

# **DRESDEN ROAD**

## **PEST DEVELOPER: NEW OUTBREAK**



**PROTECT OUR VITAL GREEN SPACE FROM THIS NEW THREAT**

### **WHAT THREAT:**

**A PROPOSED TWO STOREY DEVELOPMENT IN A WOODED BACKLAND GARDEN SPACE.**

### **IMPACT ON OUR AREA:**

- **DEVELOPMENT WILL DIRECTLY OVERLOOK NEIGHBOURING GARDENS ON DRESDEN & ASHMOUNT ROADS.**
- **INVASION OF YOUR PRIVACY**
- **WILL SET A PRECEDENT FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS**
- **WILL YOUR BACK GARDEN BE NEXT?**

### **ACTION:**

**JOIN US IN SHOWING UNITED OPPOSITION AND SEND ISLINGTON COUNCIL A MESSAGE THAT WE WILL NOT TOLERATE THIS IN OUR COMMUNITY.**

**SIGN OUR PETITION**

**OBJECT DIRECTLY – SEE P2015/1314/FUL ON ISLINGTONS PLANNING WEBSITE.**

**DO NOT BE BULLIED BY THE COUNCIL AND UNSCRUPULOUS DEVELOPERS.**

To: Islington Planning Department

Date:

Address:

We wish to object to application P2015/1314/FUL re 30-32 Dresden Rd, N19, for the following reasons:

- 1 **Please listen to local opinion.** This is only the latest in a string of similar applications to build in this backland site. A large number of local residents have objected to all of these applications. The last was granted in the face of 17 written objections including one with over 30 local signatories. We think it is high time that Planning and Councillors paid attention to overwhelming local opinion. We do not want any development on this site. We do not know of a single local resident that does. Yet the views of local residents, who are voters, and who will live with the consequences of this new backland build, seem to be unimportant to the Council.
- 2 **This application goes right against a previous Planning view.** The key difference with the plan granted in 2014 and this one, is an increase of 2.5m in the height of the house. This blatantly contradicts clear prior planning advice to Committee, which last time admitted the 'garden character' of the setting.

*Planning C'ttee Rpt 15/7/14 10.7 Whilst the proposal is one storey only above ground level, it would not be appropriate to develop a higher or larger building in this location. Indeed, Council has previously provided pre-application advice advising that any development above the height of the rear boundary wall would not be supported.*

The house now being proposed would be approximately 5.5m in total height from existing 'ground level' of the car park hard standing. If this 2.5m increase in height was not supported a year ago it obviously must not be supported now.

- 3 **The Applicant claims the poplar trees on the site are a potential danger to life, but wants to build a family home right next to them.** The Design & Access statement 03/15 says at 4.6 that a poplar that fell in 2013, 'in retrospect presented a significant danger to those in the immediate vicinity.' The tree survey, paid for by the developer and supporting this application, also claims that P1 may already be compromised with disease. The applicant has been at pains to argue in the past that the site for the new build, butted right against the two remaining poplars, is in danger from them falling, and their consultant questions the 'medium-term' viability of these trees. Given this, we submit it is folly and a potential danger to life and limb, to build a family home right next to a potentially dangerous threat from old and mature poplars, well-known to be susceptible to various fungal rots. These trees are massive in the confined context of this site space. We believe they need managing to stay healthy and are a wonderful asset to the garden character of this space. But it would be madness and irresponsible in our view, to build a new home cheek by jowl with them.

We are well aware that this developer has long wanted these trees gone, but of course they are protected under existing TPOs. The developer originally wanted to fell them both, then relented and proposed to fell one. Both these applications were rejected by Islington. In last year's application they changed their tune and said both trees could stay. It was this and the proposal to build a smaller, lower house, that swayed Planning's advice last year with the recommendation to approve.

However, we notice that this year the Arboricultural Survey in the application, commissioned and paid for by the applicant, actually proposes once more to destroy one of the poplars (P2). Presumably therefore, since Planning have recommended refusal for this in the past, to be consistent, they must refuse it now.

- 4 **Proposal flouts the Islington Urban Design Guide (2006)** The guide (p85) states: '*Backland schemes are only justifiable where they replace existing buildings...or where surrounding blocks are non-residential.*' It goes without saying that there are no existing buildings on this site which it is proposed to replace. The precise site is new ground that has not been built on before. It also goes without saying that the surrounding blocks are most definitely residential. It is therefore plain to us that this application should be refused and indeed, it seems to us, the approval of a smaller and lower house on this site last year also breached this IUDG tenet.

Tim & Helen Hall  
34 Dresden Rd, N19 3BD