

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1331/P	Vijay Patel	2/3rd Floor 29 Montpelier Grove	21/04/2017 10:01:42	OBJ	<p>I am the co-owner of the 2nd and 3rd floor flat of 29 Montpelier Grove located adjacent to the proposed dwelling. I have the following objections to the proposed application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overdevelopment - the land is within a Camden Conservation Area and this removal of what would normally be a garden/green area into multiple, multi-story residential dwellings is wholly excessive and contrary to the idea of the Conservation Area protection. The justification for lack of demand for storage units is not warrant enough to convert it to multi-level residential units. This would be a clear overdevelopment which would help the owner financially but at great expense of the area as a whole, affecting the look and feel of the area and increasing human activity to unreasonable levels. It would also set a precedent for other kinds of overdevelopment in the area.</li> <li>2. Change in style of the houses on Montpelier Grove - Whilst the application is for Falkland Road, this actually has a huge impact on the look and feel of Montpelier Grove since the proposed properties would be built at the back of Falkland Road with entrances on Montpelier Grove. The other housing on Montpelier Grove are set back with a garden, and the proposed development would not have this (the doors would be at street level) and so would not be in line with the other houses on Montpelier Grove. Also, the new dwellings would not be Victorian style houses and would be unlike the rest of the buildings surrounding it, standing out prominently due to its differences in style and position on the corner of two streets.</li> <li>3. Light level and views to/from our property - The proposed new dwellings would increase height and therefore block light, reduce our privacy and impede views from our property. The garden needs to receive adequate light to ensure it continues to grow and flourish, and we are concerned a new dwelling would impede this. The new dwellings would also impact privacy of our property, giving its residents a close view into our garden space from its rear windows.</li> <li>4. Increase in occupancy - the property at 71 Falkland Road is already multi occupancy, and the proposed new dwelling would increase this further resulting in more human activity and noise. There would also be more vehicles on the street on the corner of Montpelier Grove and Falkland Road. I strongly believe this is overdevelopment on this piece of land, increasing human activity to unreasonable levels for the land.</li> <li>5. Concerns about maintenance - the current property at 71 Falklands Road is already visually out of line with the houses on both Falklands Road and Montpelier Grove, and the maintenance level has been observed to be poor with rubbish frequently outside and an unmaintained look of the property exterior (unpainted walls and metal shutters). My concern is that the new dwelling proposals will increase this further, and more worryingly encourage it in the area.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1331/P	Vijay Patel	2 & 3rd Floor 29 Montpelier Grove NW52XE	21/04/2017 10:07:25	OBJCOMP AP	<p>I am the co-owner of the 2nd and 3rd floor flat of 29 Montpelier Grove located adjacent to the proposed dwelling. I have the following objections to the proposed application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overdevelopment - the land is within a Camden Conservation Area and this removal of what would normally be a garden/green area into multiple, multi-story residential dwellings is wholly excessive and contrary to the idea of the Conservation Area protection. The justification for lack of demand for storage units is not warrant enough to convert it to multi-level residential units. This would be a clear overdevelopment which would help the owner financially but at great expense of the area as a whole, affecting the look and feel of the area and increasing human activity to unreasonable levels. It would also set a precedent for other kinds of overdevelopment in the area.</li> <li>2. Change in style of the houses on Montpelier Grove - Whilst the application is for Falkland Road, this actually has a huge impact on the look and feel of Montpelier Grove since the proposed properties would be built at the back of Falkland Road with entrances on Montpelier Grove. The other housing on Montpelier Grove are set back with a garden, and the proposed development would not have this (the doors would be at street level) and so would not be in line with the other houses on Montpelier Grove. Also, the new dwellings would not be Victorian style houses and would be unlike the rest of the buildings surrounding it, standing out prominently due to its differences in style and position on the corner of two streets.</li> <li>3. Light level and views to/from our property - The proposed new dwellings would increase height and therefore block light, reduce our privacy and impede views from our property. The garden needs to receive adequate light to ensure it continues to grow and flourish, and we are concerned a new dwelling would impede this. The new dwellings would also impact privacy of our property, giving its residents a close view into our garden space from its rear windows.</li> <li>4. Increase in occupancy - the property at 71 Falkland Road is already multi occupancy, and the proposed new dwelling would increase this further resulting in more human activity and noise. There would also be more vehicles on the street on the corner of Montpelier Grove and Falkland Road. I strongly believe this is overdevelopment on this piece of land, increasing human activity to unreasonable levels for the land.</li> <li>5. Concerns about maintenance - the current property at 71 Falklands Road is already visually out of line with the houses on both Falklands Road and Montpelier Grove, and the maintenance level has been observed to be poor with rubbish frequently outside and an unmaintained look of the property exterior (unpainted walls and metal shutters). My concern is that the new dwelling proposals will increase this further, and more worryingly encourage it in the area.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1331/P	FRANCES ROURKE	53 Falkland Rd Kentish town NW5 2XB NW5 2XB	21/04/2017 16:36:58	OBJ	Two storey is too high and will over shadow the neighbours. Single storey only
2017/1331/P	Anke Baumgartner	First Floor Flat 28 Montpelier Grove London NW5 2XD	20/04/2017 19:01:41	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed application as</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the proposed build would visually not fit into the historic character of the surrounding houses in a conservation area, where there should be a back garden to the main house on Falkland Road and not various 2 storey dwellings</li> <li>2. the height of the proposed building will impact negatively on the open and peaceful outlook I have from my flat onto greenery and historic architecture and reduce the light entering my flat</li> <li>3. the windows of the proposed dwellings will directly overlook my flat, hence loss of privacy</li> <li>4. the area is already being built up to a maximum with various new building schemes and sites going on in close proximity. The existing extension of the house at 71 Falkland Rd already seems to be multi- tenanted, the proposed build would add to the overpopulation and noise level and reduce the much needed green spaces and views.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1331/P	Davin Pindoria	Flat 2nd & 3rd Floor 29 Montpelier Grove NW5 2XE	26/04/2017 22:34:20	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the planning application for 71 Falkland Road on the on following grounds:</p> <p>1) Size:</p> <p>Section 4.10 of the Camden Planning Guidance 1 Design states that rear extensions should be designed to be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing. I believe the proposed development contravenes this, as it seeks permission to build two double storey dwellings, on what is currently a single storey garage. This is excessive and in my opinion does not feel secondary to the existing property.</p> <p>Furthermore, section 4.12 states that in order for new extensions to be subordinate to the original building, their heights should respect the existing pattern of rear extensions, where they exist, and that ground floor extensions are generally considered preferable to those at higher levels. The proposed development clearly does not respect existing patterns, as no other property on Falkland Road has a double storey extension stretching the entire length of the land (including garden). If patterns were being followed, only a single storey extension would be deemed appropriate.</p> <p>I hope that consideration will be given to section 4.13 which states that in most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged.</p> <p>2) Density:</p> <p>The proposed development is in contravention of section 24.7 of the Camden Development Policies, as it does not take into consideration the density of surrounding development. The proposed development would not match the density of surrounding properties, given that other houses in the area which sit on corner of two roads typically have gardens/garages at the rear – these provide a natural break in properties on an adjacent road. The proposed development would remove this break on the adjacent (Montpelier Grove), and instead extend on what is already a densely populated plot of land.</p> <p>Moreover, section 4.10 of Camden Planning Guidance 1 Design states that rear extension should be designed to respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space. The proposed development seeks to extend a property which has already been significantly extended – allowing further development vertically would reduce the ratio of built to unbuilt space, and therefore contravene section 4.10.</p>

3) Amenity:

**Application No:**      **Consultees Name:**      **Consultees Addr:**      **Received:**      **Comment:**      **Response:**

The proposed development would have a significant negative impact the residential amenity of 29 Montpelier Grove. Section 26.3 of the Camden Development Policies states that consideration should be given to the design and layout, the distance between properties, the vertical levels of onlookers or occupiers and the angle of views – i.e. factors that impact visual privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, outlook, access to daylight and sunlight and disturbance from artificial light. This is backed up Section 4.10 of Camden Planning Guidance 1 Design states that development should not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking and sense of enclosure.

The proposed development does not align with either of these policies. The proposed dwellings would be double-storey and would sit closer to the street than 29 Montpelier Grove – this would therefore overshadow, reduce daylight and increase the sense of enclosure to the front garden and front windows of the basement, ground and 1st floors of 29 Montpelier Grove. The rear garden of 29 Montpelier Grove would also be impacted by the increased height of the proposed development, with reduced sunlight and a sense of enclosure. In addition to this, the windows on the 1st floor of the west side of the proposed development would have clear line of sight into the rear garden of 29 Montpelier Grove, which would substantially reduce privacy.

#### 4) Style:

I believe the proposed development is in contravention of section 24.12 and 24.13 of the Camden Development Policies, which state that that designs for new buildings, and alterations and extensions, should respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbouring buildings, and development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings of buildings.

Exiting properties on Montpelier Grove (where the proposed entrances would be) are period in style and are set back from the pavement edge. However, the proposed development does not match the character and style of current properties and would break existing uniformity. Section 24.17 states that buildings should be visually interesting at street level. I don't believe the flat-fronted design of the proposed development would provide visually interesting facades, and in fact, would negatively impact what is already a distastefully extended property.

#### 5) Conservation Area:

Section 25.2 of the Camden Development Policies states that the Council will only grant planning permission for development in Camden's conservation areas that preserves and enhances the special character or appearance of the area. In my view, the proposed development seeks to add to an already over-developed plot of land and would not enhance the area in any way.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
-----------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------

---