|            |       |   |  | Printed on: | 02/08/2023 | 09:10:09 |
|------------|-------|---|--|-------------|------------|----------|
| <br>G 1. N | B 1 1 | ъ |  |             |            |          |

Application No:Consultees Name:Received:Comment:Response:2023/1876/PAdrian Hollis30/07/2023 19:19:15 OBJOBJECTION

Meadowbank estate is recognised as being a high density development. This application has not considered the scale, massing or height in relation to the adjoining or similar buildings. Any additions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale to maintain continuity, rights of light and privacy.

Properties within the central ¿triangle¿ in the same style as No34, which include but not exclusively Nos 46-51, none have extended above the original ridge line of the terraces.

The two communal gardens to the front and rear of No34 have several properties adjoining the gardens some with 2nd floor private terraces, all these properties will be hugely affected by any upward extension beyond the ridge line.

Reference made to a tree acting as a barrier:

The estate management maintenance plan includes pollarding and/or removal of vegetation as deemed appropriate therefore it is unreasonable to consider a tree which sheds leaves as being a permanent ¿barrier¿ and should be disregarded.

The impact of such an over development in a densely packed estate will be untold if permission is given by setting a president for others to follow. The need for space cannot always be accommodated by expansion when moving would be a more appropriate solution.

We request that this application be reviewed by a full planning committee and scrutinise in conjunction with the basement and rear extension planning application already made by owner/ developer of No34.

Please note that we are in agreement with all objections made in respect to Planning Application 2023/1876/P