

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6074/P	Sonia Cohen	21/01/2022 09:46:44	OBJ	<p>I live at 35 Meadowbank, and will be directly affected by proposed changes at no. 34. I strongly object to this planning application for a basement excavation and ground floor extension for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The houses in this terrace are built on a shared foundational concrete platform. This means that works which disturb the foundations of one house are likely to cause structural instability in neighbouring houses. This has the potential to be extremely damaging to my property, and could cause major structural damage. • Basement developments elsewhere in the Meadowbank estate have led to houses being flooded. The technical assessments accompanying this application do not pay adequate attention to this risk. • There is no direct access from this property to the road. This means that the heavy machinery needed for the excavation would have to use the communal garden to access the proposed basement space. Similarly, rubble and materials from the excavation cannot be removed from the site directly onto the road. This means that the communal garden will be hugely affected, if not completely destroyed. It also means that the communal garden will not be usable by other residents for at least the duration of the building work. I am an elderly woman with limited mobility and the communal garden is important for me to be able to access fresh air. This proposed work will be extremely disruptive and will have a large negative impact on my quality of life. • Access to the site is along the path in front of the houses in this terrace. The building work will therefore be extremely disruptive, and is likely to restrict my access to my own property next door. The construction management plan does not consider access issues for neighbours at all. Instead it only addresses impacts on the public roads outside the Meadowbank estate. This is completely inadequate. • The ground floor extension will affect me directly, because it will overlook my garden space. It will overshadow my garden and block out my sunlight. • The proposed bay window of the ground floor extension is completely out of character architecturally with the Meadowbank estate, which was built with an aesthetic integrity. There are no bays or curves anywhere in the estate. • Taken together with the other recent planning application relating to this property, for a roof extension, this application represents a gross over-development of the property, turning it from a three-storey house into a five-storey house. This is unacceptable. • Finally, the design and access statement states that it has been prepared "in support of a commercial development at 34 Meadowbank, London NW3 3AY." Commercial developments are prohibited under the regulations of the Meadowbank estate. <p>For all these reasons, I object to this application.</p>
2021/6074/P	Catherine Simpson	23/01/2022 10:06:33	OBJ	<p>The proposed works would be highly disruptive to a great number of people in the neighbourhood. The property has no direct road access, only a narrow path leading from the road. Inevitably this plan will be disruptive to others' use of communal space. The noise, mess and traffic implications would affect the whole of Meadowbank and this disruption is likely to last a long time. It is unreasonable to impose this burden on the whole community for the sake of extending this very recently extended property.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6074/P	Stephen Elias	21/01/2022 15:27:26	INT	<p>We are objecting to the works on behalf of our clients Park View (Primrose Hill) Management who own the communal areas of the Meadowbank Estate, for whom we are appointed as Managing Agents. Please find attached a copy of the Estate Plan, 34 Meadowbank is shown with an X. The grey areas on the plan indicate the private roadways, pathways and communal gardens on the Estate owned by Park View (Primrose Hill) Management. (Cannot attach Estate Plan will send to the planning officer)</p> <p>Planning Permission has already been granted for a roof extension under Planning Reference, 2021/4142/P which will cause a lot of disruption on the Estate in respect of noise, residential amenity and traffic issues. To reach the above house, contractors vehicles will for deliveries and removal of waste have to access small private roads owned by Park View (Primrose Hill) Management, used by the Estate Residents to access and park outside their properties, which already have parking issues, re contractors vehicles blocking off private paths narrowing roadways. As an example please see attached photo. To reach the house the contractors/deliveries/removal of waste, have to access the house via a private path owned by Park View (Primrose Hill) Management, which serves 33-38 Meadowbank and is also an access path for other Estate Residents. As the either end of the access paths narrow at a pinch point the delivery and removal of materials would have to be via something akin to a wheelbarrow, considerably extending the contract period and thereby extending the issues caused to the properties along the route to 34 Meadowbank. The garage of #34 is not contiguous with the house and can only be reached by the narrow path. If the garage is to be used for storage/removal of waste it will mean heavy use of the path, denying reasonable access to other householders. This would particularly affect #33 which would be difficult to access whilst the contractors would be using the path. (Cannot attach photo will send to the planning officer)</p> <p>The equipment/waste etc cannot be stored on Park View (Primrose Hill) Management property, making it difficult to see how the project can be achieved.</p> <p>Adding additional works to the already approved works will double the amount of disruption re noise, residential amenity and traffic issues and will be too much to bear for the residents. If the works were approved it would create a precedent on the estate that could lead to considerable disruption to multiple householders over many years if similar works were subsequently applied for and approved.</p> <p>Additionally we would be concerned by flooding re the hole being dug for the single storey basement and the possibility of subsidence to the communal garden to the rear of 34 Meadowbank, which is an amenity open to the Estate Residents. A photograph of a flood in the garden was submitted in the objection of 27 Meadowbank, showing the current risk of flood that could only be worsened if this development would be approved</p> <p>The geothermal report at 6.1.7 states "the overall change in surface water run-off is likely to be negligible post-development." What is does not say is whilst this change may be negligible in the wider sense, at a very local level it could have a big impact in the adjacent garden which is not the property of 34 Meadowbank. The basement impact assessment report at section 3 question 5 states "Currently surface water from the site is discharged to the ground in the communal garden area only, and this will also be true after the proposed works". What is does not say is anything about historic flooding or the likelihood of this worsening</p> <p>If you are minded to grant planning permission for this work, a Construction Management Plan and Traffic Management Plan via a 106 agreement needs to be entered into to protect the house owners on the Estate, which our clients, Park View (Primrose Hill) Management, who own the communal pathways, roads and gardens should be a party to, to ensure their requirements for the project are met.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**
