

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0316/P	West Hampstead NDF	42 Sarre Road London NW2 3SL	27/03/2025 17:03:45	OBJ	<p>2025/0316/P</p> <p>19 Menelik Road NW2</p> <p>The NDF objects to this proposal because it contravenes the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (NDP), specifically:</p> <p><b>LOSS OF GARDEN/GREEN SPACE:</b></p> <p>Extract from the NDP, page 19,</p> <p>“A13. Garden developments: in order to protect the Area’s green/open spaces, the development of new dwellings in private gardens should be avoided. If any developments are approved, they should maintain a much lower profile than existing housing stock, usually one or two storeys. (Also see Policy 17)”</p> <p>“Policy 17</p> <p>Development shall protect and improve, where appropriate, existing green/open space. Development that increases the demand for recreation or amenity shall provide for new green/open space. This shall be achieved by, where appropriate:</p> <p>i. The protection of existing green/open space - from significant damage, or loss, through development.</p> <p>ii. The appropriate provision (relative to the size of the development) of new green/open space, or contributing towards addressing the open space deficiencies in the Area as identified in the development plan.</p> <p>iii. Appropriate contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of existing and new green/open space, where applicable.</p> <p>iv. The offsetting of any loss of green/open space, ideally within the Area.</p> <p>v. The protection and appropriate provision of green corridors through existing and new streetscapes. ....”</p> <p><b>HOUSE 2 IS OVERSIZED, OR UNDERSIZED.</b></p> <p>House 2 in the proposal as a garden development does not meet the requirement to have a much lower profile than the existing housing stock, being 3 stories.</p> <p>Paragraph A13, page 19, of the NDP states “.... If any [garden] developments are approved, they should maintain a much lower profile than existing housing stock, usually one or two storeys.”</p> <p>On the other hand, it does not meet the requirements for an in-fill as it does not match the substantial buildings on either side, in height or volume.</p> <p>Paragraph A13, page 19, of the NDP states “ Infill developments: any replacement of a house or houses, or addition of a new house, within an existing terrace should be to the same scale as the terrace, including the roofline. It should be similar in form, materials and details. Replication of particular exterior details is strongly recommended where such details are consistent in streets.... “</p> <p>HOUSE 2 does not match the style of houses in Menelik Road and adjoining roads, in fenestration and in roof style which lacks the interest provided by dormer roofs on all other road facing roofs. Roof lights on a new build seems somewhat unambitious.</p> <p><b>HOUSE 1 IS NOT ADEQUATELY SET BACK FROM THE ROAD FROM THE ROAD:</b></p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>The extension to the original house, House 1, is inadequately set back from the road, not matching the set back of all other existing houses along the south side of the northern part of Menelik Road.</p> <p>Paragraph A12, page 19 of the NDP states: ".....Houses should be set back from the pavement and match or fit the building lines of existing" properties, with front garden areas remaining unpaved. The same principles should apply to vacant sites in streets where there is already a pattern of existing development. "</p> <p>FINALLY:</p> <p>We see that BNG SSM Calculation Summary states that the BNG Targets on this application are not met.</p> <p>We believe that there have been no approvals for new detached houses in gardens in the Menelik/Minster Road area in the past. There was a proposal for one at the junction of Asmara and Minster Road but an application was never submitted after local consultation.</p>

---

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0316/P	Nick Jones	34B Somali Road	28/03/2025 07:30:23	OBJ	<p>RE: Objection to Planning Application Reference 2025/0316/P</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed development at 19 Menelik Road, highlighting critical concerns that fundamentally compromise the character, environmental integrity, and community wellbeing of our neighbourhood.</p> <p>I am the owner of 34B Somali Road and my garden backs directly onto the proposed development site.</p> <p>1. Violation of Privacy and Residential Amenity</p> <p>The proposed development severely compromises residential privacy and amenity, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct overlooking of my property, contradicting Camden Planning Guidance (Amenity) 2021, Section 2.2, which explicitly states that developments must protect the privacy of existing and new dwellings</li> <li>• Creation of a substantial visual barrier that will dominate my garden and neighbouring properties. To look out onto the gable end of the 3 storey house c.1m from my boundary is oppressive.</li> <li>• Overbearing Impact: Section 2.14 of the same guidance notes that developments should “ensure that the proximity, size, or cumulative effect of any structures avoids having an overbearing and/or dominating effect that is detrimental to the enjoyment of their properties by adjoining residential occupiers.” The proposed buildings would create an oppressive and dominant visual barrier, severely impacting my property</li> <li>• Loss of light into the rear of my property</li> </ul> <p>2. Architectural Incompatibility</p> <p>The proposed design fundamentally conflicts with the established architectural character of Menelik Road and a gross over development of the site :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate use of red brick, inconsistent with the predominantly pebble-dashed or painted streetscape</li> <li>• Destruction of unique architectural features, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Removal of the original stained-glass stairwell window</li> <li>o Obscuring the distinctive first-floor hexagonal window</li> <li>o Eliminating the characteristic corner entrance</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>3. Environmental and Ecological Concerns</p> <p>The development poses severe environmental damage:</p> <p>Biodiversity Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mature Bay tree in my garden (T2) has a predominantly round crown yet the proposed drawings show the crown as oval, in reality my tree would be within the envelope of the proposed new build house. The root spread also goes well into the proposed footings of the new building. Any building in this location is likely to cause severe damage or death to the mature tree in my garden, which is home to many animals with bats often seen entering the foliage</li> <li>• Destruction of a critical wildlife habitat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Hedgehog populations – on 12th September 2020 10 rescue hedgehogs were released into the gardens of Menelik and Somali Road. This release followed the introduction of a hedgehog highway, which included the garden of 19 Menelik Road.</li> <li>o Nesting birds – often seen flying from the cemetery up the green corridor of gardens</li> <li>o Bat habitats – which are regularly seen flying into and over the existing natural garden habitat of 19 Menelik Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Direct contradiction to Camden Local Plan (2017) commitments to protecting natural</li> </ul>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received
---------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------

Comment
---------

Response
----------

habitats

4. Overdevelopment and Policy Violations

The proposal represents clear overdevelopment, specifically:

- Contravening the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015)
- Failing to "complement and enhance the distinct local character"
- Introducing a density incompatible with the existing residential context

5. Precedent and Consistency

The Council has previously rejected similar developments in the area (notably at 40 and 7 Menelik Road), establishing a clear precedent against such inappropriate development.

Conclusion

This development is fundamentally incompatible with:

- Local planning policies
- Environmental protection objectives
- Neighbourhood character preservation

I strongly urge Camden Council to reject this planning application in its entirety.

---