

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1217/P	Gus Gazzard	4 Grove Terrace	08/04/2015 23:38:39	OBJ	<p>I object to this proposed development in scale, type of development proposed and its execution. It is likely to be out of keeping with the current terrace, detrimental to the structure of the terrace and overly intrusive to the immediate neighbours.</p> <p>It relies heavily on the existence of a smaller (though also architecturally unacceptable) basement extension in number 19 but Camden's own Development Policies state at paragraph 24.13 recognise that 'Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions.'</p> <p>There are other principles that this proposal contravenes:</p> <p>Camden's Development Policy 27 states that 'the Council will only permit basement and other underground development that does not cause harm to the built and natural environment and local amenity';</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cause harm to the setting of a listed building, contrary to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Camden Development Policy 25(g);</li> <li>• undermine the existing uniformity of Grove Terrace, contrary to Camden's Development Policies at paragraph 24.13;</li> <li>• neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and would impact adversely on the visual amenity of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, contrary to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Camden Development Policy 25(b);</li> <li>• not preserve garden spaces which contribute to the character of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage, contrary to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Camden Development Policy 25(e);</li> <li>• by reason of its length, size and scale have an adverse impact on the quality of life and amenity of neighbours, particularly in respect of outlook and artificial light levels, contrary to Camden Development Policies 26(b) and 26(c); and</li> <li>• lead to the loss of open space and harm the appearance or setting of the property or the established character of the surrounding area, contrary to Camden Development Policies 27(e) and 27(g).</li> </ul> <p>In summary there are multiple reasons why this is excessive in scale and inappropriate in content.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1217/P	Astrid and John Sharkey	21 Grove Terrace	09/04/2015 18:18:09	OBJNOT	<p>Planning applications 2015/1217/P and 2015?1695/L 18, Grove Terrace</p> <p>We write for a second time to object to proposals for no 18 Grove Terrace, plans which do not differ materially from those previously submitted.</p> <p>Number 18 forms part of a Listed Grade 11* Terrace, a heritage status being given to just 6% of all listed buildings.</p> <p>The Terrace is extensively described in the Dartmouth Park Area Appraisal and Management Statement, which refers to the front and back gardens that form such an important part of the setting. No 18 is central to the starred listed section between 6 and 17 thus occupying a particularly important part of the views and setting of the Terrace. These views provide a borrowed landscape for neighbouring roads, forming a garden square to the rear framed by old brick walls.</p> <p>The scale and mass of the proposed rear extension would ruin these views, grossly affecting the setting of these listed buildings.</p> <p>The applicants again refer to the unfortunate extension at number 19, opposed by residents and by Camden for these very reasons. It was surprising that PINS should have upheld the applicants' appeal as this more modest in size extension already disturbs the harmony of the Terrace and its gardens. Referring to Camden's Development Policy we note that past alterations or extensions should not be considered to create precedent.</p> <p>The proposal that the construct would cover the width of the house, would be a truly terrible incursion into the rhythm of the architecture and to the gardens. The overall size would take away the green which is the most admired and valued part of the landscape.</p> <p>The stability of our houses raises concerns for all as the foundations, which are of the shallow "raft" model. Given the considerable amount of excavation involved in such a proposal houses on either side – indeed the Terrace as a whole, could sustain substantial damage. The proposals would not preserve or enhance the conservation area, or preserve the garden spaces.</p> <p>The proposed extension would have an adverse effect on the amenity of neighbours both during construction and, critically after the finished works which could effectively ruin the house, its setting and the harmony of the entire Terrace.</p> <p>Issues of removal of spoil would present terrible difficulties as the weight limit over 21 and 22 Grove Terrace is in place to protect the cellars just below the street which are structurally unsupported.as would be the potentially disastrous use of mechanical diggers.</p> <p>The alteration of a front light well is contrary to Camden's development policy, which should be rigorously upheld.</p>

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

This is a disastrous application and must be rejected.

---