

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0316/P	Daniel Adni	23/02/2025 18:39:36	OBJ	<p>I formally object to the works proposed 19 Menelik Road. The paperwork itself has errors. I was not informed as is stated in spite of applying to be informed about applications. The plan drawing is misleading and inaccurate as the unique placement of the front door abd its angles which are enhanced by its placement and space around it on this unique corner site — is not shown at all and only the proposal is shown!</p> <p>The design is out of character for the area. And this house 19 Menelik road, is the best remaining example of the area's between- war housing development. It is the one house in the road that can be enjoyed by all passers-by in a way that no other house can because the features like the angles of the entrance and double height stair window are not hemmed in . And the unchanged footprint is as planned with space all round . The garden itself is a feature from the street and is a rare remaining london garden.</p> <p>Entrances of extra houses will crowd the site as well as be dangerous on this blind corner. There are water problems in the area and there will be increased shade caused by the buildings on this sunnier than usual site will make the street shady, and will reduce water absorption of this valuable area of large garden. Building on this site let alone destroying mature water-absorbing trees will of course only increase existing water problems.</p>
2025/0316/P	ALAN & GILL HEYWOOD	23/02/2025 13:49:21	OBJ	<p>As a local resident and neighbour, we wish to express our serious concern that Camden planning department have failed to meet their obligations and follow due process in contacting neighbouring residents. There has been a failure to post a site notice, a failure to make written communications with potentially affected parties and there has been no consultation of any sort. In addition, it is important to point out that the planning documents wrongly state that the developer has consulted residents. This is a gross inaccuracy as there has been no consultation of any type.</p> <p>We wish to object to this proposed development on the following grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The garden site of 19 Menelik Road is a green site with wildlife features including established hedgehog runs, nesting birds and mature trees. The development will create an imbalance of the character and amenity of the area (As Camden's own guidelines refer to in their local plan) 2. The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site in contravention of Fortune Green development Forum guidelines. Policy 4 states that "the development of new dwellings in private gardens should be avoided". 3. The proposed development would result in adjacent properties being seriously overlooked to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers. 4. The proposed development would worsen a road safety issue in that the existing property is on a sharp blind corner. This is an established black spot. The proposal for House number 1 will seriously impact on the sight line of oncoming traffic. There is no provision for off street parking (and indeed the existing garage and driveway would be lost) which will exacerbate the dangers caused by the inevitable additional vehicles parked by the properties (by residents, visitors, deliveries etc).

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0316/P	Dr Daniel M Guttman	21/02/2025 16:30:50	OBJNOT	<p>I would like to lodge a very strong objection to the proposed works for a number of reasons, although I would like to first also point out inaccuracies in the paperwork that was submitted. Despite claims to the contrary we (and to the best of my knowledge no-one else in the neighbourhood) was informed or consulted by the applicant about the works in any manner. Also, the drawing of the existing house is incorrect and shows the unique feature entrance door in the position the applicant will want to move it to, rather than its current state. We live diagonally opposite #19 and below the key reasons for our objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact on view and lighting - the proposed works will make the building/roof higher and add further buildings, severely impacting our views and reduce light - Trees and green space - the proposal is to cut down tens of mature trees and to replace them with small plants and trees that will "take 30 years to reach a similar canopy". This impacts visual amenity, it is contrary to creating green spaces and it will contribute to more waterlogging (which is already an issue in that property). Building into the garden really leads to significant loss of private open space / damages green space and again impacts on the visual amenity - Feel and look of the neighbourhood - this would be one of the only houses on the road in red brick, destroying the character of the road / is out of general pattern - Overcrowding - adding 15+ additional people is a clear over-development and unsuitable / out of character with the road <p>I also point out that all houses are subject to restrictive covenants, and while this might not be the council's battle, permitting this development would enable the breach of said covenants</p> <p>In summary, we feel very strongly about this ridiculous application - which was planned without any consultation of anyone in the neighbourhood and which would destroy the character and visual amenity of the road</p>
2025/0316/P	Mr Anthony Booth	23/02/2025 09:54:21	OBJ	<p>I object to the house that is planned in the garden of 19</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. it is very tall at 9m and 2 1/2 storeys which is non-compliant with both the local Fortune Green Local development Plan and with Camden Planning Guidance 2. It is planned to be very close to the road which is out of keeping with the rest of the street where there is no permitted development within 4 metres of the pavement

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0316/P	Jacqueline Bean	23/02/2025 22:26:16	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the planning application to radically alter the existing house of 19, Menelik Road, build an attached house onto the existing house and to build a detached house in the garden.</p> <p>My reasons for objection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The proposed changes to the existing house and new houses will change the character of Menelik Road. The structure, siting and building materials of the houses are completely different from the existing houses in this area. Number 19 is at the end of a terrace of 10 houses built in the same style and the construction of house number 1 on the plan will completely alter the appearance and balance of the existing terrace. House Number 2 is not following the building line of houses on the same side of Menelik Road. This development would have an extremely adverse effect on the visual appearance of the area.2. I consider that the proposed building of two new houses in the garden is gross overdevelopment and goes against the Fortune Green Development Plan which states that the building of new dwellings in private gardens should be avoided and should never be more than two stories high. The number of people residing on the plot of land could increase 6 fold from 4 to 24 or more.3. If granted, the construction of these additional properties will reduce the area of green space and necessitate the destruction of existing trees. This area has pioneered the reintroduction of a hedgehog population and any reduction in green areas will be detrimental to their habitat.4. The height of the houses will cause overlooking of adjacent existing houses and seriously compromise the existing standards of good light and privacy that occupants have at present. In addition, the increased occupancy on this site will inevitably lead to high levels of noise.5.If each house owns 2 cars or more, where are they to park? There is very limited space on Menelik Road and this will cause difficulties for all the existing residents who have visitors, workmen, carers etc needing to park.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0316/P	Chiara Alessandrini and Dario Sandroni	23/02/2025 08:18:36	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>We are writing to express our strong objection to the planning application for the erection of two-storey dwelling houses within the existing garden of 19 Menelik Road and the proposed alterations to No. 19. This development poses significant concerns that will adversely affect the character, environment, and quality of life in our neighborhood.</p> <p>The Developer claimed to have consulted nearby residents, yet we have never been contacted by them, nor have we received any notification from the Council.</p> <p>Grounds for Objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overdevelopment of the Site: The proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the site, which is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The introduction of additional dwelling houses within the garden space is excessive and will negatively impact the overall aesthetic and spatial quality of the neighborhood. 2. Loss of Private Open Space: The development will result in a significant loss of private open space, which is detrimental to the local residential amenity. The garden space is an essential feature of the property, and its reduction will adversely affect the quality of life for current and future residents. 3. Impact on Visual Amenity: The proposed alterations and new constructions seem to us completely out of character with the general pattern of development in the area. This will have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the neighborhood, disrupting the harmonious appearance of the existing streetscape. 4. Overlooking and Privacy Concerns: The new dwellings and alterations will lead to overlooking of adjacent properties, compromising the privacy of neighboring residents. This is particularly concerning for habitable rooms and gardens, which are most sensitive to overlooking. 5. Damage to Existing Trees: The development is likely to damage existing trees within the garden, which contribute to the visual amenity and environmental quality of the area. The loss of these trees would be detrimental to the local ecosystem and the overall green character of the neighborhood. 6. Loss of Sunlight: The height and proximity of House 1 will cause a significant loss of sunlight to adjacent properties. This reduction in natural light will negatively impact the living conditions of neighboring residents, particularly in habitable rooms and gardens. <p>In conclusion, we urge the Camden Council to reject this planning application on the grounds outlined above. The proposed development is not in the best interest of the local community and will have a lasting negative impact on the character and quality of the area.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our objection.</p> <p>Chiara Alessandrini and Dario Sandroni</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0316/P	Dr Mark and Mrs Rosalind Penney	22/02/2025 21:25:30	OBJ	<p>We do not support this application.</p> <p>Contrary to Section 3, 'Community Liaison' of the CMP document, which states that Mr Zaman "has been in contact with the residents of the adjacent properties...via a newsletter", and the recommendations in Section 10 of Mr Nicholls' response to the pre-planning application, neither we nor any of our neighbours, nor our local residents' association, MARA, have been contacted by the developer. Camden have not contacted local residents or posted notices locally either.</p> <p>No. 19 Menelik Road is unique in its corner door and the hexagonal window above this. Despite Mr Nicholls' pre-planning recommendation that this door be retained, the plans show it as removed. Also no.19 is one of the few houses in Menelik Road to have the original stained glass in the large landing window on the side of the house. In the plans this would be lost. The plans also appear to include mainly brick frontages. These would be out of keeping as the vast majority of houses in Menelik Road are pebble dashed or painted pebble dash.</p> <p>Front bedroom windows at no 38 Menelik Road would be overlooked by the first and second floor windows on the north side of House 1 as would those in nos. 36 and 34. Currently, above ground floor at no. 19 only the opaque stained glass faces these houses. House 1 would also overlook nos. 40 and 42 Menelik with a barrage of new east facing windows. The ground floor windows of House 2 would be in direct sight line from the no. 38 kitchen window. The proposed buildings are three storeys (including loft rooms) and this would make the overlooking effect more pronounced. The outlook of the houses on the north side of Menelik Road have had the benefit of open and tree views since they were built and this would be lost, to their detriment.</p> <p>The Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (NDP) was drawn up by a Development Forum recognised by Camden in May 2013 and the NDP was adopted by Camden in Sep 2015 "to help decide planning applications".</p> <p>Both House 1 and House 2 are extremely close to the pavement boundary. This is out of keeping with existing houses in the road, which are all about four metres from the boundary. Both the main house and garage at no19 are currently four metres from the boundary. The NDP says that for infill developments (at A12) that "Houses should be set back from the pavement and match or fit the building lines of existing properties". The proposals have attempted to follow such lines in respect of House 2, but without regard to the distance to the pavement; for House 1 no such consideration of building lines for adjacent properties has been given.</p> <p>This corner of Menelik Road is almost blind but the current space at the side of no. 19 helps drivers to see oncoming vehicles. This sightline would be lost if House 1 were built, threatening traffic accidents.</p> <p>The proposed development will very significantly alter the large garden of no. 19 Menelik Road and this will have an effect on the neighbourhood. The view of the trees and shrubs in the garden is an especially pleasing one for local residents. They soften the urban environment and of course provide habitats, shelter, seeds and pollen for wildlife. The Camden Local Plan (page 194) recognises this as an issue and states that "development that occupies an excessive part of the garden" will be resisted. The NDP (at A13) also recommends "the development of new dwellings in private gardens should be avoided".</p> <p>According to the Arboriculture Report submitted with the plans, six trees will be removed as part of the</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

development, as well as two areas of shrubs. Three trees have been earmarked as being especially affected by new structures and surfacing. The garden at no 19 has several areas which have been relatively undisturbed, and this is highly beneficial to the local ecosystem, providing habitats for bees and other insects. Bats visit the garden at dusk (although nests have not been seen there). It is home to many birds, including blue tits, goldfinches, jays and woodpeckers, and on the ground to foxes and hedgehogs. Recently Menelik Rd has developed a "Hedgehog Highway" in consultation with a local vet and a hedgehog conservation organisation. Several hedgehogs were introduced into local gardens, and residents including at no. 19 made hedgehog-sized holes in their fences so that the animals could roam freely between gardens. This has been very successful and there have been hoglets seen. This initiative is supported by Camden, who put up road signs locally with images of hedgehogs to encourage drivers to be careful to look out for them crossing roads. Development at no19 would disturb this positive effort.

The BNG SSM Calculation Summary states that an "offsite purchase of 0.0913 habitat units prior to first occupation" will be required. We believe such suggested mitigations for loss of trees and habitats to be unacceptable. The NDF (page 60) says that offsetting of loss of green/local space should be "within the Area". Any purchase outside the area is of no benefit whatsoever to local biodiversity and ecosystems, which are unique, and so vital in our urban area.

Similarly the Arboriculture Report's conclusion that the loss of trees can be mitigated by one new tree planting within the site, and an area of whip plantings, is extremely inadequate. These will take many years to reach the maturity of the removed trees and, for the 30 years to maturity, the neighbourhood will be in deficit. They will also require, especially in the case of heavy-standard trees, regular watering and proper care in order to thrive, and there is no guarantee they will get this.

The Arboriculture Report gives very detailed advice on how existing trees, including the beautiful Prunus – winter-flowering cherry – at the front of no. 19, can be protected during the building work. They state such work must be overseen by an Arboricultural Clerk of Works, but there is no undertaking that this will be done or that the recommendations will be carried out.

According to the CMP report, site clearance work will begin in August. This will include tree work. The Arboriculture Report has said in Appendix 1 that the Prunus in the front should be reduced to ensure clearance from existing and proposed walls and the crown should be lifted to 4m prior to construction for access. Winter-flowering cherry trees (which this is, and not a 'Plum' as it is called in the Report) should only be pruned in late winter or early spring, to avoid their susceptibility to bacterial canker. The proposed work would therefore take place at the wrong time of year, potentially endangering a beautiful tree which is a lovely feature of our neighbourhood.

The loss of a large part of the front and rear gardens at no. 19 is also likely to affect water absorption in the neighbourhood. Although the Gov.UK flood risk checker describes risk of flooding at no. 19 as 'very low', the surface water flood map for our area does show risk of groundwater flooding overall. Menelik Road residents on the same side as no. 19 and from the top of the corner with Minster Rd downwards report the appearance of water running through their gardens in heavy rain. Water pools in the gardens for several days after this and has been known to run out under the fence of no. 19 opposite nos. 32 and 34 Menelik Road. This may be a small tributary of one of the underground rivers in the area covered during developments in the 1920s. A significant reduction in permeable ground and larger trees would exacerbate this.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>We are very concerned that this site would be overdeveloped, as the proposed number of residents is 22 (more than double the current maximum). This is out of keeping with the neighbourhood. We understand that no parking permits will be allowed, although the residents may be able to obtain visitor permits, so the issue of additional congestion would still exist. Planning storage for just 4 bicycles, while possibly consistent with the minimum requirements, seems inadequate if it is really expected to cater for 22 people. We are concerned that the existing issues with the dumping of Lime bikes and scooters around Menelik Road will be worsened, adding pavement danger to passersby.</p> <p>We also object to this proposed development on the grounds that it provides neither social or affordable housing, nor housing for the elderly. The Camden Local Plan (page 101) recognises the importance and need for these in the Borough. We are concerned that the proposals seem to choose deliberate non-alignment with London-wide and Camden objectives and to accept the fines and offsets (ie. Camden fine, Mayoral fine, Biodiversity offset). Whilst it might benefit Camden financially to accept this, it would be to its own detriment.</p>
