

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1217/P	John Chamberlain	11 Grove Terrace	12/04/2015 20:27:50	OBJ	<p>I support the position of the Grove Terrace Association in opposing this application in all respects. It appears to be a resubmission of the previous application, with minor changes.</p> <p>It is unclear whether they plan to excavate the front garden ("Enlargement of front lightwell") but this must be opposed. With regard to the rear extension, this is totally out of character for this Grade II* listed house and would more or less double the footprint of the house. It is far bigger than any other rear extension on the Terrace and would set a dreadful precedent as well as having significant detrimental effect on the neighbours.</p> <p>The proposed excavation of the garden is a travesty and should not on any account be allowed. It will leave the historic garden walls perched on unstable ground and form a dark trench which will be detrimental to the shared amenity of these historic gardens.</p> <p>I believe that the application should be rejected in its entirety and the applicant informed that any further application that goes beyond a short extension will also be rejected.</p>
2015/1217/P	Ian Bostridge	2 Grove Terrace	11/04/2015 15:20:56	OBJ	<p>The plans for the front of the property are inappropriate and would disrupt the historical and very rare look of an eighteenth century terrace which is 2* listed. The applicants will have known when they bought the house that there were likely to be severe restrictions on development. Beyond this, the plans are disruptive and also likely to threaten the integrity of the surrounding buildings. Similarly for the plans for the back, which are utterly out of character with this listed terrace. The gardens, with their historic layout, will be spoilt by this development.</p>
2015/1217/P	Sara Whyte	15.grove Terrace	11/04/2015 16:41:51	OBJEMPER	<p>I strongly object to this plan. The rear extension is still excessive in scale with the original depth of the house. It will also seriously impact on the garden area which will intrude on the shared garden views of the terrace - the low walls enable a "shared landscape" which is a valued feature of the grove Terrace gardens.</p>
2015/1217/P	Sara Whyte	15.grove Terrace	11/04/2015 16:41:29	OBJEMPER	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1217/P	Dr Peter Bourdillon	13 Grove Terrace	10/04/2015 20:48:17	OBJ	I am a resident of Grove Terrace and I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the proposals set out in these applications.

These applications differ in only minor respects from the applications submitted under 2014/7203/L and 2014/7024/P, to which we also objected strongly. They should be rejected.

Context

Nos 6-27 Grove Terrace is listed Grade II* and is located in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. Grove Terrace, together with its gardens (front and back), not only is outstandingly beautiful, but also has a unique place in Camden's heritage.

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.'

The front gardens are mirrored by the importance and setting of the rear gardens, which are at the heart of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, as well as in the curtilage of the listed buildings. They are bordered by brick walls of the same age as the buildings. These gardens are long and narrow, so that each house in Grove Terrace has the benefit of views over at least three or four gardens to each side—an unsurpassed example of borrowed landscape. Together they form a large open green space that is overlooked not only by Grove Terrace itself to the west but also by Woodsome Road to the north, Boscastle Road to the east and Dartmouth Park Road to the south. The many residents of these roads have the benefit of this green space that has existed since Grove Terrace was built in the eighteenth century.

We therefore believe very strongly that it is essential to protect and preserve this space and not to encroach on it or to build on it.

Excavation of lightwell

It is not clear whether the excavation of the lightwell which was a significant feature of the earlier applications is included in the current applications. The description of the application still refers to enlargement of the lightwell, and there are still references in the Design and Access Statement to the existing railings being replaced like for like and for there to be a stair. However, the applicant, Mr Vara, previously assured us that he was not pursuing that enlargement. The drawings submitted with the new application show the existing coal cellars and say they will be tanked, suggesting that the applicant no longer proposes to excavate the lightwell. The applicant should be required to clarify the application.

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

Comment: **Response:**

If it is still proposed to excavate the lightwell, then we believe the proposal should be turned down for the following reasons:

Allowing the excavation would disrupt the overall unified effect of the lightwells and gardens for 6-27 Grove Terrace, would harm the relationship between the building and the street and would disrupt the unity of the overall frontage of the listed terrace. It would therefore have an adverse impact on the listed building and its setting.

There is no justification for the removal of the existing railings (which are specifically mentioned in the listing description) and replacement with reproductions, or for the removal of the original coal cellars.

The removal of original fabric, the change in the historic size and shape of the lightwell, and the change in the relationship of the building to the garden and street would all be contrary to Camden's policy in respect of listed building and conservation area basement developments, as set out in paragraph 27.11 of Camden's Development Policies.

Rear extension

We continue to object strongly to the proposed extension at the rear of the property, which is substantially the same as in the previous applications. The length of this extension has been reduced from 7 metres to 6 metres; this is a trivial change. The width of the extension from wall to wall, the proposed green roof, the roof light and the dug out lower terrace (all of which were objectionable to neighbours in the original applications) are all retained in the current applications. Although there have been some changes in the profile of the lower terrace or courtyard dug out at lower ground floor level, the overall length of the dug out area (including the stepped terraces now proposed) appears to be somewhat greater than under the original proposal.

We object to this development for the following reasons:

Excessive scale: Even at 6 meters, the extension would be nearly as long again as the original depth of the house. We believe 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, which (although they vary in date and style) are all roughly of the same (relatively modest) proportions.

The applicants make comparison to the existing extension of number 19. Camden's Development Policies 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.' In any event, unlike number 19, this extension would cover the entire width of the house, running from garden wall to garden wall. Even if number 19 were acceptable as a precedent (which it is not), this is an incremental worsening of the impact of number 19's extension. Moreover, the residents of the Terrace have serious concerns that if permission is granted for this extension, the Council could have difficulty resisting similar developments elsewhere on the Terrace. The cumulative effect would be devastating to the character of the listed building.

Adverse impact on garden setting: The Association has always been very concerned about the building

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

Comment: **Response:**

of new structures in the gardens of Grove Terrace. This extension, which occupies an excessive part of the garden, not only would intrude into views from the houses of the immediate neighbours but would impinge on the views up and down the gardens, which as noted above is one of the most significant features of the Terrace.

Lower terrace: The further extension for a basement level courtyard is also unprecedented and, even with the revised profile in the current applications, would create further undue and objectionable incursion into the garden. The area of the garden available for planting would be greatly reduced, adversely impacting the green aspect of the gardens. The proposal would further significantly erode the aspect of 'borrowed landscape' which is such a feature of Grove Terrace, and adversely impact both the character of the conservation area and the setting of the listed Terrace. Not only is there no need to destroy a beautiful garden in this way, but the lower terrace is unlikely to be successfully used for the purposes anticipated by the applicant. This part of the gardens gets limited light due to the heights of garden walls and sun angle, and this will be made even worse by putting the terrace at the lower level. It is likely to soon become an unused and abandoned space.

Impact on stability of other houses: 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 provide any information on 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 and heave, resulting in frequent movement to the 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, there is serious concern about what the effect would be if one house were underpinned, so that it did not move in concert with the others. Residents are seriously concerned that this could have significant impacts on the stability of other houses in the Terrace in the longer term. The applicant has provided no information about how such adverse effects would be prevented.

Violation of basement policy: 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'. By virtue of the size and unprecedented incursion into the garden, the proposed development contravenes this policy. It also is at odds with the growing consensus that basement extensions should not be permitted on listed buildings. The Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, for example, has recently adopted a total ban on basement extensions for listed buildings.

Disruption from spoil removal: The degree of excavation that would be required for this development is a major concern. If this were done with mechanical diggers, the impact on neighbouring properties could be significant. In addition, the excavated spoil would all need to be removed through the front of number 18 or from Grove Terrace Mews (which runs behind the Grove Terrace gardens). However, removal through the Mews is unlikely to be practical, as there is a weight limit at the entrance to the Mews as a result of the fragile cellars running under numbers 21 and 22. In either case, removal of this quantity of spoil would result in many months of disruption. Grove Terrace is a single lane wide, with

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

Comment: **Response:**

restrictions on access from the north at certain times of the day. The numerous lorry movements required to remove the spoil will regularly block Grove Terrace, creating safety concerns about accessibility for ambulances and fire engines, in addition to the significant burden and disruption to residents. The scale of the works is simply unacceptable in such a constrained environment.

Harm to listed garden walls: The effect of the extension on the historic garden walls is not clear from the application documentation, but is a serious concern. There is no explanation how the walls (which have no foundations) would be protected during the construction. Although not expressly suggested in the application documentation, we would like to make it clear that it would be totally unacceptable for the historic walls to be demolished and reconstructed.

Light pollution: The proposed rooflight would introduce an extensive area of glass which would create night-time illumination. 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. There are no enforceable means of preventing this. Day-time reflection would also be intrusive.

Materials/green roof: The proposal for a green roof is also of concern. It would be out of keeping with the gardens for the rest of the Terrace and, if not properly maintained, could become an eyesore. There are no enforceable means of ensuring its upkeep and maintenance. If any extension roof were clad in sympathetic materials (for example, York stone similar to that of the existing terrace), it might be more acceptable.

Use of roof as terrace: Although not entirely clear, there are suggestions in the application documents that the applicant now proposes to use the roof of the rear extension as a terrace. If so, this would present serious issues of overlooking. Moreover, we understand that, given the proposed drop in elevation from the roof to the lower terrace, railings would be required around the roof under the building regulations. This would increase the unsightliness of the proposed extension and detract from the setting of the listed building.

Internal alterations

We have fewer concerns about the proposed internal alterations. Our overriding concern would be to see the retention of any original or historic material.

Application documentation

Inadequate Construction Management Plan: Camden's Development Policies at paragraph 26.10 require a construction management plan to identify the potential impacts of the construction phase of the development and state how any potential negative impacts will be mitigated. The very cursory

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Construction Method Statement provided by the applicants is completely inadequate for the scale of the works proposed. For example, there is no description of how the neighbouring houses and walls would be supported and protected during construction. Nor is there an adequate description of how traffic would be managed on the narrow, one-lane Grove Terrace.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>The proposed development would:</p> <p>cause harm to the special interest of a listed building and adversely impact on features of special architectural or historic interest, contrary to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Camden Development Policy 25(f);</p> <p>(if the front lightwell is to be excavated) result in the demolition of a part of a listed building without any showing of exceptional circumstances, contrary to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Camden Development Policy 25(e);</p> <p>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);</p> <p>undermine the existing uniformity of Grove Terrace, contrary to Camden's Development Policies at paragraph 24.13;</p> <p>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);</p> <p>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);</p> <p>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</p> <p>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).</p> <p>The importance of settings such as the Grove Terrace gardens is emphasised in Camden's Development Policies at paragraph 22.15:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">‘The setting of a listed building is of great importance and should not be harmed by unsympathetic</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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.'</p> <p>For these reasons I think the proposed development should be refused.</p>
2015/1217/P	Mrs Catriona Bourdillon	13 Grove Terrace Highgate Road London NW5 1PH	12/04/2015 17:36:50	OBJ	<p>These are not minor alterations. The front garden already has two cellars well waterproofed and usable. To allow such a desecration of one of the finer Georgian Terrace Grade II* in Camden, would be vandalism.</p> <p>The rear garden already has development there as there is a garage. A small extension of the kitchen of not more than 12 feet would be reasonable, but excavating the amount intended will affect the neighbouring houses badly and the garden walls which have no footings at all will fall down. If the owners require more space, a larger house would suit them better.</p>
2015/1217/P	Christopher Harrison	26 Grove Terrace	12/04/2015 19:22:30	OBJ	<p>I do hope that this application will be roundly rejected. It suffers from many of the same problems as the previous applications 2014/7024/P and 2014/7203/P. It is tedious to have to comment again, but I think it is important to do so in order to show that applicants cannot wear people down by making repeat applications with just irrelevant changes.</p> <p>No 19 is at the centre of Grade II* Listed Grove Terrace. The II* Listing is, of course, rare. It reflects the great importance attached to these beautiful buildings. The Terrace is not just a wonderful heritage asset of Dartmouth Park, but indeed it is one of the most beautiful terraces in Camden.</p> <p>The Terrace is unique, because it has been preserved with both its front and rear gardens, and it is these that make it so special. Surely they must be preserved? The Terrace has stood in the setting of these gardens for more than 230 years - this is a rich and wonderful heritage, and surely it is to be protected? The application seems to be seeking an alteration to the front lightwell. It is a little unclear what is intended, but no alteration should be allowed. The front garden should be protected, not damaged.</p> <p>The application in respect of the rear garden shows no sensitivity at all to the property and its setting or to the Terrace as a whole. It would be a desecration of the garden - and the garden of course is part of the II* Listed curtilage - and so surely this must be rejected.</p> <p>I therefore object to the application very strongly.</p>
2015/1217/P	Wyand	14 Grove Terrace	11/04/2015 14:52:54	COMMEMP ER	I object to this application which will seriously disrupt the largely unspoiled character of the back of this 18C terrace.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1217/P	Nicholas Haag	23 Grove Terrace	11/04/2015 14:50:34	OBJ	<p>I have read objection/comments submitted by Grove Terrace Association. They amply reflect my own views as a resident of the terrace. The rear extension as proposed would materially alter the character of the road (one of the finest in Camden) and would set a dangerous planning precedent for future developers. I am acutely sensitive to this precedent-setting due to the construction of a grossly oversized 'summer house/garage' in the rear garden of #24 which by common consent (including retrospectively members of Camden's own planning/heritage team) should never have been approved and now sets a precedent for the terrace which, I am advised, would make it harder for Camden to object to other similar scale construction projects in our back gardens. The proposal for #18 is potentially even more damaging in this respect as it is an attached extension to the original Georgian house and out-of-keeping with almost all other properties in the terrace.</p> <p>Regarding excavation of a lightwell at #18, I assume this has been dropped or will be disallowed for frankly obvious reasons of disrupting the harmony of the terrace facade and its front gardens, in the context of not only the Grade 2* listing but also Camden's declared protection of front gardens.</p>
2015/1217/P	Mrs Catriona Bourdillon	13 Grove Terrace Highgate Road London NW5 1PH	12/04/2015 17:36:28	OBJ	<p>These are not minor alterations. The front garden already has two cellars well waterproofed and usable. To allow such a desecration of one of the finer Georgian Terrace Grade II* in Camden, would be vandalism.</p> <p>The rear garden already has development there as there is a garage. A small extension of the kitchen of not more than 12 feet would be reasonable, but excavating the amount intended will affect the neighbouring houses badly and the garden walls which have no footings at all will fall down. If the owners require more space, a larger house would suit them better.</p>
2015/1217/P	Tamara Oppenheimer	4 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PH	12/04/2015 23:25:32	COMMNT	<p>Dear Mr McClue</p> <p>I object to this application for all the reasons set out in the letter dated 7 April 2015 from Ms Ellen Gates on behalf of the Grove Terrace Association, of which I am a member.</p> <p>It is of particular note that this latest application barely differs from the applicants' earlier application which was objectionable in a large number of respects (and to which members of Grove Terrace strongly objected).</p> <p>I urge that you reject this application.</p>
2015/1217/P	Lucasta Miller	2 Grove Terrace NW5 1PH	10/04/2015 23:15:25	OBJ	<p>I am astonished that any excavation to the front of this listed property should even have been suggested. The street view has remained intact since the 18th century and the terrace as stands forms a valuable heritage asset. The proposals for the back are equally out of character and arouse much anxiety as to the potential impact on adjacent properties in this historic terrace.</p>
2015/1217/P	Lucasta Miller	2 Grove Terrace NW5 1PH	10/04/2015 23:15:24	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1217/P	Lucasta Miller	2 Grove Terrace NW5 1PH	10/04/2015 23:15:17	OBJ	I am astonished that any excavation to the front of this listed property should even have been suggested. The street view has remained intact since the 18th century and the terrace as stands forms a valuable heritage asset. The proposals for the back are equally out of character and arouse much anxiety as to the potential impact on adjacent properties in this historic terrace.
2015/1217/P	vicky mansour	27 grove terrace	11/04/2015 16:15:12	OBJ	My concerns with this development is the impact it will have on the stability of the other houses on the terrace both during the excavation works and also post them. I would also be concerned over the disruption these works would cause to the terrace. No 18 is in the middle and with such a huge excavation project all the spoil would need to come through the house and out along the terrace. I have no concerns or comments with regards to the internal alterations.