

Printed on: 25/02/2020 09:10:04

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/6344/P		21/02/2020 11:43:18	OBJ	I live at number [REDACTED] Meadowbank. I have read the detailed comments of [REDACTED] submitted on 13 February 2020. I agree with all of them and ask the London Borough of Camden to reject the application.
2019/6344/P		21/02/2020 20:19:58	OBJ/NOT	<p>I object to the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>Firstly, the Meadowbank estate is a compact development of 69 houses within a small boundary. Residents like myself have already had immense disruption to their lives over many months through the construction of a basement for a neighbouring house. I was very surprised to read that the applicant received pre-application advice from Camden that 'basement under house likely to be acceptable'. The lives of Meadowbank residents would become unbearable if basement construction became the norm throughout Meadowbank estate. I would ask the Planning Committee to review whether pre-application advice like this should be given if there are any similar applications in the future.</p> <p>Secondly, the change to the entrance to the house would disrupt the harmonious and symmetrical appearance of the row of houses visible to all residents when they use the pedestrian walkway which passes in front of this house.</p> <p>In addition there are very serious problems with the draft Construction Management Plan. On page 21 it is stated: '! As vehicular access to the site is not available it is proposed that all loading and unloading activity will need to take place in front of the applicants' garage along the vehicle route within Meadowbank. On this basis it is proposed that a temporary vehicle loading area is provided on Meadowbank adjacent to the frontage of the garage. It is proposed that a number of resident parking spaces may be temporarily suspended to create a temporary vehicle loading area and provide sufficient space for vehicles to manoeuvre. To be confirmed once contractor is appointed. Please refer to the attached Traffic Management Draft Plan Fig 2. !' This statement is speculative and misleading in its entirety! The proposed vehicle loading area in front of the garage for #38 is land is owned by the Management Company for Meadowbank and not by #38. No permission has been granted by the Company for #38 to put a skip on it and it is by no means certain that this permission would be forthcoming. The land on the other side of the road (outside #40) is owned by me and my wife. We park our car on it and it is presumably one of the parking spaces which the Construction Management Plan is suggesting may be temporarily suspended so that lorries could load skips etc. We have no intention of having our parking suspended and #38 has no power to do this. The Construction Management Plan also refers to suspending parking on pages 22 and 23. This is misleading as Meadowbank is a private estate and therefore there are no powers available to suspend parking as on public roads.</p> <p>In conclusion I ask that this planning application is refused.</p>