

3 Gloucester Crescent  
London  
NW1 7DS

Planning Office  
Camden Town hall, Judd St  
London  
WC1H 9JE

27th May 2015

To whom it may concern,

**Re: Objection to Planning Application 2015/2042/P**

We write with comments about the above application submitted by 5 Gloucester Crescent and with additional comments on related previous applications 2014/6478/P and 2014/3287/T as these applications together form an overall redevelopment plan.

**Planning Application - 2015/2042/P**

**Plans for rear garden**

These are at best, vague. The drawing "051\_PL\_108: Rear Garden" proposes a "Garden Room" with no details as to how this structure will actually look, its function, materials or permanence. The spacial relationship to the proposed external spiral staircase, which has been omitted from the plan sheet, is ambiguous.

Privacy concerns should be considered with the proposed lower ground floor extension, combining a metal staircase and glazed balustrade, in effect a raised viewing platform that would impact a right to privacy of others, as it would overlook adjoining gardens.

**Building controls, noise pollution and timescale**

The proposal does not address the issues of various disruptive consequences for neighbouring residents of the scheme, which has no definite timescale, or measures for counteracting the negative impacts of prolonged construction, as has already been the case with the granting of application 2014/6478/P. These building works have already caused a considerable noise in the locality, with plant machinery being used daily and as early as 7am on occasions, including public holidays. Parking restrictions and/or permits have not been demonstrated.

**Preservation of architectural heritage**

During works allowed by the granting of earlier application 2014/6478/P, a garden feature fountain unearthed during topsoil removal was destroyed, as was a substantial amount of subterranean brickwork. This may have been of historic interest and raises legitimate concern that any further features that may come to light during works proposed under the

current application will be reported to the planning office. In lieu of listed building status, these concerns should be addressed.

**Conservation of green space habitat**

Camden have failed to make an informed decision on rear garden tree removal by the misleading earlier application 2014/3287/T, which claims to have consulted Camden conservation area document and concluded that “Figure D, Pear Tree, would likely be diseased. Application for removal”.

As well as Camden’s conservation policy, attention should be paid to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 specifically for the protection for bats and nesting birds. This decision should be rescinded immediately and a Tree Preservation Order obtained for the remaining large Pear tree.

On a question of light and shade, such trees can be pared back without the need for total removal and destruction of the local ecosystem. On the question of tree roots and drainage concerns, to our knowledge the area was not independently surveyed for validity. This can only be in effect for a future planning application submission, as proved by a timescale of stated of “a couple of years” with the intention to redevelop and subsequent applications 2015/2464/L & 2015/2042/P being lodged.

Although bushes and shrubs are not protected by statute, all other trees are. Fruit trees provide excellent feeding sites for pipistrel bats (e.g Codling moth) which do hunt at the rear gardens of Gloucester Crescent around dusk and during bright moon phase. This behaviour is associated with the life cycle and abundance of differing moth species within locations and seasonal flight. It is also an ideal area for woodcock, blackbird and wren as the hedge and tree foliage, at present, is the entire length of a number of rear gardens, providing ideal wildlife habitat at differing tree levels. A break in this corridor would set a precedent for further planning applications and ultimately destroy the overall habitat.

We would ask if the environmental impact of these applications has been fully considered by the department, given the earlier granting of application 2014/3287/T. Again, we would ask for a Tree Preservation Order to protect the remaining tree.

It is unreasonable to ignore the likelihood of future applications for further redevelopment. The applicant’s possible intentions for the lower ground floor garden are clearly listed here (Note the complete raising of the ground level, or the excavation to achieve same result):



Considering all applications together, the overall proposals for the exterior light well, internal floor lowering, rear extension, glazed balustrade and garden feature are architecturally unsympathetic to Henry Bassett’s Italianate designs. It should also be

emphasised that the conservation of urban garden habitat should not be partitioned from the buildings form or current listed designation, as well as being considered in a wider context of governance and policy on green space and wildlife conservation.

This application should not be approved.

Yours sincerely,

Daire and Jenny Moffat