

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/0099/P	Heather Daly	8 Meadowbank NW3 3AY	10/02/2015 14:59:03	OBJ	<p>We would like to register our objections to the proposal submitted for alterations to number 7 Meadowbank, particularly as relates to the roof-level extension at the front elevation as well as the Juliette balconies at the ground and 2nd floor level elevations.</p> <p>With regards to the Juliette balconies, these are clearly out of keeping with the surrounding area as none of the homes between 1 and 24 have such protrusions. Indeed, every other home on the park side of the Meadowbank development has flush windows with the only protrusions being the same small balcony on the 1st floor level throughout the development. The addition of the Juliette balcony to the second floor in particular would be a very noticeable deviation from the established pattern on the street and is therefore undesirable. If the owners wish to extend their windows as it appears, it would seem more sensible that they propose larger windows in the same flush style as is currently present as there is some variation already in the size of windows in the development.</p> <p>Whilst the top floor extension will certainly have a detrimental impact on our residential amenity, our objections relate primarily to the impact the development would have on the surrounding homes, including our own. Indeed, we were refused a similar proposal in late 2012 by Camden with the following comments and explanation:</p> <p>“Following an Assessment of the proposed extension at the third floor level, it is generally considered that this element of the development would be unacceptable...no.s 5,6,7, and 8 Meadowbank are built at a higher level than no.s 1,2,3 and 4 and both set of four create their own roofline and pattern of development...Insofar as no’s 5, 6, 7 or 8, there have been no alterations undertaken to their third floor levels to create a new extension to the roofline area. Essentially they retain a roofline that is largely unimpaired by alterations and extensions.”</p> <p>“...with the exception of a small, conservatory-style, top floor extension to No. 1 Meadowbank, which is set back and largely obscured from ground level views, each of the eight dwellings in the terrace appear largely unchanged. This provides the area with an attractive, uniform character, adding significantly to the aesthetically pleasing appearance of this part of Meadowbank.”</p> <p>In our own recent case, when we suggested revising our proposal to a smaller extension, we were informed that no extension to the top floor would be considered acceptable by Camden Council, even one of similar proportions to that of number 1 as the roofline was unaltered. Due to its positioning, any extension to number 7 would also be visible from the street and I would expect that it would be regarded as similarly undesirable from the Council’s viewpoint.</p> <p>I was surprised to discover recently that number 6 had been granted permission to create a top floor extension as we had not been consulted during the planning permission process. It appears that number 7 is using this as a precedent for their proposal. However, although this permission was granted to number 6 last April, no work has been done on the extension to date and as such, the roofline in question remains “unimpaired by alterations and extensions.”</p>