

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1099/P	Daire Moffat	Flat 5 3 Gloucester Crescent	31/03/2016 23:54:49	OBJ	Daire Moffat 3 Gloucester Crescent London NW1 7DS

Planning application 2016/1099/P (encompassing 2015/2042/P)  
5 Gloucester Crescent, NW1

To whom it may concern,

This submission is in response to proposed expansion of the property at 5 Gloucester Crescent, NW1.

As a resident of 3 Gloucester Crescent I am concerned that the proposed works are not of sufficient detail to offer a clear understanding of the outcomes of the proposal, as was the case with previous plans submitted by the applicant that intended to advance and ground this proposal.

Concerns over granting additional works are based on the trust that proposals are largely final and that the declarations signed on previous application forms, box 17 "declaration", that full disclosure of knowledge is used in proposing the planned works is to be trusted. Clearly the personal declaration is made void in this instance, as was pointed out by my previous objection, that full knowledge of facts were withheld from the planning department and residents of Gloucester Crescent when submitting for consideration proposals based on a false premise, that 2015/1099/P was a final design.

This application 2016/1099/P is not an additional request or a post planning application attached to the previous granting, but a freestanding application based on 2015/2042/P. 2016/1099/P avoids any limitations or conditions of the previous submissions granting. The inclusion of "existing plans" are on paper only, and have been granted on the merits of the submission at that time. To date no building work has been carried out at the rear of the property and it is disingenuous to present these as existing in actuality or fact. The nature of 2015/2042/P was to further advance any plans offered at a later state, providing a stepping stone to future schemes. I can appreciate that ideas & plans alter through necessity or regulation adherence, but as documentary evidence previously provided suggested the intention was always to create a space akin to the 2016 proposal. It is either misrepresentation or professional oversight that has failed to account for the massive

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>omission of a five to seven metre deep basement until now, and there are no guarantees of further applications or substantial alterations in the future.</p> <p>The inclusion of a subterranean concrete structure will no doubt channel ground water flow around and under its perimeter onto adjacent properties. The effectiveness of the described sump installation is questionable in correlation to the actual data provided, and no annual measurements for ground swell or shrinkage have been given for a wider area. Water drainage is expressed purely as effecting and being dealt with locally to the structure, and not in context to the detrimental effects of subsidence or lateral slip compounded by channelling ground water to adjacent properties.</p> <p>As has been the case with various building works carried out at other Gloucester Crescent properties, noise and dust pollution can be extreme and have a disproportionately negative impact to the wider area. There are no clear limitations placed on the construction timescale or determination of environmental concerns.</p> <p>This must be given due consideration by the department when placed in context with future HS2 construction, due to begin 2017-19 and must also address the serious concerns of people living with an unacceptable level of disruption for an undefined timescale.</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/394622/CS236I_Volume1.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/394622/CS236I_Volume1.pdf</a> Map number: PC-01-002</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Grade listed status is not determined by market value or occupation arrangements but by a need to preserve unique architecture of merit or aesthetic value for future appreciation. I cannot see the destruction of the town house garden being separable to the buildings grade II status in preserving its merits, or the inclusion of a wine rack gymnasium as beneficial to the listed status.</p> <p>With these and other concerns I must object to the proposal in the strongest terms.</p> <p>Mr D Moffat</p>

---

**Total: 7**