

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/1876/P	Claire Shamash	13/07/2023 11:01:39	OBJ	

To : Leela Muthoora

CC: Councillor Cooper , Councillor Burrage, Councillor Athion, Daniel Pope

Councillor Gould

13/07/23

Dear Miss Mutthorra,

On 28/06/23 I received a letter from Camden Planning Committee dated 20/6/23 informing me that yet another application has been submitted by no 34 Meadowbank to increase the height of the roof. It stated that we would have 3 weeks to comment. My daughter sent an email to you on my behalf on 30/06 which highlighted this delay and I understand that because of the 8 day delay in the letter arriving, the date has now been extended by 1 week.

She also raised the fact that, contrary to the information on your portal which stated that a notice regarding work was posted in Meadowbank on 23/06/23, no such notice was posted. I understand from your subsequent email that this was also an error and that you would arrange for the notice to be posted. I can confirm that a notice was finally posted outside no 34 on July 7th. Please can you confirm if as a result the consultation period will now be extended to July 28th? Also your website states that the expiry date is 11/07/21 which was the initial expiry date. This is misleading and many people will not comment as they will believe they have missed the expiry date. Please can you update your website with the correct expiry date.

I cannot stress enough the importance of Camden adhering to their own planning processes as these are absolutely vital if neighbours are to be allowed to have their views heard.

On reading the application, I was shocked to see that, now in addition to the 2 applications which have already been granted:

34 Meadowbank London NW3 3AY (2021/4142/P)

Grant Prior Approval (Dec 1 2021) - Historic application

Erection of an additional storey 2.8m in height above existing roof level of dwellinghouse.

34 Meadowbank London NW3 3AY (2021/6074/P)

Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement (Jun 28 2023) - Householder Application

Excavation of basement with skylight to front, erection of a ground floor rear extension and replacement windows and doors.

There is now a new application:

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

34 Meadowbank London NW3 3AY (2023/1876/P)
New application (Jun 20 2023) - Historic application

Erection of an additional storey above existing roof level of dwellinghouse including rooflights and vents.

This application would mean that instead of raising the roof line by 1.8 m which was granted by 2021/4142 P, they now propose to raise it a further 1.3m so it will be 3.1 m above the existing roof line of the terrace.

I strongly object to this proposal for the following reasons:

1) It is not at all in keeping with the design of the terrace. It will mean that the roof of no 34 will be 3.1 m higher than the current continuous roofline of the terrace and thus is not keeping with the design of the terrace and is detrimental in terms of its appearance.

Please note that at the time that the roof extension which is currently in place was applied for circa 2007, Camden Council stipulated that the height had to be at the level of the other houses in order to retain the original character of the estate. This stipulation which was adhered to both by no 34 and no 38 was overridden in 2021 when the planning committee approved application 2021/6074 P increasing the height by 1.8m. This new proposal will now increase the height by a further 1.3m.

2) I am very concerned about the damage it will cause to my home and to its structural integrity. The intention is to demolish the current top floor extension and then rebuild it so that the roof will be 3.1 m higher than the current roof line.

The existing extension, which was carried out in 2008 in accordance with Camden Council's ruling, caused serious damage to our house and to our roof. It took 6 months to repair and it was at considerable cost. I fear that demolishing the top floor and rebuilding it at an even greater height will cause even greater damage and will impact the structural integrity of my home.

3) I am very concerned about my health and safety and that of all the other residents of Meadowbank in terms of how the rubble can be removed safely in such a confined space .

4) I do not believe that the planning statement issued for this application is an accurate reflection on the proposed work.

Page 5 states: The works are very minor in nature and the adjoining owners likely to be most affected are the immediate neighbours at Nos. 33 & 35. I do not believe this statement to be true, demolishing and rebuilding a floor is far from being "minor in nature".

Page 9 states: " The proposed alterations will be a considerable design improvement over the existing condition, will respect the varying pattern of heights established within the street scene and has the potential to create an improved template for upwards expansion within an estate clearly desperate for additional space. " I find this statement quite unbelievable. The houses on this terrace are spacious family houses with 3 bedrooms, 2 bathrooms, a toilet, a large kitchen and 3 reception rooms and this does not include the

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

additional storey which is already in place. I find the statement that people are clearly desperate for space quite divisive. It suggests that the developers are solving a problem when in fact what they are doing is creating one. If this development goes ahead it will add significant value to no 34 and will then create a domino effect of developers buying houses on Meadowbank, extending them and reselling them at great profit. This is not in the interest of the residents of Meadowbank who have bought these houses as homes and not as property investments. I also do not believe this is what Camden Council is there for.

I am afraid that I am simply at a loss to keep up with the pace of the number of applications and documents submitted to the council over the last 18 months. There are now over 140 documents on Camden's portal related to the 3 applications. It seems that each application is granted piecemeal. I feel strongly that this should be regarded as one project, with one application, with the planning committee considering the full impact that this is having on no 35, no 33 and indeed on the whole of Meadowbank.

When the first planning application 2021/4142P was posted, we objected but we were told that it was granted based on "Permitted development". We disputed this on the basis that a storey had already been added in 2008 and that the "Permitted Development Rights" , did not apply to houses which have already had any new storeys added to them since they were built. I understand that the "storey" added in 2008 was not considered to be a storey because of its reduced height. Hence this loophole enabled them to be granted their application.

Next inspite of numerous objection (> 25) a second application 2021/6074 P was granted allowing them to build a basement.

Now we have the 3rd application to further raise the roof height. Clearly the architects / developers are skilled in their approach as this strategy of applying for progressive applications appears to pay off and that this approach has worked well from the developers' perspective in managing Camden Council.

Let us be clear on one point, all the houses on the terrace were identical when they were built, but if this third application is permitted, the house will have cumulatively increased in size by > 70 %. Surely this constitutes overdevelopment.

It is for this reason that it is only reasonable to ask for one application to be submitted to cover the totality of the work. This application should include everything in one final request so that the true impact can be considered. This would ensure that the piecemeal strategy of multiple progressive applications, which is time consuming for both the council and the residents, does not allow applicants to succeed in gaining permission for a project which perhaps under normal circumstances might not have been allowed.

I would also add that when the Council met everyone agreed that every effort would be taken to keep the neighbours informed and supported. The developers made a point of saying at the meeting that they were taking every effort to communicate openly at every stage of the process and that my interests were a deep concern for them. Clearly this latest application shows that open communication and my interests are in fact a very distant concern.

Yours sincerely

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/1876/P	Jane Sydenham	13/07/2023 22:46:45	OBJ	Claire Shamash (33 Meadowbank) The success of this application, would have a significant effect on light for the neighboring houses, and would likely lead to other applications of a similar sort, so that the Meadowbank development would become higher rise, darker and would begin to resemble blocks of flats, changing the character of the road