

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7024/P	Gus Gazzard	4 Grove Terrace	10/12/2014 00:13:56	COMMNT	<p>I object to the front garden component of this application because it will irreversibly and detrimentally affect the whole Terrace.</p> <p>The lightwell excavation would be unprecedented. It would harm the relationship between the building and the street and would disrupt the overall unified effect of the lightwells and gardens for numbers 6 to 27 of the Terrace. It would also potentially involve demolition of the original cellars. It thus would have an adverse impact on the a Grade II* listed building and its setting. It is also Camden policy to resist basement development fronting the street.</p> <p>The proposal involves removal of the existing railings at the front and replacement with reproductions. There is no justification given for the destruction of original material.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposal, there are many other examples along the Terrace of more sensitive options that achieve a similar purpose (e.g. numbers 2&3).</p>
2014/7024/P	R F BAILEY	10 Grove Terrace	21/12/2014 17:36:21	OBJ	<p>This proposal would cause very real harm to both the front and rear harmony of these listed buildings. As a resident I most strongly object to this proposal.</p>
2014/7024/P	Eve Murray	27A Grove Terrace	24/12/2014 14:09:44	COMMNT	<p>I would like to object to the excavation of the front light well at no 18 Grove Terrace. This will be completely out of character with neighbouring houses at 6-27 Grove Terrace a unified terrace of Grade II* listed buildings.</p> <p>The front gardens form part of the Terrace. If a development like this is approved, there is nothing to stop someone deciding to also remove the front railings and park their car in their front garden. The unification of the architecture would be destroyed and it would set a danger precedent.</p>
2014/7024/P	Christopher Harrison	26 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PL	24/12/2014 11:39:08	OBJ	<p>I object to the application, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The property is part of Grove Terrace, which is listed Grade II*. The II* listing is rare. English Heritage's website explains that the II* listing is for "particularly important buildings of more than special interest" and that only 5.5% of listed buildings are II*. Grove Terrace is probably the most beautiful and harmonious Terrace in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area; indeed, one of the most beautiful and harmonious in the whole of Camden. 2) The beauty and harmony of the Terrace comes not only from its buildings, but from its setting, with its gardens both at the front and the rear. These gardens - both front and rear - are a crucial part of the heritage of the Terrace. They are an outstanding example of the survival of the setting of a Georgian terrace. 3) The application would destroy the gardens at No 18, both front and rear. The proposal to dig out the front garden would ruin the front of the Terrace. There cannot be any possible sensible reason for desecrating this space. The same is true of the rear garden - this is a beautiful space, at the heart of a large area of green space in the heart of the Conservation Area, that has sat here unmolested for 230 years. Surely it must be essential to preserve this heritage, not to destroy it. 4) These are my fundamental objections, ie that neither the proposed plans for the front nor the proposed plans for the rear should be allowed. Otherwise, on points of detail, the application seems to suggest the removal of items that may be original, such as railings, fireplaces and doors - surely none of this should be allowed?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7024/P	Elizabeth Bailey	10 Grove Terrace Highgate Road London NW51PH	24/12/2014 16:44:03	OBJLETTE R	10 Grove Terrace, London NW5 1PH Jonathon McClue Planning Officer London Borough of Camden 2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square c/o Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 9JE

23 December 2014

Dear Mr McClue

Planning applications 2014/7203/L and 2014/7024/P, 18 Grove Terrace, NW5 1PH

I have lived at the above address for the last 30 years and I object to the proposals set out in these applications and can't understand why these alterations would even be considered on a listed building in a conservation area. I strongly oppose any excavation of the front light well and to the large extension at the rear of the lower ground level and the sunken courtyard as these are not in character with these listed properties and their gardens. The whole terrace is of historic importance and I object to the changes proposed in this application.

As pointed out to me at a recent meeting: The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement records that 'Nos 6-27, with their curtilages . . . are an unusually comprehensive survival of an 18th century piece of speculative development and are listed Grade II*.' It notes that 'The Terrace reads as a unified whole but has a pleasing rhythm within it. An important aspect of the whole terrace is its front gardens with mature shrubs, railings, low walls and original flagstones that form part of the setting of the listed buildings.'

Living in these vertical houses (most are of 5 floors), the views from the upper windows across the gardens are of great importance to all residents and historic importance of Grove Terrace. Any extensions into the rear gardens would cause light pollution which currently does not exist (except at No.19 where the abhorrent and out of character extension plans were unfortunately granted).

The historic walls are also a feature of these long and narrow gardens and I fear such a development as proposed would undermine the structural integrity of the walls and they would fall down – especially as they have shallow or no foundations. Also I object to changing the position of the railings in the front garden and extending the light well as this would be completely out of character with the rest of the Terrace. I therefore believe very strongly that it is essential to protect and preserve this space and not to

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

encroach on it or to build on it.

Numbers 1-5 Grove Terrace should not be viewed as a precedent. These buildings form a separate block from 6-27 Grove Terrace, are later in date and are separately listed only at Grade II. Also the original coal hole covers are still in place at 18 Grove Terrace, and I expect that the original coal cellars (which form part of the listed building) are also still in place. The proposal would involve the demolition of these original cellars, again with no justification.

The proposed extension at the back being 7 meters long extends the width of the existing building (from garden wall to garden wall). I think this would be an excessive development for the scale of the house and garden. It is out of proportion with all the existing extensions on the remainder of the Terrace. Also I do not want permissions granted and for this to set a precedent for future planning applications and ruin the character of these listed terrace.

The size of the garden extension also raises concerns about the impact on the stability of other houses in the Terrace, both during construction and in the longer term. The application documents do not detail how the neighbouring houses will be supported during excavation and construction of the extension. The houses in Grove Terrace have minimal foundations, and are likely to be adversely affected by the significant excavation proposed. Moreover, they are located on London clay, which is prone to shrinking/swelling, heave and movement. Contrary to the statements in the Basement Impact Assessment that there is no evidence indicating any possible shrink-swell subsidence in the local area, there is frequent movement of the houses in Grove Terrace. At present, the houses tend to move in concert, as a block, so there is limited visual evidence of such movement on the exterior. However, the application documents make reference to using 'conventional underpinning methods'; there is serious concern among the residents that underpinning one house could have significant impacts on the stability of other houses in the Terrace.

The proposed rooflight would introduce an extensive area of glass which would create night-time light pollution. The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy specifically notes the 'quality of darkness at night' that characterises the conservation area. The Grove Terrace gardens contribute significantly to that quality. At present, they constitute a large area of darkness with minimal external lighting; this is extremely rare in London. The use of rooflights in this extension thus would not only be intrusive to immediate neighbours, but would also erode the character of this dark area more generally.

Please can I draw your attention to the importance of settings such as the Grove Terrace gardens which is emphasised in Camden's Development Policies at paragraph 22.15:

'The setting of a listed building is of great importance and should not be harmed by unsympathetic neighbouring development. While the setting of a listed building may be limited to its immediate surroundings, it often can extend some distance from it. The value of a listed building can be greatly diminished if unsympathetic development elsewhere harms its appearance or its harmonious relationship with its surroundings.'

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					In conclusion I strongly emphasise that the proposed development should be refused. Yours sincerely Elizabeth Bailey
2014/7024/P	Gus Gazzard	4 Grove Terrace	10/12/2014 00:14:34	OBJ	I object to the front garden component of this application because it will irreversibly and detrimentally affect the whole Terrace. The lightwell excavation would be unprecedented. It would harm the relationship between the building and the street and would disrupt the overall unified effect of the lightwells and gardens for numbers 6 to 27 of the Terrace. It would also potentially involve demolition of the original cellars. It thus would have an adverse impact on the a Grade II* listed building and its setting. It is also Camden policy to resist basement development fronting the street. The proposal involves removal of the existing railings at the front and replacement with reproductions. There is no justification given for the destruction of original material. I strongly object to the proposal, there are many other examples along the Terrace of more sensitive options that achieve a similar purpose (e.g. numbers 2&3).
2014/7024/P	Gus Gazzard	4 Grove Terrace	10/12/2014 00:14:18	COMMNT	
2014/7024/P	Christopher Harrison	26 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PL	24/12/2014 11:44:58	OBJ	(I am resending this objection, as I am not sure it went through the first time.) I object to the application, for the following reasons: 1) The property is part of Grove Terrace, which is listed Grade II*. The II* listing is rare. English Heritage's website explains that the II* listing is for "particularly important buildings of more than special interest" and that only 5.5% of listed buildings are II*. Grove Terrace is probably the most beautiful and harmonious Terrace in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area; indeed, one of the most beautiful and harmonious in the whole of Camden. 2) The beauty and harmony of the Terrace comes not only from its buildings, but from its setting, with its gardens both at the front and the rear. These gardens - both front and rear - are a crucial part of the heritage of the Terrace. They are an outstanding example of the survival of the setting of a Georgian terrace. 3) The application would destroy the gardens at No 18, both front and rear. The proposal to dig out the front garden would ruin the front of the Terrace. There cannot be any possible sensible reason for desecrating this space. The same is true of the rear garden - this is a beautiful space, at the heart of a large area of green space in the heart of the Conservation Area, that has sat here unmolested for 230 years. Surely it must be essential to preserve this heritage, not to destroy it. 4) These are my fundamental objections, ie that neither the proposed plans for the front nor the proposed plans for the rear should be allowed. Otherwise, on points of detail, the application seems to suggest the removal of items that may be original, such as railings, fireplaces and doors - surely none of this should be allowed?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7024/P	Jane Hives	24 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PL	24/12/2014 13:16:00	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed changes to the front lightwell and new rear extension. The proposals at the front are out of keeping with the rest of the Terrace and will significantly alter its overall appearance. It appears that the changes are principally to provide access to bins and bicycles, but this could equally be achieved at the rear of the property with access to the Mews, rather than by more than halving the front garden and destroying the historic frontage.</p> <p>The application infers that the proposal at the rear follows the precedent set by the extension at No 19. The latter was objected to strongly by Grove Terrace residents, in particular because it would set a precedent. However, I do not believe that there is a precedent, because there is a huge difference between the proposed rear extension which fills the entire width of the plot and the much narrower conservatory at No 19. The latter is also a much lighter and less imposing structure and its courtyard is smaller and lawned, as opposed to flagged and painted white, which will be very intrusive in the landscape of the Terrace rear gardens.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7024/P	Astrid Sharkey	21 Grove Terrace	23/12/2014 18:31:50	OBJ	<p>We object to the application registered for no 18 Grove Terrace.</p> <p>Whilst we fully support plans to improve and renovate what remain of the original features in the interior property, we have cannot support the proposals for the plans for the exterior of the house.</p> <p>1) Any alteration to the light well should be rejected, as these would interfere with the harmony and setting of the listed Terrace. It should be noted that number 19, Grove Terrace submitted a plan to alter their light well a few years back and this was refused by the council for this reason.</p> <p>2) We have overriding concerns and objections to the creation of an extension and sunken area, which would provide an undue incursion into the garden. We vehemently opposed the building of an extension by no 19 Grove Terrace, whose plans were rejected by the council yet, astonishingly, granted on appeal. This addition has already posed a negative impact on the green aspect of the open London square garden layout at the back, which the architect's photographs do nothing to dispel. It is this very layout, which places the setting of Grove Terrace in a unique context, with its area of night darkness and unprecedented open views at the back.</p> <p>The proposed construct would alter that layout fundamentally, as does the existing glass extension at no 19. This planned development is also considerably larger in scale and mass. Indeed, the size of this extension is a most unwanted upscaling of development. The paved courtyard takes away the green open views, which are so important in this Terrace and enjoyed by all who live here. The proposed addition of a green roof does nothing to improve this. Essentially, this development comprises a most unwanted garden grab within this uniquely rural area that is full of wildlife.</p> <p>3) Any project which requires excavation should surely be discouraged in a Grade 11* Terrace. The current plan requires considerable and potentially damaging digging out and the removal of a large amount of spoil. It should be also be noted that there is a weight restriction on Grove Terrace Mews. The access via the mews running to the side and down the back of the Grove Terrace gardens carries a weight restriction. This is in place because of the fragile cellars running under numbers 21 and 22, which do not have foundations. Therefore, any building spoil would need to be removed either through the front of no 19, or at the back through the mews whilst respecting the weight limit. However we revert to the main concern, namely that no such excavation should take place.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7024/P	John Chamberlain	11 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PH	20/12/2014 10:25:50	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to both the plan to excavate the front garden and potentially destroy the historic cellars and to the large rear extension and sunken garden.</p> <p>This is a grade 2* listed terrace. The front elevation is consistent and continuous including the line of the front 'areas' (light wells). This plan would destroy that and ruin the consistency.</p> <p>The rear extension is oversized and not in keeping with other rear extensions and both it and the proposed sunken garden would destroy the historic rear garden, which provides a shared landscape and quiet, light-free area. The gardens also provide a wildlife haven and corridor.</p> <p>The impact on neighbouring houses and on the historic garden walls is also likely to be massive and ongoing.</p> <p>Please reject this proposal and any similar one that may be filed in the future.</p>
2014/7024/P	Sara Whyte	15 Grove Terrace Nw51ph	21/12/2014 13:51:24	COMMNT	I strongly object to the excavation of the rear garden area. This would destroy a large part of the garden, intrude on the shared views of the green space at the back of the terrace and create light pollution