

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0012/P	Anne Alexandre	04/03/2024 16:52:06	OBJ	<p>We would like to object to the current planning proposal for the redevelopment of 194 Goldhurst Terrace.</p> <p>Our several concerns are summarised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Size of the basement excavation compared to the existing building (with creation of sub-standard flat deprived of natural light) 2- Effect of deep barrier (created by basement) on underground water flows and repercussions on properties in the area 3- Lack of car park for these nine new dwellings, putting pressure on already tight parking in the area 4- Overall height of the building and effect on neighbouring properties 5- Loss of very productive Bramley apple tree, wrongly presented as small (25cm diameter) in the application but in reality much bigger and vigorous
2024/0012/P	R Mistry	04/03/2024 17:23:37	OBJ	<p>We are seriously concerned about the proposed development, creating 8 dwellings for a relatively small site. The basement excavation is enormous and not justified. The impact will be huge on parking, disturbance to the area during and after construction (initially with noise, pollution and impact on traffic), in particular the underground streams that flow in the immediate vicinity. There will be repercussions to the wildlife and the local and yet fragile ecosystem.</p> <p>In conclusion am writing to formally object to the planning application.</p>
2024/0012/P	Peter Guest	05/03/2024 15:16:11	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden,</p> <p>I & my wife object in the strongest terms to this proposal.</p> <p>The number of flats applied for is ridiculous. The local infrastructure, let alone the existing residents, could not cope with potentially 10-12 more vehicles.</p> <p>The disruption such a significant re build at a key road junction is a both a safety & an access concern to say nothing of the potential loss of parking spaces during the building work.</p> <p>This is a conservation area so a like for like improvement of the existing building is surely more in keeping with the intention of the conservation area. This has been done with two other houses close to number 194 over the last 2 years. Why should number 194 be different? What has changed in Planning's duty to protect the conservation area?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Peter Guest</p>