

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4142/P	Paul Filer	10/10/2021 15:13:20	OBJ	<p>A planning application to raise the roof ridge of 34 Meadowbank in the same manner as on this application was made in 2014 under application 2008/4876/P. The application was refused then for the following reasons:</p> <p>Raising the roof ridge makes this application unacceptable in this location</p> <p>It is considered that a roof extension to this property would fundamentally alter the existing roof form and would cause unacceptable harm in this location. By virtue of its bulk and size the proposal would have an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building and the wider streetscene. None of the roofs ridge have been risen along the applicants terrace which runs from number 32 to 39. The roofscape of these building have been designed in a way that makes this proposal inappropriate and unsuitable.</p> <p>The proposed roof extension including front and rear dormers due to its height, bulk, detailed design and location within a terrace with a largely unimpaired roof line would result in an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the building and the terrace</p> <p>In addition, under the current Camden Guidance Dated January 2021 (5.14) it states that account should be taken of whether</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact on adjoining properties both in terms of bulk and design and amenity of neighbours would be detrimental, e.g. due to a loss of light from the additional height;</li> </ul> <p>It is clear that raising the roof height would lead to a loss of light in both the garden and the houses opposite.</p> <p>Lastly</p> <p>I believe #38, which has the same dormer window extension as #34 currently, had lowered the ceiling of the second floor in order to have a full height third floor. #34 could do the same and not need to raise its roof.</p> <p>Whilst the regulatory environment has evolved, nothing has changed in the neighbourhood since 2014. The issues then of bulk and size, impact on skyline and loss of light to both the houses and garden amenity are the same now as when the then owner of #34 applied to raise the roof of the house and so this application should also be refused.</p>
2021/4142/P	Mrs Christine Brace	10/10/2021 14:50:07	COMMNT	<p>A similar application 2008/4876/P was refused in 2014 and we believe this application should again be refused. 34 and 38 Meadowbank have both added front and rear dormers to the level of the existing roof of the entire terrace. To further develop upwards would mean a lack of symmetry, create an eyesore and further affect the light and sunlight to the communal garden and the houses opposite viz Nos. 27 - 30 Meadowbank.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4142/P	Nigel Smith	10/10/2021 14:12:30	OBJ	<p>The various aerial photos of the surrounding houses attached to this application should make clear to the reader that the Meadowbank estate is a high density site where any extension into the roof space or beyond carries a high risk of compromising the light and amenity of a number of neighbouring properties and their communal gardens.</p> <p>This application not only adversely impacts the houses opposite to number 34's rear elevation, situated in Ainger Rd but arguably even more significantly to the terraces perpendicular to the front elevation and in particular the houses at the end of those terraces - number 46 and 52 - and the communal garden between these terraces.</p> <p>All existing roof extensions have to date kept within the ridge line of the existing property and in most cases have confined their extension, whether front or rear, to the least "offensive" side to minimise impact on surrounding properties. The existing dormers on number 34 departed from this convention by extending both front and rear and in doing so have already adversely impacted my property,</p> <p>The previous owner's application (2008/4876/P) to raise the roof ridge by 1m was rejected. The current application proposes a 2.87m extension above the existing ridge. Such an extension will be an oppressive over development of the property, detrimental to a number of neighbouring properties and would establish a very unhelpful precedent. Please reject this application.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4142/P	Claire Shamash	15/10/2021 09:01:20	OBJ	<p>We would like to register our objections to the proposal submitted for alterations to number 34 Meadowbank, regarding the demolition of the existing roof and dormers and their replacement of an additional storey 2.8m in height above existing roof level.</p> <p>We consider that it would have a significant negative impact on the appearance of the terraced houses as it would extend high above the roof line and thus would be incongruous with the appearance of the other houses in the terrace. Hence it would be detrimental to the appearance of the terrace and would not be in line with the design and character of the estate.</p> <p>All the properties along the terrace (33 to 38) were originally built identically with a continuous roof-line and with joined gutters from one end to the other. When an application was first lodged in 2009 to add an extra storey, many residents objected, however, it was only permitted provided that "no part of the roof would exceed the highest part of the existing structure". (planning reference :2009/3691/P). Thus the application was restricted to the height of the other seven houses in the row.</p> <p>The replacement of an additional storey 2.8m in height above existing roof level would add significantly to the bulk and would unbalance the architectural composition of the row. Thus by reason of its height, bulk, and design, we believe that the proposed storey would be detrimental to the appearance of the roofscape of the terrace of houses of which it forms part, contrary to policies B1 (General Design Principles) and B3 (Alterations and Extensions) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and advice contained within Camden Planning Guidance 2006.</p> <p>Furthermore we are concerned about the safety and integrity of the roof and the drainage of gutters.</p> <p>In addition we are concerned about the structural damage it may cause to the neighbouring properties in the process of this extension. The initial extension created significant cracks in the walls of the adjacent houses. We are very concerned that demolishing the extension and rebuilding it will undoubtedly cause damage to the adjacent houses.</p> <p>Having lived in our house since 1972, we have always endeavoured to keep both the interior and the exterior in perfect condition. It has only just been redecorated.</p> <p>Number 34 has changed hands twice in the last 3 years . During lockdown considerable non-structural work was carried out over a period of months which caused cracking and which has only just been repaired.</p> <p>Being retired, I spend a considerable amount of time at home and thus am anxious about the obvious disturbance and noise that is inevitable with the demolition and rebuilding of the additional storey.</p> <p>We understand that there is an intention to build a basement to this property. Whilst this does not form part of this proposal we would equally register our objections on the grounds of uniformity of the design of the terrace but also out of real concern regarding damage to the stability of the adjacent properties. We understand from our discussions with Camden's planning department that this would require a separate planning application.</p>