

Leela Muthoora

From: Paul Filer [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 February 2024 09:14
To: Daniel Pope; Osian Jones; Leela Muthoora
Cc: Matt Cooper (Cllr)
Subject: HPRM: objection to house 34 Meadowbank planning application (2024/0273/P)

Record Number: PLD/24/14680

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

I would like to object to the above application on the following grounds:

1. The patio extension is higher than previously, adversely impacting the garden amenity. The new drawing [Proposed Elevations and Sections \(revised\) PD3015_rev01](#) shows that the total height of the extension (which is what should be the measure) will be 3.130 metres. This is above the permitted height of 3 metres and so should be refused. It is also higher than on the previous application, which was below the 3 metre limit. This increase in height will adversely impact the neighbours, as well as the garden amenity.
2. The raising of the first-floor balcony rail breaks the architectural integrity of uniform balconies of all the other houses facing onto the garden and elsewhere in the other 68 houses on Meadowbank and will look awful. You can see this is evident from the photo below that shows the first four houses of the terrace (the terrace extends with more houses with identical features), #34 being the second from the left. The balconies are identical and the ability to overlook the adjoining houses is limited.

There is no obvious safety or aesthetic reason for raising the balcony rail. I can only speculate that the applicant wants to lay some form of decking so that the balcony is level with the floor of the first-floor room, making it more of a terrace than the balcony it is at present. We and our neighbours have lived for many years perfectly happily and safely stepping out from our first-floor rooms onto our balconies. What justifiable reason can the applicant have to change this? This alteration will be highly intrusive to the neighbours, enabling the applicants to look directly into neighbour's living rooms. It should be rejected.

I wish to place on record that this is the applicant's 5th planning application. Every new application has resulted in the council granting permission to increase the size of this small house. I seriously wonder whether the council would have approved all these incremental applications if all the alterations had been included in a single scheme at the outset when the overdevelopment of this property would have been plain to see. I am beginning to doubt whether the council ever says 'no, enough is enough' to applicants who apply for planning permission in this way.

Regards

Paul Filer

