Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1534/P	John Beard	61 Gloucester Avenue	19/04/2017 08:09:02	COMMNT	The finished design of the proposed sub-basement does not visually impact on the surroundings much but the achievement of it would be a local nightmare. There is no precedent for this type of development on these canal side houses. Whether a sub basement within15m of the canal bank is a risk to it needs specialist consultation. Excavating 4-5m bleow existing garden level would also mean that the proposers would have to cover the costs of party wall surveyors and structural engineeers for all houses close by the proposed works. To buy a house in St Mark's Crescent should mean accepting that it is a special environment where unique conditions have to be respected. There has long been a serious traffic problem in this narrow street, where residents can only practically own small cars and even then get them frequently damaged by trucks trying to get down the street. Any building work always causes a problem, so a major development would not be welcome. To hope that some of the disruption can be transferred to the rear and the canal is just as unacceptable. This section of the Regent's Canal is a peaceful leisure and wildlife attraction at all times. The site is also opposite the Camden visitors moorings. The exposure to noisy builders conveyor belts and unattractive waste barges, which are 2-3 times as long as a St Mark's Crescent garden, would change all that.
2017/1534/P	Mr and Mrs Kasfiner	10 Waterside Place NW1 8JT	19/04/2017 23:05:27	COMMEMP ER	I have concerns about the possible long term outlook on the canal as I live opposite so would like some indication as to how long the project will take especially the unsightly process of the removal of all the rubbiish/skip on the canal being opposite my house.

Printed on: 20/04/2017

09:05:07

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 20/04/2017 09:05:07 Response:
2017/1534/P	Mrs Scarlett McNally on behalf of Mrs Dinah Hutchinson	59 Gloucester Avenue Primrose Hill NW1 7BA	14/04/2017 14:58:24	OBJEMAIL	I am objecting on behalf of my mother, Mrs Dinah Hutchinson. I have authority under the Court of Protection to deal with her affairs. • My mother has lived in her house undisturbed for 43 years, since 1974, in an area that is peaceful. • My mother's property at 59 Gloucester Avenue shares the entire length of garden wall of 31 St Mark's Crescent, on the eastern side. • My mother has disabilities, which limit here ability to travel so she spends almost all her time at her home and enjoys her garden. A building project of 34 weeks, with noisy works 09:00-18:00 would be very distressing and upsetting for her when she is physically unable to escape this disruption. • The planned building works include a conveyor belt running along the length of the garden to remove mess and a refuse barge parked so that it extends over my mother's garden. This would cause great distress to my mother. It would also prevent her from using her own garden, which would have a negative impact on her physical and mental health. • The plans include lowering the height of the garden by at least one metre. This will impact on my mother's garden and her wall. • The proposed sub-basement also extends to within a few metres of my mother's house and outbuilding, which has the potential to destabilise them. • We object to a deep sub-basement proposed within 15 meters of the Regent's Canal. Although the expert reports describe the canal as 'lined', there are great breaches of the 19th Century lining. We bring to the Planning team's attention that there used to be an enormous horse chestnut tree at the end of my mother's garden, abutting onto the canal wall. At one stage the brick retaining wall had to be re-built ½ metre into the canal because the tree roots had distorted it. It is highly probable that the tree roots had also distorted and breached the lining of the canal below the water level. The trunk was over a meter across. There would have been an extensive root network. We point out that the ground in this area so very close to the c