

MRJ Rundell Associates
Attn Mr Daniel Burt
Unit 2A, The Courtyard
44 Gloucester Avenue
LONDON
NW1 8JD

Application Ref: **2008/1304/P**
Please ask for: **Katrina Christoforou**
Telephone: 020 7974 **5562**

21 January 2009

Dear Sir/Madam

DECISION

Town and Country Planning Acts 1990 (as amended)
Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995
Town and Country Planning (Applications) Regulations 1988

Full Planning Permission Refused

Address:
55 Holmes Road
London
NW5 3AN

Proposal:
Removal of existing plant room at roof level and erection of two additional stories to create three new self-contained residential flats.

Drawing Nos: Site Plan 001; 002; 049; 100; 150; 151; 152; 153; 200; 250; 251; 252; 253; 299; 300; 301; 302; 310; 350; 351; 352; 353; 354; 400; 401; 402B; 450A; 451A; 452A; 453A; 454.

The Council has considered your application and decided to **refuse** planning permission for the following reason(s):

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposal, by reason of its height and bulk, would be an unduly prominent and incongruous feature to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building and its setting, contrary to policies B1 (General Design Principles) and B3 (Alterations and Extensions) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement



Unitary Development Plan 2006 and supporting documentation within the Camden Planning Guidance 2006.

- 2 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement for car-free housing, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area contrary to policies T8 (Car-free housing and car-capped housing) and T9 (Impact on parking) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and supporting documentation within the Camden Planning Guidance 2006.
- 3 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement for the submission of a construction management plan, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to traffic disruption and general highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to policy T12 (Works affecting highways) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and to guidance within the Camden Planning Guidance 2006.
- 4 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing highway/public realm improvements, would be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to policies SD2 (Planning obligations) and T12 (Works affecting highways) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and to guidance within Camden Planning Guidance 2006.
- 5 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing a BRE EcoHomes post construction review would fail to adequately conserve energy and resources, contrary to policy SD9 (Resources and energy) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and supporting documentation contained within the Camden Planning Guidance 2006.

Informative(s):

- 1 Without prejudice to any future planning application or appeal, the applicant is advised that reasons 2-5 could be overcome by entering into a S106 legal agreement with the Council.

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613