

| Application No: | Site Address: | Case Officer: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: |
|------------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 2013/4970/P | The Poplars Montpelier Grove London NW5 2XD | Rachel Miller | Mr Giles Pratt | 07/09/2013 12:02:12 | OBJ |

Response:

The previous application at this property was refused by reason of its height, size, bulk and design. Most of the problems with the original application remain. The current application, in particular because of its bulk relative to the plot and the existing building, remains out of keeping with, and does not respect, the context and character of neighbouring and surrounding buildings (contrary to policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy, and policy DP24 of the Local Development Framework (which highlights density as an important issue)).

Unduly high density use of land in a residential area

Considering how little land would remain for the garden at the Poplars, the proposed extension is an inappropriately high density development for this residential part of the borough (contrary to sections CS1 and CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy). By building on the garden all the way to the rear edge of the property boundary, the development would be inconsistent with the density of neighbouring properties, out of scale compared to properties in the neighbourhood, would cause a material loss of the site's natural assets by removing an excessive amount of garden space, and would significantly change the appearance of the neighbourhood, particularly from the houses on Brecknock Road. The development would, as such, also breach development policy DP24.

Interference with light and privacy

By building four stories high (including the roof) right up to the backs of the gardens of the properties on Brecknock Rd, the new development would block light for, and (including by adding two new windows at each level, facing directly into properties on Brecknock Road) interfere with the privacy at, the rear of those properties. Considering that neighbouring roof terraces have recently been refused by the council, that loss of privacy (and light) is inappropriate.
