

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr:                   | Received:           | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------|
| 2014/7097/P     | Paul Filer       | 28 Meadowbank<br>LONDON NW3<br>3AY | 12/12/2014 15:53:27 | OBJEMAIL |           |

12 December 2014

Dear Sir

Re: Planning application 2014/7097/P  
No. 29 Meadowbank

I would like to oppose the application for a rear extension at ground level and a balcony extension at 29 Meadowbank. I live in the neighbouring house, no.28. Whilst I understand the wish of the applicant to extend the house, there are certain design issues which I believe need to be addressed before this application should be considered.

I am opposing the application because:

- The proposed balcony will overlook our house at first floor and ground floor level, which will infringe our privacy.
- Raising the height of the boundary wall between our house and 29 will affect our light and quiet enjoyment.
- Flawed design will have a negative impact on the back elevation.
- The extension bulk will lead to a loss of amenity within the shared communal garden.
- An alternative proposal of digging down may be a solution.

The detailed objections are:

1. It is proposed to raise the boundary wall between our house and 29. It is the boundary wall between our patios. The height of the existing boundary wall between our house and 29 would be increased by some three feet. This is a significant increase. The result of this will be to reduce the light entering our downstairs habitable room. The height will also reduce the sunlight reaching our patio. The additional height will be an oppressive intrusion onto our patio. It will also reduce the view of the garden from our first floor window.
2. The applicant argues that by raising the wall it means the proposed extension would be on the same level as 30, the house up the garden from 29. However our house, and 27 are built at a lower level to houses 29 and 30. The reason for this is that we are on a hill. All the houses on the other side of the garden are also at our level. It is only 29 and 30 that were built on the higher level.  
It would make more sense if the benchmark height of the boundary wall was set at the height of the boundary wall between our house and 29 (which is the same height as between our house and 27). That way, if either our house or 27 built a patio extension, all three would be at the same height. The same consistency of build height would also apply if the houses opposite were to build on their patios. Those houses are built on the same level as our house. Only the end terrace house, 29 would be different. Thus if patios are to be built on, the visual effect would be better if apart from 29 all extensions are built at the lower height of the majority of houses abutting the garden.
3. Camden planning and residents generally, have been concerned about any development in such a

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

built up space. The preservation of the garden amenity is an important consideration. If the lower wall height were to be applied, then it would mean that there would be less massing as the extension heights would be less. Thus the impact on the garden amenity would also be reduced.

4.    Should the applicant be concerned about the room height of the proposed extension, then it would be possible to dig down. The habitable room could be entered by a small step from the house and the desired room height achieved. If you were minded to approve any extension, this option would mean the room could be built with less impact on our house and a reduced impact on the garden amenity

5.    I cannot tell how far the proposed patio extension covers the existing patio. The extension at 30 did not cover the whole patio and I would trust the proposed extension covers the same amount. The reason for not covering the whole patio is, again, the impact on the garden amenity. Attention is drawn to Application 2007/5284/P which required there to be "A strip (full width \* 0.5m) of external wood timber decking would be retained as per the previously approved scheme."

6.    With regard to the balcony, we are concerned that the extension would lead to our property being overlooked. This would be both at the patio level and possibly also into our first floor room. We do not consider this loss of privacy reasonable. In terms of visual appearance, house 29 is consistent with our house and 27. None of these houses have rear balconies that extend across the full width of each house. Nor do the ones on the other side of the garden. Please note also the Application 2007/5284/P gave approval to extend the balcony of 30 in the direction of a wall, not an adjoining house. It did not give approval to extend the balcony so it would lead to another property being overlooked. Thus the balcony extension request for 30 was different to that in the current planning application of 29. The former did not directly overlook another property, the latter does. We would ask that the proposed balcony extension in the application is not approved

7.    We have a query regarding the proposed materials to be used for the roof of the patio extension. We would ask that a condition be that the skylights are fixed, if they can be opened that will lead to increased noise. In addition any skylights should be made of non-reflective material, so as to reduce the risk of reflective glare into the other houses.

8.    We have discussed the matter with a number of residents whose houses look onto this garden. They are also concerned. We expect they are will also contact you to object to this application.

Yours faithfully

PAUL FILER

---

| <b>Application No:</b> | <b>Consultees Name:</b> | <b>Consultees Addr:</b> | <b>Received:</b>    | <b>Comment:</b> | <b>Response:</b>  |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---|
| 2014/7097/P            | Michael Brace           | 27 Meadowbank           | 17/12/2014 15:01:28 | COMMNT          | <p>I live at 27 Meadowbank NW3 3AY two doors down from No.29.I have lived here for 32 years and fully endorse the comments made by mr P.Filer of No.28 . I further wish to comment on the application of No.29 to extend their patio and balcony.</p> <p>In my view it is important to have extensions in harmony with the present layout of the garden which is available for the enjoyment of all Meadowbank residents.</p> <p>The loss of light to the garden is undesirable and overlooking the patios of No 28 and 27 is unwelcome</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Michael Brace</p> |

---