

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0705/P	Henrietta Goodden and David Thomas	Flat 6 47 Regent's Park Road London NW1 7SY	07/03/2017 15:49:27	OBJ	<p>We object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposed additional floor area is disproportionate to the existing and must constitute overdevelopment.</p> <p>The noise, vibration and dust generated would unduly disturb the neighbours.</p> <p>The earth removal and parking and movement of delivery lorries and vans would frequently block this narrow mews.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0705/P	Caroline and Nick Powell	18 Albert Terrace Mews Primrose Hill NW1 7TA	05/03/2017 16:26:44	OBJ	<p>We live two doors away (at 18 Albert Terrace Mews) from the proposed development at 20 Albert Terrace Mews and are most concerned for the following reasons:</p> <p>Our prime concern is in relation to the basement proposal. Having already had a basement dug opposite our house recently (Number 11) we know from first hand experience the noise and dust and disruption such a project causes the remaining residents in the mews for a lengthy period. We understand, in another planning dispute involving a similar plan in Kingstown Road, the scale of the mews street, the neighbours' amenities during construction were a material consideration in the planners decision making. Digging out the floor area of Number 20 to create so much basement space will also result in tons of spoil being removed from the house which is inconveniently placed in the mews - that is not close to either exit. Apparently the spoil is going to be removed by wheelbarrow to the exit onto Regents Park Road. In the last basement excavation the removal of the spoil resulted in countless times the exit and entrances to the mews were blocked and the soil from this excavation was deposited into lorries directly from a conveyor belt construction, as it could be kept in the big garden awaiting the next lorry. This cannot happen at Number 20 as it does not have the outside space for storing large amounts of soil.</p> <p>With regards to structural damage: the properties close by in Albert Terrace and those in Prince Albert Road may well suffer ground movement and clay heave both in the short and the long term. We understand buildings in close proximity have already had to have remedial structural repairs :10 Albert Terrace Mews has had to be underpinned and there are reports circulating that several properties on Prince Albert Road are already moving resulting in some cases mortgages being denied. We have heard that when 20 Albert Terrace Mews was originally built it suffered cracks from clay heave and the parking area has already had to be levelled off to try and make the ground stable. We understand there is an old well in close proximity of number 19 and 20 Albert Terrace Mews.</p> <p>In addition the house is positioned next to number 21, the basement excavation of which caused major planning headaches in recent years and indeed had to be stopped by the planning office due to the impact it was having on the mews road. I understand this basement is now pumped out 24 hours a day to deal with the levels of water that enters the building.</p> <p>We are one of the lowest areas in Primrose Hill, downhill from both the hill itself and from St John's Wood, so that vast amounts of surface and underground water seep down in our direction. This can only cause trouble to both buildings and road surface. This basement excavation may destabilise the mews road surface yet further, causing further movement among nearby houses. We read that basement developments can cause damaging effects on the water table and Hydro-geological. We also understand that because Camden has had so many problems with basement developments, they carried out a survey which revealed that 'Approximately one quarter of respondents suffered damage to their property. 25% windows and doors sticking; 19% internal fractures; 20% external cracking; etc'. We have learned that during the construction of Nos. 20, 19 and 21 the mews road has suffered slippage and movement and has had to be re-levelled. With regards to the maintenance of the road surface; we do not have a "sinking fund" nor a legal agreement requiring those conducting major works to contribute a sum to pay for potential damage both short term and long term to the surface of the road for the maintenance of this road so if there were to be damage caused by this development one wonders how all the residents</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>would get compensation to repair it.</p> <p>We would consider extra living space to be overdevelopment in the mews. The Advisory Committee noted that the proposed basement would add a substantial volume to the existing house, possibly as much as 50% of the existing. The Committee also noted that Albert Terrace Mews is recognized in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement, the current SPD, at p. 12, as contrasting with the wide roads in the area, and characterized as 'narrow mews roads originally provided servicing to the rear gardens of the villas ... these small mews buildings are generally located directly abutting or close to the highway'. What is significant about the Mews is its character as 'narrow', 'small', with a function of 'servicing', with a subservient, modest character. If the mews becomes an enclave of the mega house surely this goes against its original distinguishing feature and is something Camden Council should be keen to preserve?</p> <p>We urge the planning officers to turn down this application.</p>
2017/0705/P	Mrs. Pamela Marks	1 Albert Terrace Mews London NW1 7TA	07/03/2017 17:21:43	COMMEM AIL	<p>We live at NO. 1 Albert Terrace Mews. The problems are enormous if the proposed basement is built. The house next door excavated under the garage and the floods started and were never ending. There is a river under those houses and NO. 21 is still having to pump water out of their basement many years later.</p> <p>The mews has had around four of the houses underpinned due to settlement and this would exacerbate that situation. Many of the houses were built circa 1840 and are fine specimens of that era.</p> <p>The roadway is sinking drastically in front of No. 20 and was completely flooded last Sunday 5th March 2017 due to the rain.</p> <p>We would urge the planning committee not to allow these alterations to 20 Albert Terrace Mews.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0705/P	David Hoffmann-Howard	2nd Floor Flat 41 Regent's Park Road	03/03/2017 20:50:09	OBJ	<p>I object. Article 8 of the HRA, which gives the right to respect for private and family life and home and Article 1 of the First Protocol (A1P1) (“peaceful enjoyment”) are important principles. My objection to the application falls under Article 8 or A1P1. If the Council were to give planning permission it would be breaching the right of surrounding residents who would be subject to extraordinary noise and disturbance.. The Council must stand up to the greed of those who seek to add value to their homes at the cost of all their neighbour’s right to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes. There is need to balance a planning system that favours developers with the legitimate desire of neighbouring residents to enjoy peaceful occupation of their homes and to avoid the endless noise, dust and disruption.</p> <p>Further, the Council must consider the loss of amenity to local residents during basement development, which is aggravated by the extended duration of these works and the frequency of one site following another in the same street. The disruption and disturbance goes well beyond that involved with classic renovation works - initial boring and other tests, noise and vibration from excavation and piling, delivery and installation of concrete construction, and all the associated traffic. The Council must protect residents from loss of amenity.</p> <p>There is no assurance in the application with regard to the risk of structural damage to neighbouring properties. There have been many cases of this and Council will be failing in their duty to residents if it does not recognise that many developments have caused damage, the owners of properties being developed then disappear leaving surrounding residents with the liability of their failed projects. If the Council were to grant approval it must ensure that the development is executed in accordance with terms of permission and relevant regulations and must have the means of making those controls effective or it will fail in its duty to residents. In several cases the foundations of surrounding buildings have subsided – requiring costly underpinning, and party wall agreements have been useless as redress mechanisms.</p> <p>I would expect the planning committee to take extremely seriously the need for independent assurance with regard to technical issues in the process for deciding whether or not to approve an application. The surrounding buildings are old in various states of repair and very close to the proposed development.</p>
