

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2614/P	Nezhat Irvani	5 Oakhill Avenue London NW3 7RD	09/07/2017 04:56:52	COMMNT	I oppose extending the new development into the green space(garden) which is against green space policy.
2017/2614/P	Nezhat Irvani	5 Oakhill Avenue London NW3 7RD	09/07/2017 04:57:09	COMMNT	I oppose extending the new development into the green space(garden) which is against green space policy.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2646/P	Kai Alexander Maack	4 Bacons Lane N6 6BL London	05/07/2017 15:43:56	COMMNT	I am the lead tenant at No. 4 Bacons Lane and currently share the house with two other tenants. We are concerned of several problems that are likely to occur during the construction process of the planned construction of a two-storey wing to extend a family home at No. 5 Bacon's Lane.

Problems of access and parking:

We all have frequent visitors with a car and delivery vehicles coming at various times of the day. We fear that with the constant stream of delivery vehicles loading and unloading material onto telehandlers and parked in front of No 4, on the side of the lane at the bottom of No 3's garden as well as at the designated turning area in front of No.5, access will be obstructed or severely limited, there will be no parking space during construction and the house risks to be hemmed in. The plan states that access is retained into our garage but it does not seem to be wide enough for any vehicle bigger than a small car including delivery, tradesmens' and emergency vehicles.

Designated turning area:

Vehicles and telehandlers parked in front No.5's garage (as referenced in the application document) would block the designated L-shaped turning area for all vehicles using the lane, which is not to be obstructed at any time. A car coming from our garage at No 4 needs to turn at this designated turning area in order to safely proceed up Bacon's Lane to South Grove.

Noise

No. 4 is less than two yards apart at the site of the proposed extension. Any work done at weekends would unreasonably affect us.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2864/P	farroukh mahboubian	hadley hurst hadley common herts en55qg	06/07/2017 22:29:48	OBJEMPER	<p>Dear Mr Diver</p> <p>OBJECTION T Application No. 2017/2864/P: Excavation of new basement at 51 Gloucester Crescent NW1 7EG</p> <p>The above planning application has been brought to my attention and I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the above proposal.</p> <p>In brief my objection to this application, and confirm that our objections cannot be addressed by mitigating conditions; arise because of:-</p> <p>The noise / dust / vibration / vehicle movements during the works; The likelihood of permanent damage to adjoining trees and buildings; The permanent adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, and the resultant harm – in particular, a front lightwell will impact on perceptions of the Conservation Area; and The permanent impact on our reasonable residential amenity and enjoyment of our property, not only during construction works but from a resultant larger property so close to other homes. Over congestion of an already congested and overly populated neighbourhood. I wish to further support my objection on the following grounds; The application site is in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area; the Conservation Area Statement (2000) classifies the application property as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, and the application proposal will have an unacceptable adverse impact. There are two lime trees protected by TPOs immediately adjacent to the application site (to the front of no.59a – TPO ref S2), and there are also a number of mature trees located in the rear gardens of properties in close proximity to the site, which will be unnecessarily endangered by the proposal.</p> <p>In this context, the starting point is the requirement that any proposal must preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area (policy DP25). Basements are a feature of houses in some parts of the borough, but not in this locality; in streets such as this, where basements and lightwells are not a traditional feature, the excavation of a basement will have a significant impact on the appearance of the house and the street scene, both by “enlarging” the front elevation of the house itself and because part of the front garden will be removed to provide the lightwell.</p> <p>Where, like here, basements are not a characteristic feature, it is inevitable that they will be incongruous in the front elevation of the house, and the related paraphernalia in the front garden will dominate the character of the area; construction of basements involves an array of equipment and features, such as guard-rails, drainage and anti-flood equipment, skylights and fire escapes. These will be intrusive, adding clutter to the front garden, and will have an</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

unacceptable impact on the appearance of the property and on the street scene generally.

The Council's planning guidance on "Basements and lightwells" acknowledges that in some cases basements may cause harm to the amenity of neighbours, affect the stability of buildings, causing drainage or flooding problems, or damage the character of areas and the natural environment. The application documents do not put our minds at rest on this. Further, policy DP27 (Basements and lightwells) of the Camden Development Policies 2010 provides that in determining such applications, the Council will consider whether (1) the architectural character of the building is protected, (2) the character and appearance of the surrounding area is harmed, and (3) the development results in the loss of more than 50% of the front garden or amenity area; the proposal offends this policy, as there will be an impact on the character and appearance of the area, which will be permanently harmed.

We hope that these objections will be borne in mind, and that the application will be refused. We would be grateful if we could be kept informed of progress on the application.

Yours sincerely

Farroukh Mahboubian

2017/2864/P	G Wheeler	2 Oval Road London	05/07/2017 22:23:50	OBJ	<p>I object to this proposal. I live at 2 Oval Road, a Grade II listed property which is attached (through shared walls) to 22 Regents Park Terrace, also a listed property. 22 Regents Park Terrace lies in very close proximity to the proposed works. Whilst the supporting documentation considers the potential impacts on the two closest properties (which are not themselves listed) none of the supporting documentation considers the potential impact on the listed terrace in general or 22 Regents Park Terrace in particular. I estimate that 22 Regents Park Terrace is at its nearest corner about 2 meters from the proposed work. From the supporting documents it appears that there will likely be an impact on 22 Regents Park Terrace and it is not possible to conclude from those documents that such impact will not be detrimental to that property (and in turn through common shared walls, my property). In particular my objections are based on the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ground movement report shows there will be movement from heave and settlement of up to 8.5m in either direction for 50 Gloucester Crescent, a property only slightly closer to the works than 22 Regents Park Terrace. 2. The soil report notes that the underpinning process could cause significant movement if not carried out to the highest standard. Thus the building work puts the listed terrace at a very high risk of damage. 3. The surface water report notes that an increase in the groundwater levels is possible, most likely in the direction of Oval Road and Regents Park Terrace, where my property is located. This would likely increase damp issues in the basement level of my house. <p>I also note that the surface water assessment was uploaded to the Camden planning website on the 5th July which will not have given the owners of the properties affected by the potential increase in the water table adequate time to consider that information and either object or include that matter in an objection submitted prior to the 5th July.</p>
-------------	-----------	-----------------------	---------------------	-----	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2864/P	Claudia Lipitch	25 Christopher street london ec2a2bs	06/07/2017 22:23:09	OBJ	<p>Dear Mr Diver</p> <p>OBJECTION T Application No. 2017/2864/P: Excavation of new basement at 51 Gloucester Crescent NW1 7EG</p> <p>The above planning application has been brought to my attention and I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the above proposal.</p> <p>In brief my objection to this application, and confirm that our objections cannot be addressed by mitigating conditions; arise because of:-</p> <p>The noise / dust / vibration / vehicle movements during the works;</p> <p>The likelihood of permanent damage to adjoining trees and buildings;</p> <p>The permanent adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, and the resultant harm – in particular, a front lightwell will impact on perceptions of the Conservation Area; and</p> <p>The permanent impact on our reasonable residential amenity and enjoyment of our property, not only during construction works but from a resultant larger property so close to other homes.</p> <p>I hope that these objections will be borne in mind, and that the application will be refused.</p> <p>We would be grateful if we could be kept informed of progress on the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Claudia Lipitch</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2864/P	alexander mahboubian	53 Beech Hill Hadley wood en40jw	06/07/2017 22:18:00	OBJ	

Dear Mr Diver

OBJECTION to Application No. 2017/2864/P: Excavation of new basement at 51 Gloucester Crescent NW1 7EG

The above planning application has been brought to my attention and I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the above proposal.

In brief my objection to this application, and confirm that our objections cannot be addressed by mitigating conditions; arise because of:-

1. The noise / dust / vibration / vehicle movements during the works;
2. The likelihood of permanent damage to adjoining trees and buildings;
3. The permanent adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, and the resultant harm – in particular, a front lightwell will impact on perceptions of the Conservation Area; and
4. The permanent impact on our reasonable residential amenity and enjoyment of our property, not only during construction works but from a resultant larger property so close to other homes.
5. Over congestion of an already congested and overly populated neighbourhood.

I wish to further support my objection on the following grounds;

The application site is in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area; the Conservation Area Statement (2000) classifies the application property as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, and the application proposal will have an unacceptable adverse impact. There are two lime trees protected by TPOs immediately adjacent to the application site (to the front of no.59a – TPO ref S2), and there are also a number of mature trees located in the rear gardens of properties in close proximity to the site, which will be unnecessarily endangered by the proposal.

In this context, the starting point is the requirement that any proposal must preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area (policy DP25). Basements are a feature of houses in some parts of the borough, but not in this locality; in streets such as this, where basements and lightwells are not a traditional feature, the excavation of a basement will have a significant impact on the appearance of the house and the street scene, both by “enlarging” the front elevation of the house itself and because

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

part of the front garden will be removed to provide the lightwell.

Where, like here, basements are not a characteristic feature, it is inevitable that they will be incongruous in the front elevation of the house, and the related paraphernalia in the front garden will dominate the character of the area; construction of basements involves an array of equipment and features, such as guard-rails, drainage and anti-flood equipment, skylights and fire escapes. These will be intrusive, adding clutter to the front garden, and will have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the property and on the street scene generally.

The Council's planning guidance on "Basements and lightwells" acknowledges that in some cases basements may cause harm to the amenity of neighbours, affect the stability of buildings, causing drainage or flooding problems, or damage the character of areas and the natural environment. The application documents do not put our minds at rest on this. Further, policy DP27 (Basements and lightwells) of the Camden Development Policies 2010 provides that in determining such applications, the Council will consider whether (1) the architectural character of the building is protected, (2) the character and appearance of the surrounding area is harmed, and (3) the development results in the loss of more than 50% of the front garden or amenity area; the proposal offends this policy, as there will be an impact on the character and appearance of the area, which will be permanently harmed.

We hope that these objections will be borne in mind, and that the application will be refused.

We would be grateful if we could be kept informed of progress on the application.

Yours sincerely
Alexander Mahboubian
