

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7709/P	PJ White	45 Princess Road	11/02/2015 20:43:43	COMMNT	<p>I object to this proposal for a basement for the following reasons in a very constricted area like our mews. The mews has only a single access road, which at the best of time is difficult to negotiate. The traffic plan in place illustrates that it would suffer from a number of daily visits from reasonably large vehicles to collect about 300 tons of soil and deposit numerous loads of building material. This would make access to the mews difficult for a long period of time. This is of serious concern from some of the people living in the mews of frail health and with mobility issues.</p> <p>Similarly the mews would become incredibly unpleasant during that same period due to the dirt, dust and noise they would suffer. A substantial number of residents are retired and their lives would be a misery.</p> <p>This is based on the assumption that the development did not set a trend and other residents would attempt to do something similar. A prior application from number 17 was rejected on various ground including access and correctly so. Please observe this precedent and refuse this one too.</p> <p>The Camden Planning Committee did the right thing when it recently rejected the attempt to do work at Quadrant Grove, a rejection which has not been appealed on. You will of course be aware of all the reasons why, and I believe the same concerns apply to this case.</p> <p>A mews is a small, constricted environment, that should be supported by a strong social network. To a large degree that is the case in Albert Terrace Mews. It has a certain character in terms of scale and development – this is obvious to everyone when they decide to move here. It is considered a conservation area.</p> <p>This is overdevelopment for this small house and it seems obvious that, after the basement is built if you give consent, the rooms will become habitable but unhealthy ones. The applicant should buy the size of house she requires not this house and try to make it in to the size of house she wants. I urge you to refuse this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7709/P	Stephen Robinson	2 Albert Terrace Mews	11/02/2015 14:43:16	OBJ	<p>The last time this committee authorised a basement dig in this mews, it resulted in the road subsiding. That was a much smaller dig than this one, which will surely do even more damage and further disturb the water table in a mews where flooding and water seepage are already a problem. The proposed work is out all proportion for what is a mews house. The owner has not had the courtesy to advise residents of how the disruption will be minimised, but got her people to write a holding letter when the story appeared in the Daily Mail. Excavation on that scale will blight the entire mews for many months with noise and dust and traffic. The road surface will be damaged by lorries. Already on the current work lorries have been blocking the mews for long periods of time, which is dangerous in the event of emergency access being necessary. As the father of three young children who cycle and scoot down that side of the mews I strongly object to the work which is already creating a mess. I am sure the committee will approve the work as it always does, especially when applications make nonsense of Camden's showy support for the environment. Assuming you allow this to go ahead, how will you subsequently force the applicant to repair the damage that will be done to the road surface; and who will be liable for repairing the subsidence. Feelings are running high in this mews, but no-one expects Camden to turn down an application from an important Labour supporter.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7709/P	Mr Terry Goodfellow	1 Egbert Street NW1 8LJ	13/02/2015 15:13:45	COMMNT	I write to you to object to the planning application noted above. My objection relates to the basement development. I have no comment in respect of the potential new windows, though I do not find them attractive to look at.

In general my view is that if you live in an ancient city like London, you must accept that the city needs to develop in order to be functional and for that reason I have never objected to a planning application before in spite of the considerable nuisance one has experienced as a result of recent developments in this area.

However there comes a point where the needs of the individual and the concerns of what I will call the wider society clash.

The spread of basements is a point in kind. The point has been made by our local MP Frank Dobson in his support for a recent private members bill that was proposed by Karen Buck MP. In general basements are being built in order to fulfill luxury needs or for pure speculation, not in order to deal with issues of wider importance.

The developments are on doubtful ground from an engineering perspective as the many un-expected issues, which have arisen in this and other London boroughs. As such I am not a fan.

However all these issues are multiplied when you deal with a very constricted area like our mews. The mews has only a single access road, which at the best of times is difficult to negotiate. The traffic plan in place illustrates that we would be suffering from a number of daily visits from reasonably large vehicles to collect about 300 tons of soil and deposit numerous loads of building material. This would make access to our mews difficult for a long period of time, I am guessing 9 months. Apart from the factual issues, I know this is of serious concern from some of the people living here of frail health and with mobility issues.

Similarly the mews would become incredibly unpleasant during that same period due to the dirt, dust and noise we would suffer. A substantial number of residents are retired and our lives would be a misery.

This is based on the assumption that the development did not set a trend and other residents would attempt to do something similar. A prior application from number 17 was rejected on various grounds.

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

including access and in my view correctly so.

The Camden Planning Committee did the right thing when it recently rejected the attempt to do work at Quadrant Grove. You will of course be aware of all the reasons why, and I believe the same concerns apply to this case.

A line needs to be drawn in the sand. A mews is a small, constricted environment, that should be supported by a strong social network. To a large degree that is the case in Albert Terrace Mews. It has a certain character in terms of scale and development – this is obvious to everyone when they decide to move here. It is considered a conservation area.

Please conserve the nature of our area by establishing once and for all that it is neither possible, nor practical (or considerate) to extend the scale of housing by increasing the total footage of buildings around here. It would lead to larger houses with ever increasing number of cars, staff, traffic etc and substantially change the character and spirit of the area. That would not be in the interest of people living here, nor of the rest of Camden.

It is high time the council put a stop to basement excavations which are no more than vanity projects, for all the reasons already stated.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7709/P	Matthew Nelson	41 Regent's Park Road	11/02/2015 21:59:32	OBJLETTE R	Mr. Nelson Camden Council Planning Department Planning Application for 11 Albert Terrace Mews 014/7709/P

Dear Mr. Nelson,

I write to object to the planning application noted above. My objection relates to the basement development. I have no comment in respect of the potential new windows.

In general basements are being built solely to fulfill luxury needs, not to deal with issues of wider importance (e.g. additional homes).

However the problems are exacerbated when you deal with a very constricted area like the mews behind our building. The mews has only a single access road, which at the best of times is difficult to negotiate. The traffic plan in place illustrates that we would suffer from a number of daily visits from reasonably large vehicles to collect about 300 tons of soil and deposit numerous loads of building material. This would make access to our mews difficult for a long period of time (I am guessing 9 months). I know this is of serious concern from some of the people living here of frail health and with mobility issues.

Similarly the mews would become incredibly unpleasant during that same period due to the dirt, dust and noise we would suffer. I work/write at home (as a junior academic), and this disruption would seriously disrupt my modest career.

This is based on the assumption that the development did not set a trend leading other residents to attempt similar excavations. A prior application from number 17 was rejected on various grounds including access and in my view correctly so.

The Camden Planning Committee did the right thing when it recently rejected the attempt to do work at Quadrant Grove. You will of course be aware of all the reasons why, and I believe the same concerns apply to this case.

A line needs to be drawn in the sand. A mews is a small, constricted environment that should be supported by a strong social network. To a large degree that is the case in Albert Terrace Mews. It has a certain character in terms of scale and development – this is obvious to everyone when they decide to move into the immediate vicinity. It is also a conservation area.

Please conserve the nature of our area by establishing once and for all that it is not practical (or considerate) to extend the square footage of buildings around here. It would lead to an ever-increasing number of cars, staff, traffic etc. *without* necessarily increasing the number of homes. Such projects will also substantially change the character and spirit of the area. That would not be in the interest of people living here, nor of the rest of Camden.