

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5814/P	Tomasz Boniek	11/02/2022 21:21:04	COMMNT	<p>There are several important issues with this planning application, which seems to be against some Policies set out in the Camden Local Plan and guidance contained in the Camden Planning Guidance on Amenity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy A1 in the Camden Local Plan specifies that developments should protect amenities (point a), balance the needs of the development with those of the local area (point b) and that visual privacy and outlook should be respected by new developments (point e) - Para 6.3 in the Camden Planning Guidance on Amenity states that development should avoid harmful effects on the amenity of nearby properties amongst others - Para 2.2 and 2.3 specifically address lack of privacy from new developments, highlighting rear gardens as sensitive areas <p>I believe that the proposed development at 29 Ulysses Road falls foul of those Policies and Guidance for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The design of the proposed dormer is not subordinated to the existing host building and appears unduly bulky. Applications 2016/7018/P and 2009/3540/P have been refused for this exact same reason - The applicant makes reference to a similar dormer extension in 27 Ulysses, which is incorrect. The dormer extension at 27 Ulysses Road has been done under a Lawful Development Certificate Regime. In any case, it is a far less bulky extension than the one proposed by 29 Ulysses Road - The balcony on top of the new dormer extension would cause a significant lack of privacy as it would directly overlook the rear garden at 27 Ulysses Road. Please see planning application for 2006/1831/P where permission for a flat roof terrace has been refused for this reason - The conversion of 29 Ulysses Road into three flats causes significant overdevelopment issues. These terraced houses are not designed to host three flats, particularly if that requires excavating a basement and have a bulky dormer extension. The 25 and 37 Ulysses Road are not relevant examples. As noted by others, they were given retrospective permissions and those two developments are still ugly reminders of past mistakes in planning policy