

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0705/P	Gavin Pattison	Flat 1 20 Prince Albert Road London NW1 7ST	22/03/2017 22:40:17	OBJ	<p>20 Albert Terrace Mews lies along the northern boundary of my lower ground floor property.</p> <p>The applicant claims that “Basement development is a feature of all houses on Prince Albert Road, which the rear of No 20 Albert Terrace Mews adjoins”. This is a complete falsehood. The ground level of my flat is the very same ground level as that of 20 Albert Terrace Mews. There is no basement beneath my flat, and I am not aware of ANY houses along this stretch of Prince Albert Road having basements. To pretend that this is a common or normal occurrence is totally wrong and misleading.</p> <p>And contrary to Camden Council’s preference for a basement development to not extend beyond the footprint of the original building, it appears that this proposal does in fact exceed that footprint by including within it the entire current ground-level rear garden patio. Surely it should be the footprint of the building, not the footprint of the building + garden that is taken into account?</p> <p>Related to that, I think it’s worth emphasizing point no. 6 of the Conservation Area Advisory Committee’s consultation response: there is a misleading line drawn on the Key Plan on each page of the Existing Floor Plans which could be mistaken for being the boundary between 20 Albert Terrace Mews and 20 Prince Albert Road. In fact the only outdoor garden space belonging to 20 Albert Terrace Mews is the small rectangle of patio which the applicant is including in the basement footprint. The longer rectangular strip shown above that belongs entirely to 20 Prince Albert Road.</p> <p>The lengthy Basement Impact Assessment does not give one much confidence when, in section 6.3, it erroneously provides data apparently for 24 Crawford Place instead of 20 Prince Albert Road. Is this a cut-and-paste typo? Will Camden Council be checking whether the assessment is up to scratch?</p> <p>I also do not think the applicant has accurate data on sewers in the vicinity. I believe the waste pipe from 20 Prince Albert Road passes north, about one metre below the ground surface, seemingly straight beneath 20 Albert Terrace Mews. If that’s right, it runs directly through the middle of the proposed basement.</p> <p>The applicant has put in serial planning applications with regard to this property over the past few years – for larger windows (including a huge one facing directly into my garden – permission already granted), for a roof terrace, and now a basement. If the property in its current state is so unsuited to the applicant’s needs, might it not perhaps be appropriate to consider moving house instead of submitting the neighbours to many months of noise and disruption, dust and traffic blockages, and potentially long-term building damage caused by ground movement and unpredictable hydrology?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0705/P	Mr & Mrs Critchley	21 Prince Albert Road NW1 7ST	23/03/2017 19:10:20	OBJ	<p>We are the owners of the adjoining Mews property, No. 21 Albert Terrace Mews and also No. 21 Prince Albert Road, a townhouse to the south.</p> <p>We have a number of concerns regarding the proposals as submitted and object to the proposals.</p> <p>There have been numerous applications to alter and extend No. 20, each one getting larger and with this latest scheme now including a full basement.</p> <p>The original mews house was designed to preserve the privacy of the residents of Prince Albert Road. This is especially important as the rear of the applicants property is only 10m from the rear of ours. Windows were previously arranged specifically so that there was no overlooking, typically with high cills set above eye level. Over time there has been a gradual erosion of this privacy.</p> <p>In the application of 2015 (2015/0485/P) the proposed new first floor rear bay window was deemed by Officers to unacceptably overlook our and neighbouring rear gardens. Amendments were made to obscure glaze the bay with fixed windows. Opening windows are now show on the scheme, hinged at the sides which when open, will provide direct views into our garden and house. Clearly this is unacceptable and against planning policy. These windows must be obscure glazed and should not open. The terms of the previous application need to be reinstated therefore.</p> <p>Secondly we are concerned regarding our three Hornbeam trees set alongside the boundary with No. 20. The current scheme proposes excavations right up to the boundary with a lightwell located immediately alongside these trees. Any such excavations, piling and poured concrete within a metre of their trunks will inevitably cause both immediate and long term harm.</p> <p>The tree report submitted dismisses the tree's importance and describes them as a hedge. We disagree and have sought independent advice to confirm the situation. The three trees are some 5m high and are currently thriving. We have consulted with an independent tree expert, and they confirm that the limited wall between the two properties is sufficiently shallow such that it will not have prevented root growth under our 20 Albert Terrace Mews. We would be happy to put them in touch with the Council. Excavating to a depth of 4m+ immediately alongside their trunks will, we are told, inevitably damage the roof structure. In addition to the three Hornbeam trees, we also have an Acer tree which is one meter from the same boundary which will also be negatively impacted in the opinion of our independent consultant. The acer tree has not been referred to in the tree report produced by no 20.</p> <p>Our last concern relates to the parking arrangement at the front of the property. Parking and access in the mews is already tight, and with modern cars getting ever larger, parking spaces need to allow a car to fit. The current parking space is 4.8m long. The space now proposed is only 3.6m, meaning it is no longer of adequate size to accommodate a car. This inevitably will mean that any car parked there will obstruct the mews and has the potential to threaten the safety of all residents in the event of a fire say.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the application as submitted is refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0705/P	Stephen Robinson	2 Albert Terrace Mews	23/03/2017 21:19:07	OBJ	It is astonishing that Camden would give this application serious consideration as the proposal is so out of keeping with the council's vaunted commitment to protection of the "green" environment and the character of this conservation area. I am making this objection only for the record as I am confident the committee will side with the developers, as it always does in the endless in-building of Primrose Hill. The digging of the basement will obviously cause the road to subside further but Camden will deem itself not to be liable to rectify the consequences of its planning decisions. Some years ago I asked a Labour councillor if pure corruption explained the inexplicably lax decisions by the planning department. The councillor said that was a difficult question, but that when questions were asked, "the shutters come down". I shall leave it at that.
2017/0705/P	Stephen Robinson	2 Albert Terrace Mews	23/03/2017 21:19:26	OBJ	
2017/0705/P	Stephen Robinson	2 Albert Terrace Mews	23/03/2017 21:19:27	OBJ	
2017/0705/P	Neil Chappell	20 Prince Albert Road London NW1 7ST	22/03/2017 20:12:44	OBJ	<p>On top of the horrendous disruption and noise issues. There are numerous structural and hydrological considerations that should preclude this application from being passed. We have prepared a report on the surrounding conditions:-</p> <p>Contained within this report is an amalgamation of compiled factors which need serious consideration when appraising the above basement application. We believe once you have read & considered the following document the only sensible decision for this application is Refusal.</p> <p>We have been provided with information by surrounding neighbours. Given the amount of reported movement in the area, the disclosure that there was a well present next door at N019 & the fact that in No21 basement pumps have to be kept running otherwise it floods. To mention just a few, there is a compelling case for if not refusal at this stage at the very least further investigations be thoroughly carried out as the applicant hasn't taken any of these factors into consideration. They appear to have based their assessments without all the facts. To the question - 'Is there a history of shrink/swell subsidence in the local area and/or evidence of such at the site? They answered 'unknown' They also don't seem to have been aware of the ground water conditions that exist & the current continuing problems they are causing but have relied on historic bore holes.</p> <p>We therefore request that this report is passed on to Campbell Reith, who we are led to believe are carrying out an independent appraisal of the application on behalf of Camden Council.</p>