.

The proposal would therefore result in detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, contrary to policy A1 of the Local Plan and Camden Planning Guidance (CPG 6).

Drainage and Flood Risk

The proposed alterations to the rear would result in an increased area of the garden being impermeable and hard surfaced without space for planting.

The proposals do not provide any form of site plan to show the implications on the full rear garden environment. Neither has any technical detail been provided with respect of the proposed overall drainage strategy for the property, particularly in such a sensitive area.

The works therefore have the potential to harm the garden setting and character of the host property and terrace, erode its biodiversity value and, in the absence of adequate reporting, exacerbate a local issue of flooding.

The scheme would consequently be contrary to policies A1, A2, A3, D1 and CC3 of the Local Plan.

Construction Impacts

Without prejudice to the above points of objection, the application proposal would also give rise to a host of unacceptable construction impacts.

Given the relationship between the properties, it is reasonable to expect the Applicant's to provide sufficient detail up front as to the proposed construction methods, with methods of ensuring the safety and stability of neighbouring properties throughout the construction phase.

Our client is also particularly concerned regarding the impact of any future build in terms of the threat to local air quality given the levels of dust that would be generated, together with the obvious concerns regarding noise and disturbance.

Security Concerns

Given the configuration of flats within the building, the introduction of a rear extension gives rise to new security concerns, as it enables easy access to above ground windows.

Whilst it is recognised that security arrangements may not be material to the overall assessment of the merits of the planning application, it is considered that the Applicant should detail how these matters could be suitably addressed.

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 client's 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.

Yours sincerely
Metropolis Planning and Design



David Symonds
Associate