Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 20/01/2025 09:10:04 <b>Response:</b>
2024/5687/P	Adrian Hollis	19/01/2025 15:05:25	OBJ	Meadowbank NW3 3AY is already a densely populated, overdeveloped estate.
				The recently granted (strongly opposed) planning permission, No.34 Meadowbank has set a precedent for future unacceptable planning applications to be made.  This development has already led to a loss of light to neighbouring properties and the communal gardens.  No.35 planning application shows a lack of continuity which the terrace should preserve and apply to any future planning applications.  The roof terrace on top of the additional new level is great cause for concern. If approved, we would request that restrictions are imposed to prevent the external terrace becoming an internal space in any future planning application.
2024/5687/P	Maeve Feeny	18/01/2025 10:10:18	COMMNT	I live at No 39 Meadowbank which is the lower end of the terrace.  I would like to support the objections and comments made by No 46 and No 28 Meadowbank  The application is a substantial overdevelopment of the site In addition if consent is granted the access to the site must be strictly controlled. All delliveries must be made from the top end of the terrace abutting the main estate road. No parking and no deliveries should be permitted in the cul de sac which is at the bottom of the terrace. This is my only access to my home and garage. I will not be able to live in my house if the access is permanently blocked which is what will happen in practice as there is a development being carried out at No 41 which has severely disrupted the access and parking of some of my neighbours although it does not block my home. However this development will do so unles the access is only possible from the top of the terrace. This will be pedestrian access past No 33 and No 34.
2024/5687/P	Barry Moody	17/01/2025 17:23:32	PETITNOBJ E	<ul> <li>I fully support the grounds of objection lodged by Nigel Smith and Paul Filer.</li> <li>My house (44) would also be overlooked from the proposed roof terrace, as would others. It is disingenuous of the applicants to concentrate solely on the effect on nos. 28/31 and not on the properties bordering the 'middle garden' area.</li> <li>The proposed roof terrace would end any chance of a harmonious new roof line being established at the level set by no. 34, as well as effectively preventing no. 36 from ever doing the same as no. 34.</li> <li>If granted, any construction plan for the development would need to take account of the experience gained as regards site access in the recent development of no. 34, as well as not directly affecting any ongoing works there. It should again reject any possibility of carrying out the development from the nos. 38/39 end of the terrace. This should be secured by appropriate planning obligations and conditions.</li> </ul>