

Our Ref: RM:DW:100381.0002

16 January 2023

Leela Muthoora
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

By e-mail only

Dear Ms Muthoora

**Planning Application reference 2021/6074/P (“the Application”)
34 Meadowbank, London NW3 3AY
Excavation of basement with skylight to front, erection of a ground floor rear
extension and replacement windows and doors.**

We are instructed in this matter by Park View (Primrose Hill) Management Ltd (“PVPH”).

PVPH is the Management company for the Meadowbank Estate (“the Estate”) and owns the roadways and pavements on the Estate. PVPH manages the Estate; providing services and enforcing Estate regulations for the benefit of all residents.

PVPH does not object to owners redeveloping their properties in appropriate and considerate ways – indeed it encourages them to do so.

However, as has been made clear through the numerous objections it has already submitted, PVPH has serious concerns regarding this Application.

PVPH notes the references to precedents for basements but wishes to point out the two applications referred to are not comparable with this Application. The basement built at House 30 is actually on Ainger Road and none of the points at issue with this Application applied to that property. The other application (house 38) relates to a basement not yet built, and which does not have an agreed CMP, with no certainty that one will be approved.

The main reason for PVPH’s concern is the inaccessibility of the Application site in that it does not front a roadway, merely a pedestrian passageway which is not easily accessible by contractors. To the rear is a private enclosed garden. Spoil from the proposed basement development cannot be removed via the rear of the property. Nor can deliveries be made via the rear. As regards access via the front of the property, agreement will need to be reached by the applicants with PVPH and satisfactory arrangements made with owners of other houses so that their use and enjoyment of their houses is not affected, and they do not suffer a loss of amenity.

The latest CMP indicates there will be a holding area for spoil by the front door of the house (instead of the previously proposed holding area that would have blocked the passageway in front of the property) but this is an extremely small area and will not be adequate to hold spoil. It is far smaller than the previously proposed holding area. There is no indication of where the excess spoil might actually be held.

Instead of using a conveyor belt the CMP proposed using a wheelbarrow. But the revised CMP proposes traffic of 7/8 vans a day instead of the previous 2/3. This is even if the vehicles can avoid blocking the garage of house 33, which is doubtful. The plan further suggests very considerable use of the narrow passageway to move many van loads of spoil each day, preventing owners of other houses enjoying two way access to their houses during construction – a situation which is not acceptable to PVPH and which will not be permitted. The CMP is therefore misleading and inaccurate. In addition, there is likely to be considerable damage to the properties owned by the other owners and to the property owned by PVPH, including to the passageway, if the works were to be allowed to proceed in this way.

The CMP acknowledges there will be difficult and possibly unresolvable issues associated with the proposed construction. It states:

“the excavation of the soil will need a holding area which is difficult to start with due to space restrictions but becomes more complex as the project proceeds”.

In addition, the proposed intensive use of the walkway is unacceptable to our clients as it will give rise to unacceptable fire safety and security risks, and on this basis consent will not be given.

In the absence of workable access arrangements which respect the interests of other householders and which do not give rise to unacceptable safety risks, PVPH requests that the Application should be **REFUSED**.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Richard Max' followed by a stylized flourish.

RICHARD MAX & CO