

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6074P	Esskay Management Services	25/01/2022 11:37:02	INT	<p>We are writing on behalf of our client, Park View (Primrose Hill) Management who own the communal areas, paths, roadways, communal gardens, lighting etc of the Meadowbank Estate of which 34 Meadowbank forms a part.</p> <p>We are aware that about one third of the Estate has objected to the planning application for the basement extension, which shows the opposition to this development from the local community and highlights the potential negative impact these works will have on so many local residents.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6074/P	Paul Filer	26/01/2022 18:37:41	OBJ	28 Meadowbank LONDON NW3 3AY

Planning - Development Control
Camden Council
Camden Town Hall
LONDON WC1H 8ND
26 January 2022

Dear Sirs

Objection to the construction of a basement at 34 Meadowbank NW3 3AY and ground floor rear extension (Application No. 2021/6074/P)

My family and I have lived at 28 Meadowbank for 26 years and wish to make the following objections to the above planning application:

1. Flood risk

34 Meadowbank abuts a communal garden. The garden does not drain well and, during heavy rain, surface water flows towards the four houses on the Ainger Road side of the garden (Numbers 27, 28, 29 and 30 Meadowbank). Since these four houses are on a slope, heavy rain has caused water build-up on the patio of our house, with the highest water levels experienced at the lowest house on the slope, number 27. House 27 has filed photos showing flooding. Putting a large box below ground to create a basement is bound to lead to more surface water in the garden when it rains. Basement developments on the west side of the garden create an obvious and unacceptable risk of flood damage to the Meadowbank houses on the east side of the communal garden. This risk has not been addressed by the geotechnical assessment, and I would submit that, in view of the flood risk, the basement application should be rejected.

The geothermal report at 6.1.7 states 'the overall change in surface water run-off is likely to be negligible post-development.' What it does not say is that, while this change may be negligible in the wider sense, at a very local level it could have a big impact in the communal 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'. It does not mention the historic flooding nor does it assess the likelihood of this worsening.

2. Over-development

Previous owners of 34 Meadowbank already extended upwards to provide an extra floor in the roof space of the house. In their first Planning Application (2021/4142/P), the current owner applied for, and was granted, planning consent to expand this extra floor by raising the roof of the existing extension. Planning Application 2021/6074/P is accordingly the third application further to enlarge the original three-storey home, resulting in

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

over-development of the site, in an already dense and over-developed neighbourhood.

Should Planning Application 2021/6074/P be granted, it would set a precedent that could create chaos in Meadowbank. All the houses in the terrace 33-36 and elsewhere could apply for similar planning, reducing the access on the pathways and roads for years.

3. Purpose of development as a commercial development inappropriate

The Design and Access Statement at 1.1.1 states: 'This Design and Access Statement has been prepared... in support of a commercial development at 34 Meadowbank'. This property is zoned as residential; a commercial development should be refused.

4. Variation to Planning Application 2021/4142/P?

Looking at the planning documents on Camden's website, the proposed plan of the third floor and roof attached to Planning Application 2021/6074/P is different to the proposed plan to which consent was granted pursuant to Planning Application 2021/4142/P. Has a mistake been made, or does the current owner intend Planning Application 2021/6074/P to be an application to vary the consent? If so, has the variation request been properly made? If it is an application to vary, then this is further over-development to add two more bedrooms on the third floor.

A sub-issue is whether skylights on the attached proposed plan need consent?

5. Ground floor extension issues

Planning consent (2021/4142/P) granted to the current owners to raise the height of the attic room beyond the roof level was made pursuant to the principle dictated by government legislation of 2020 to permit upward extensions. This was the permitted reason to break the uniformity of the terrace of which No. 34 is a part.

Construction of a bay window to the proposed ground floor rear extension now proposes to break the terrace's uniformity at ground floor level too. This is entirely out of keeping with the architecture of Meadowbank as a development, including where ground floor level extensions have been permitted. It further damages the design integrity of the terrace and sets a precedent for 'free-for-all' alterations to the terrace to the detriment of the neighbours on the opposite side of the communal garden.

6. Access issues

The house has no road access, being reached by a footpath leading down via a slope or several steps from the private Meadowbank Road. Indeed, Planning Application 2021/4142/P concedes the narrowness of this footpath, stating that it is a 'pedestrian alleyway...for pedestrian use only [which] does not allow vehicular access.'¹ (Emphasis added)

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Esskay Management has supplied photos to show the narrowness of the footpath.

Raising the height of the roof level, building a basement, extending onto the terrace, and effectively rebuilding every floor of the current scheme of the house, contemplates that this narrow footpath will become a building works access for the demolition waste from the interior of the house, for removal of many tons of soil to construct the proposed basement, and for incoming building materials. Materials and soil waste will have to be moved from the house, along the narrow footpath and the private road to one of the adjacent public roads available for work vehicles, Ainger or Oppidans Road. These works will result in disruption, mess, and noise for the occupants of the terrace, the residents on the Meadowbank private road, and the residents in the public roads. The construction management plan is silent about these matters. Any planning consent should insist on an approved construction management plan and a s. 106 Agreement that covers all affected properties, whether adjacent to house 34 or facing the communal garden.

The garage of house 34 is not contiguous with the house itself and can only be reached by the narrow footpath. If the garage is to be used for storage/removal of waste, it will mean heavy use of the footpath, denying reasonable access to other householders. This would particularly impact house 33 which would be difficult to access during the building works.

It seems that Camden Council is being asked to approve works that will:

- increase flood risk to nearby properties;
- permit an original three-storey terraced house to be over-developed into a five-storey house;
- allow a bay window in the proposed rear extension to further undermine the design integrity of a terrace;
- contemplate extremely significant works to a property with only pedestrian access;
- allow a commercial development in a residential area;
- include a variation to a planning consent not expressly applied for in this application;
- result in many residents of Meadowbank being unable to enjoy their properties for a long period.

This application should be rejected.

Yours faithfully

Paul Filer

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6074/P	Paul Filer	26/01/2022 18:36:59	COMMENT	28 Meadowbank LONDON NW3 3AY

Planning - Development Control
Camden Council
Camden Town Hall
LONDON WC1H 8ND
26 January 2022

Dear Sirs

Objection to the construction of a basement at 34 Meadowbank NW3 3AY and ground floor rear extension (Application No. 2021/6074/P)

My family and I have lived at 28 Meadowbank for 26 years and wish to make the following objections to the above planning application:

1. Flood risk

34 Meadowbank abuts a communal garden. The garden does not drain well and, during heavy rain, surface water flows towards the four houses on the Ainger Road side of the garden (Numbers 27, 28, 29 and 30 Meadowbank). Since these four houses are on a slope, heavy rain has caused water build-up on the patio of our house, with the highest water levels experienced at the lowest house on the slope, number 27. House 27 has filed photos showing flooding. Putting a large box below ground to create a basement is bound to lead to more surface water in the garden when it rains. Basement developments on the west side of the garden create an obvious and unacceptable risk of flood damage to the Meadowbank houses on the east side of the communal garden. This risk has not been addressed by the geotechnical assessment, and I would submit that, in view of the flood risk, the basement application should be rejected.

The geothermal report at 6.1.7 states 'the overall change in surface water run-off is likely to be negligible post-development.' What it does not say is that, while this change may be negligible in the wider sense, at a very local level it could have a big impact in the communal 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'. It does not mention the historic flooding nor does it assess the likelihood of this worsening.

2. Over-development

Previous owners of 34 Meadowbank already extended upwards to provide an extra floor in the roof space of the house. In their first Planning Application (2021/4142/P), the current owner applied for, and was granted, planning consent to expand this extra floor by raising the roof of the existing extension. Planning Application 2021/6074/P is accordingly the third application further to enlarge the original three-storey home, resulting in

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

over-development of the site, in an already dense and over-developed neighbourhood.

Should Planning Application 2021/6074/P be granted, it would set a precedent that could create chaos in Meadowbank. All the houses in the terrace 33-36 and elsewhere could apply for similar planning, reducing the access on the pathways and roads for years.

3. Purpose of development as a commercial development inappropriate

The Design and Access Statement at 1.1.1 states: 'This Design and Access Statement has been prepared... in support of a commercial development at 34 Meadowbank'. This property is zoned as residential; a commercial development should be refused.

4. Variation to Planning Application 2021/4142/P?

Looking at the planning documents on Camden's website, the proposed plan of the third floor and roof attached to Planning Application 2021/6074/P is different to the proposed plan to which consent was granted pursuant to Planning Application 2021/4142/P. Has a mistake been made, or does the current owner intend Planning Application 2021/6074/P to be an application to vary the consent? If so, has the variation request been properly made? If it is an application to vary, then this is further over-development to add two more bedrooms on the third floor.

A sub-issue is whether skylights on the attached proposed plan need consent?

5. Ground floor extension issues

Planning consent (2021/4142/P) granted to the current owners to raise the height of the attic room beyond the roof level was made pursuant to the principle dictated by government legislation of 2020 to permit upward extensions. This was the permitted reason to break the uniformity of the terrace of which No. 34 is a part.

Construction of a bay window to the proposed ground floor rear extension now proposes to break the terrace's uniformity at ground floor level too. This is entirely out of keeping with the architecture of Meadowbank as a development, including where ground floor level extensions have been permitted. It further damages the design integrity of the terrace and sets a precedent for 'free-for-all' alterations to the terrace to the detriment of the neighbours on the opposite side of the communal garden.

6. Access issues

The house has no road access, being reached by a footpath leading down via a slope or several steps from the private Meadowbank Road. Indeed, Planning Application 2021/4142/P concedes the narrowness of this footpath, stating that it is a 'pedestrian alleyway... for pedestrian use only [which] does not allow vehicular access.'¹ (Emphasis added)

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Esskay Management has supplied photos to show the narrowness of the footpath.

Raising the height of the roof level, building a basement, extending onto the terrace, and effectively rebuilding every floor of the current scheme of the house, contemplates that this narrow footpath will become a building works access for the demolition waste from the interior of the house, for removal of many tons of soil to construct the proposed basement, and for incoming building materials. Materials and soil waste will have to be moved from the house, along the narrow footpath and the private road to one of the adjacent public roads available for work vehicles, Ainger or Oppidans Road. These works will result in disruption, mess, and noise for the occupants of the terrace, the residents on the Meadowbank private road, and the residents in the public roads. The construction management plan is silent about these matters. Any planning consent should insist on an approved construction management plan and a s. 106 Agreement that covers all affected properties, whether adjacent to house 34 or facing the communal garden.

The garage of house 34 is not contiguous with the house itself and can only be reached by the narrow footpath. If the garage is to be used for storage/removal of waste, it will mean heavy use of the footpath, denying reasonable access to other householders. This would particularly impact house 33 which would be difficult to access during the building works.

It seems that Camden Council is being asked to approve works that will:

- increase flood risk to nearby properties;
- permit an original three-storey terraced house to be over-developed into a five-storey house;
- allow a bay window in the proposed rear extension to further undermine the design integrity of a terrace;
- contemplate extremely significant works to a property with only pedestrian access;
- allow a commercial development in a residential area;
- include a variation to a planning consent not expressly applied for in this application;
- result in many residents of Meadowbank being unable to enjoy their properties for a long period.

This application should be rejected.

Yours faithfully

Paul Filer
