

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5277/P	Sara Whyte	16/01/2021 10:23:45	COMMNT	<p>Objection:</p> <p>There are currently 121 residential developments in the Dartmouth Park Conservation area which have planning permission. All of these are to be built on the existing footprint of the previous buildings. This proposal is not. It involves building on the carport and front garden of No1. This past year has highlighted the importance of our own outside recreational space and front gardens within residential streets make an important contribution to the character, this plan reduces the soft landscaping.</p> <p>Little detail is given to the digging down into the subfloor to provide disabled access, and the effect this will have on the water table and drainage of surface water. The proposed house is at the top of the slope leading down towards the rest of the terrace, several of the houses are set below pavement level and recent heavy downpours have demonstrated the increased intensity of the water flow.</p> <p>Policy H3 Neighbourhood plan and Camden guidance to access for all attaches considerable importance to the provision of new homes that can accommodate older people or people with disabilities. This house does not do this. The 1:12 ramp is very steep and would pose a safety risk in icy weather. No dimensions are shown on the plans eg width of doors/ turning circles. The spiral staircase poses a risk to the elderly, disabled or even young children.</p> <p>There is a lot made in this proposal of the gate house to a pocket park. The new 3D picture, submitted on January 13th, shows a feature wall and trees which help to mask the visual impact of the new build. However both of the wall and trees are on land which is now in the hands of a new owner who has not yet submitted his plans for the site.</p>
2020/5277/P	Rosemary Budge	17/01/2021 15:41:56	OBJ	<p>As a long time local resident I OBJECT to this planning application on a number of grounds . First it is a prime example of land grab Of a garden space . It is not a brownfield site but just an unattended garden that with a little imagination and a few hours work could be turned into an attractive garden . No 1 Regency Lawn has very little rear space as it is . The proposed development has even less and is designed right up to the boundary of the old bowls club fence . Such a development could set a local precedent for similar buildings to be squeezed onto tiny sites .</p> <p>The planning application mentions the development of the bowls club as though these two development are complimentary. The site was sold in August 2020 and at present there are no plans in the public domain as to what is to be built on the site .</p> <p>The balconies are not in keeping with the area . The line of the new build does not sit well with the current terrace and the fenestration is completely out of keeping with the area .</p> <p>The plans call it a three bedroom house but the drawings show bed no 1 as part of the sitting room so making it really a 2 bed house . It also mentions housing for elderly or disabled ... this house definitely does not match that demographic .</p> <p>This planning application is out of keeping with the area and should not go ahead .</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5277/P	A. Rose	16/01/2021 19:59:25	OBJ	<p>Object to the plan as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider this application as garden grabbing which could set a precedent for future local houses to follow suit in the 'green corridor' as mentioned in the Design Proposal, it is not an effective or appropriate use of the land. Reference to the land being scrub land is not relevant it needs attention to make it attractive as can be seen by many local front gardens. 2. Site cannot support such a build due to loss of outdoor recreation space to No. 1 Regency Lawn and the loss of currently used car port facility for car recharging. 3. Whilst much is made of the need for local housing stock one house on a compact garden plot is not going to benefit the local area given the number of recent or up coming builds. Namely the recent Chester Balmore Estate and the Swain Lane development, the current work on sites in Highgate Road, ex garage site, and the Bertram Street site together with the yet to be granted for but potentially very extensive Murphy's Yard extending from Gospel Oak to Kentish Town and the possibility of housing yet to be applied for on the ex Mansfield Bowling Club site, Croftdown Road. 4. The site is too small and the location is inappropriate for any such development. <p>Should this application be granted by the council I wish to make the following observations and objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan appears to show that the building line will be up against the back fence abutting the land behind hence no outdoor space to the rear. It is unclear from the plan how much green space to the front and side of the site will be retained for outdoor space. The amenity space provided by balconies in lieu of garden space is out of keeping in the Conservation area and would not sit well with the local streetscape where balconies are not evident. The balcony to the front appears to protrude beyond the building line and would stick out like a sore thumb. Reference is made to the Regency Lawn houses having protrusions at the back of the houses. There appears to be no evidence for this statement with regard to the 9 houses immediately next to no.1. 2. The design does not blend well with the immediate Regency Lawn neighbours in regard to size, shape and placement of windows. Will the windows have clear or darkened glass? If the latter I would object. 3. Reference is made to the ground floor being lowered. Does this mean below street level? Concerns over impact on local housing stock and water table implications if digging out beyond the necessary foundation level. This would be a reason for objection if not on current street level. 4. This cannot be considered a modern design of merit unlike others mentioned in the application. 5. The brick colour and finish is acceptable. <p>Throughout the application and in the Conclusion much is made of the ex Mansfield Bowling Club land adjacent to the site as being of material consideration to the plan i.e. "hints at the architecture of the new dwellings concealed behind", and graphics indicating the build being a gatehouse to the new park beyond being two of many references. This application was made in December 2020 and further graphics have been added since throughout referencing the Mansfield Bowling Club both in text and sketches. It is well known that the whole site was purchased in August 2020 well before this application was submitted and that the new owner has clearly stated he has no intention of building as per the planning granted on appeal to the Mansfield Bowling Club. I conclude that the detail in this application is both out of date and in effect unintentionally misleading as it is built on the premise of it being a gatehouse to a park next to a site for which no such planning has been submitted.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5277/P	Sara Whyte	16/01/2021 10:29:56	OBJ	The previous submission by Sara Whyte January 16th should be read as an 'objection' and not a comment.
