

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2024/2992/P	John Reiss	26/07/2024 14:40:34	OBJ	<p>I have lived at 1 St Georges Terrace ("SGT") for almost 20 years and have seen various alterations and extensions made to the rear of this architecturally important Georgian Terrace. I am a leaseholder of the top flat and joint freeholder of the entire house.</p> <p>Subject to the two concerns below, I have no objection in principle to a sensible, discrete, rear infill to this property:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. If the roof-top of the infill extends higher than the existing garden wall between the houses, then I believe there will be significant loss of light to the bedroom roof window (the only window) of the basement flat of 1 SGT, also to the rear bedroom of the ground/first floor flat and to the two landing windows of my upper flat.</li><li>2. A very major concern of myself and the other freeholder and leaseholders of No 1, and indeed multiple neighbours whose properties are adjacent to No 2, is the fact that SGT is over 170 years old, apparently built on soft soil and subject to subsidence as has been recognised by Camden Council leading to the recent removal from SGT Open Space of three large London plane trees whose roots had spread extensively under No's 1-3 SGT. The concern is that any significant disturbance at No 2, which might involve load-bearing walls and any excavation, could put at risk not merely No 2 but also adjacent properties. There is an unfortunate precedent in recent years when excavation at the rear of a house further to the west on SGT caused the undermining of a mews house in St Georges Mews.</li></ol> <p>It is the intention of the owners of No 1 and all the other adjacent properties to rigorously use the provisions of the Party Wall Act.</p> <p>It would be to every concerned party's advantage if careful consideration were made to these two matters and Planning Approval made conditional on satisfactory solutions.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/2992/P	Peter Charles Medawar	26/07/2024 16:25:27	OBJNOT	<p>We have lived in No 1 and No 2 St George's Mews for over 50 years, a property closely adjoining the proposed development, separated by a party wall. For several reasons, we believe we could be much and adversely affected by the works proposed and give notice of our intention to object. However, we do not expect to be able to do so within the deadline proposed for comments online.</p> <p>One important reason for this that we would want to take account of the findings of the Party Wall surveyor we need to engage – as we understand several other affected interests are intending to do.</p> <p>I would add that our view of the proposed development has been much influenced by the complete lack of communication from either our neighbour (the applicant) or his architect. Our confidence is further reduced by the applicant's highly optimistic assessment of the timings involved. To suggest that works costing up to £2m will be completed by the year end seems completely unrealistic.</p> <p>On the face of it, the proposed development is most unwelcome. It threatens significant noise nuisance, loss of privacy and deprivation of the only source of natural light to the only bedroom in No 1 St George's Mews. We are also very concerned about the impact of the proposed development on the stability of our back wall. Our house was built as a stable block, some 150 years ago, and has no foundations. In 1999, severe damage to the back wall was caused by a self-seeded Sycamore tree in No 4 St George's Terrace; it led to our having to move out of our house for over six months, while the damage was repaired.</p> <p>We note that this planning application does not refer to one other possible complication – namely the tunnelling in and around the end of the garden of No 2 St George's Terrace – and the ownership of said structures. We believe they originate from the pub, the Queens, on Regents Park Road and that they may originally have run the length of that garden</p> <p>We trust that Camden Planning and Building authorities will critically scrutinise this application, to ensure that collateral damage is avoided.</p>

---