

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2025/0521/L	Mark Ebbinghaus	03/03/2025 10:15:04	OBJ	<p>I have lived at 1 St Georges Terrace ("SGT") for approximately 5 years and have seen various alterations and extensions made to the rear of this architecturally important Georgian Terrace. I am a leaseholder of the ground floor 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 invoke the protective 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:
2025/0521/L	Lucy Cottrell	04/03/2025 08:10:58	COMMNT	<p>I would like to object to planning applications 2025/0523/P and 2025/0521/L, relating to Flat 1, 2 St George's Terrace.</p> <p>After all the issues with subsidence on the lower end of the Terrace, it would be worrying for building work disturbing the ground to take place at the moment at one of the very most impacted houses.</p> <p>Four things need resolution before any such works should be: (1) Camden Council settling with residents, now that tree damage has been established as the cause; (2) the ground settling and stabilising, currently being monitored (3) the requisite house repairs being done, (4) the whole Terrace to getting back its subsidence insurance. As I understand it, we are some distance away from these items all being resolved.</p> <p>Although I live in house no 10, I am one of the many co-owners of the freehold of no 2, so very much an interested party.</p> <p>The Terrace is as fragile as it is beautiful. The London County Council Bomb Damage Maps 1939-45, map 38, available at the British Library – 'the bible of bomb damage' - shows serious bomb damage to the houses of St George's Terrace. In fact, beyond number 11 houses were demolished because of what was the bomb damage in what is now the site of Hill View. Local historian Martin Sheppard gave a talk on this subject to the community a number of years ago. Surely, this is relevant information in assessing subsidence risk. The history of bomb damage is, surprisingly, not mentioned in the structural report attached to the current application.</p> <p>Sadly, past works in the Terrace have shown the risks are very real, despite copious reassurances from the structural engineers involved at that time. Hundreds of thousands of pounds of compensation were required for the subsidence in the Mews as a result of works at no 9 basement, work that progressed despite the objections of multiple residents. Residents impacted had to wait for almost 10 years – planning application 2014, case settled end 2024, their lives turned upside down, with court case after court case. The stress on the victims was considerable.</p> <p>The proposed works at no. 2, as per the planning application in hand, promise "manual hand tools and small-scale demolition equipment will be used where possible to prevent damage to existing structures" (underlining mine). Similar reassurances were given for the works undertaken at no 9, where the excavation method was given as "hand tools" and they promised "any protrusions of the footings into our site shall be carefully trimmed back using hand tools to avoid causing any damage to the foundation". Despite this, the floors of both Mews houses collapsed.</p> <p>So, in conclusion, given Camden Council is currently a party in a subsidence dispute/issue at Number 2, and has been forced to sacrifice three glorious plane trees as part of the remedy, trees with combined utility values over £300k, something not done without extensive evidence, the Council will be all too aware of the strong basis for our concerns. I would urge Camden to refuse planning permission until all these matters are resolved and the buildings have stabilised once more and are insurable.</p>