

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2950/P	Jo Baktis	Flat A 6 Regent Square London WC1H 8HZ	06/07/2017 23:28:09	OBJ	<p>This application looks more like a new application, rather than merely an amendment to the approved plans - which were accepted only after a good deal of controversy about previous proposals, which were totally inappropriate to this sensitive site.</p> <p>The site, as you know, is a narrow one between the southern terrace of Regent Square and the Grade II* St George's Gardens. The latter is a much-valued local amenity, being not just a "green space" but offering rare peace and tranquility in the centre of London.</p> <p>The application adds a material amount to the commercial space at the Wakefield Street end, and doubles the planned residential numbers in the rest of the site. This will undoubtedly add to pressures on local amenities. There is also a concern locally that the increased occupancy will lead to greater disturbance both to Regent Square residents and to the Gardens - it is hard to interpret the drawings online, but the roof terraces combined with the higher population are likely to cause disturbance to one or the other, if not both.</p> <p>It is also impossible for a layman to really understand from the drawings the changes to the north-facing fenestration arising from the change from small family houses to flats, but this also looks likely to impact Regent Square dwellings adversely.</p> <p>I question why we are now considering flats on the site, when there has long been a need for more family-sized accommodation in the part the borough (i.e. south of the Euston Road). It looks like opportunism on the part of the developers to maximise financial returns by over-development, with insufficient regard to the sensitivity of the site.</p> <p>I would therefore ask that my objection to the application be formally registered.</p>

Printed on: 11/07/2017 09:10:03

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2974P	Hampstead CAAC	c/o Flat 6 4 Ferncroft Avenue NW3 7PH	10/07/2017 16:36:05	COMMEM AIL	Hampstead CAAC finds it difficult to relate the drawings to the application description and to each other, therefore difficult to see where reduction of bulk is proposed. Some clarity would be appreciated.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3012/P	Maria Devis	Ground floor 282 Grey's inn rd Wc1x8eb	07/07/2017 17:39:31	COMMENT	This will create a lot of noise and intrusion to the garden and residents of 282. There are concerns about the access to light from the extra building over the garden of 282 garden flat.

Printed on: 11/07/2017 09:10:03

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3014/P	D Florentzou	33 Camden park road NW1 9AX	07/07/2017 20:25:49	OBJ	I think these types of roof terraces are not suitable for Victorian or indeed any terraced house. They can often be in line with neighbours bedrooms, and on warm evenings such as we are experiencing now residents using a terrace could be out there well into the night. I think planning should be refused.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3029/P	Miss John Robin Moss	Ground Floor Flat 32 King Henry's Road London NW3 3RP NW3 3RP	07/07/2017 14:10:44	OBJEMPER	<p>My name is John Robin Moss. I was born on 27 May 1940, the first day of the Dunkirk landings. I was the first of my family to win a scholarship to higher education, at The Queen's College, Oxford. My career was in educational television, where I rose to be Head of Educational Broadcasting for ITV, ILR and Channel 4.</p> <p>My beloved partner, Jill Turner, brought me to King Henry's Road in 1988. We have lived here happily ever since with our daughters, the first now qualified as a doctor, the second as a barrister.</p> <p>The small but beautiful gardens to the North of Jill's property and its neighbours overlook the world's first railway and looks beyond to St Saviour's superb spire and splendid woodland around it.</p> <p>Our neighbour's proposal to erect a large glass box 12 feet high, stretching 12 feet out into his garden will mar and potentially forever destroy the magnificent Northward outlook he shares with his neighbours, a unique and magnificent secret London treasure. It deserves sympathetic conservation, not a crude glazed box extension.</p> <p>As I approach my 78th birthday, I am more than ever aware of the unique glory of my partner's property and her blessings. It would be a tragedy to spoil and potentially destroy them by erecting a vast glazed box nearby.</p> <p>I have lived happily at 32 King Henry's Road for thirty years. The proposed extension would damage my enjoyment of life here and indeed my sense of security and safety. If we were driven away from Jill's lovely property, I should lose my safe harbour and with it, an invaluable sense of security and confidence.</p>
2017/3029/P	Carole Cox	30 King Henry's Rd NW3 3RP	06/07/2017 14:06:44	NOBJ	Excellent and imaginative plans. Surprisingly unobtrusive to all. I do hope they are granted permission
2017/3029/P	Tyreena Brooks	36 flat d King Henry's road. NW3 3RP NW3 3RP	06/07/2017 18:14:33	INT	I am opposed to the request for these building works because it's already very noisy and disrupted live next to how many train lines going night and day, 20 or more. I only found out about this today the 6th July 2017. This could mean noise and disruption from 8am etc 6 times a week for up to 12 months possibly more as we all know how building is never a straightforward matter!

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3029/P	Genevieve Moss	32 King Henry's Road London NW3 3RP	07/07/2017 23:57:42	COMNOT	<p>Objection of Genevieve Moss to Planning Application of 34A King Henry's Road</p> <p>I write with reference to the above planning application. I am the daughter of Caroline Jill Turner and John Robin Moss. My family have made 32 King Henry's Road our home all my life, and consequently my earliest memories are of the house and garden.</p> <p>My mother is 67 years old, and, following a fall down the front steps a few years ago, she has 4 broken vertebra in her back which periodically causes her immense pain, which she manages as best she can with painkillers. Mum has lived in the basement flat for nearly 40 years. It is her home.</p> <p>My mother has lovingly tended the garden so that it is in bloom in every season, day and night. I regularly see couples and families stopping at our wall to point out its beauty and even photograph it. Sometimes people even knock on the door to compliment her for having turned this small space into such a treat for the senses.</p> <p>My father, Robin, is 77 years old. He has been struggling with memory loss for nearly 10 years and was formerly diagnosed with Alzheimers in 2013. He can get very confused and upset when he does not understand what is happening. When there are new noises or unfamiliar people around, he can panic and, because of his illness, he often responds with anger. He does sometimes shout at others, but mainly he shouts at my mum, and, to a lesser extent, my sister and I. Moving my dad would undoubtedly cause him huge distress, as he has lived with my mother for thirty years, mostly in that house and that neighbourhood. It is a safe place for him where people know him and if he is found wandering he is easily recognised and encouraged home. When he goes missing, my sister and I know the places where we are likely to find him. It is some small comfort to us to know that Dad is unlikely to get lost or be targeted because of his vulnerability in this area.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on my father, I am deeply concerned for my mother. Mum is Dad's sole carer, and she is finding this role increasingly taxing. As I have stated, she is not well herself. My sister works full-time in Cambridge as a clinical registrar and academic fellow of the university. I am a barrister in London and have very irregular hours. Neither of us can support our parents as much as they need, as we are both just beginning our careers (our parents had us late in life). It all falls to Mum. None of us want Dad to be anywhere but at home, but realistically this may not be possible for much longer. I can only beg the council not to allow this re-build of a two bedroom flat. It would fill what may be my father's last few years in his home with noise and dust and stress. He will struggle to rationalise the disruption and this will make life unbearable for my mother.</p> <p>It is telling indeed that the couple proposing these works will be moving themselves out of their (home) while it is changed beyond recognition. I wonder whether they will ever move back in, once a zero has been added to the value of their real estate. What about the rest of us? My parents will not have the option of packing their bags and leaving - and why should</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>they have to consider it? This is no 'extension' but greedy plans doubling the square-footage of an already spacious basement flat. I should add that my mother, father, sister and I lived in the equivalent basement flat (and no other part of the house) from before my elder sister's birth until I was 7 and my sister was 10. There is plenty of space there for a young family of four, and more. The suggestion that a new baby needs another two bedrooms is a dishonest attempt to humanise a commercial decision.</p> <p>The plans for 34A have patently been drawn up with no consideration for maintaining the character of this neighbourhood, by people, I would suggest, who have no love or appreciation of the elegant beauty of this period street. They are frankly gross. By comparison, my mother's extension of her galley kitchen in to the coal hole (c. 2015) looks meant and has turned a place to store bins and old bikes into another charming courtyard for her to fill with pot plants. It does not affect the character of the street at all, other than to smarten it, and is hardly noticeable from the street or neighbouring properties. If 34A's proposed plans were anything similar, we would not object as such a development would be reasonable and proportionate and hardly affect others either in its construction or long-term existence.</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the extension into the rear garden will change the perfect shape of the buildings and gardens on our street. It will set a precedent for others to follow. I am not a structural engineer, but these are old houses, which suffer from subsidence because they back onto an ancient railway line. Digging into that small back garden will undoubtedly cause long-term structural issues for 34 and surrounding houses.</p> <p>It is remarkable that one can set up a table and chairs at the foot of the garden of number 32 and hear nothing but birdsong punctuated by the soothing rumbling of passing trains. If the living quarters of 34A are permitted to project further into their garden, this wondrous tranquility inevitably will be lost.</p> <p>Sitting at the bottom of our garden, as for all the other gardens on our street, there is - and always has been - a beautiful line of bay windows, surrounded by sash windows, in a row of iconic Primrose Hill buildings. It is where I return year on year for peace and strength, and it is a treasure that will not be there for future generations if you allow this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3029/P	Miss Caroline Jill Turner	Flats A-E 32 London NW3 3RP NW3 3RP	07/07/2017 18:52:25	OBJEMAIL	<p>I have lived in the garden flat of 32 King Henry's Road since 1980. I now own the whole house, freehold and leaseholds. With my partner, I have brought up our children here and I still run two businesses from my study. I have done my utmost to care for the original beauty of the house and gardens. Passers-by, from the Tube to the Hill, often compliment me and even tell me they travel here in January to see the Japanese cherries in flower.</p> <p>The plans proposed by my neighbour are excessive and inconsiderate of others. They detract from their own house and from those on each side. The plans would detract from the special qualities of every flat in this house and spoil its garden. The OS map shows no extensions between Nos 28 and 48.</p> <p>The applicant, a Hedge Fund Manager and his accountant wife, purchased their flat only two years ago. It has only one single and one double bedroom. They now propose to build four bedrooms and three new bathrooms - on the pretext that they are expecting a second baby! The bedrooms are to be underground and internal. One wonders why they don't spend their estimated £800,000 costs on a comfortable house that suits their needs, rather than destroy the peace and civilised settings we and others have established in Primrose Hill. I will write separately in an email about the importance to our family of keeping our way of life here and our plans for the future of the house.</p> <p>The most disruptive and disturbing feature of the proposal for us is that all the living space in the flat will be new and will entirely project deep into the garden. It will take up almost a quarter of the garden's length, with sliding glass doors to full height which will be open whenever the weather is at all warm. Their inside/outside living will drive us indoors and wipe out our use of the belt of sun across the lawn in the middle of our garden.</p> <p>The proposed extension will destroy the privacy or peace in the garden of No 32 (my prime pleasure and a haven for my partner, Robin, who has dementia) and indeed in other neighbouring properties. Barbecues and drinks parties currently held close to the house or at the end of the garden will be held in the middle, driving neighbours from their own gardens. Most people nearby respect each others' gardens and their use of them - we often have a quiet lunch there when no one is around.</p> <p>The plans do not respect the current beautiful building line of flat-backed Victorian houses, each with a single magnificent hanging bay window on wooden supports. The view of neighbouring houses, built in 1860, from the gardens is very special, as is the run of gardens seen from the houses' bay windows.</p> <p>In place of this, the applicants would place a crude glass box, surrounded, amazingly, by lavatorial white ceramic tiles against the darkened ochre brick! Nothing could be less appropriate and more aggressively offensive. The box would rise so high that it would visually all but prop up the bay window. Presumably the original wooden pillars would be removed or hidden. The whole extension would darken the back of my house, particularly if No 30 followed suit, as they threaten if these plans are passed. This really is the beginning of the end!</p> <p>The extension fails to comply with Camden's own Development Policy on the following counts:</p> <p>24.5: Design should respond creatively to its site and its context. ... the design and layout of which should take into account the pattern and size of blocks, open spaces, gardens and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

streets in the surrounding area (the urban grain).¹

24.12: "Where townscape is particularly uniform, attention should be paid to responding closely to the prevailing scale, form and proportions and materials."

24.7: "Development should consider:

- † the character and constraints of its site;
- † the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
- † the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape;
- † the compatibility of materials, their quality, texture, tone and colour;
- † the composition of elevations."

24.13: "Overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. Extensions should therefore be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation."

24.15: "Architectural detailing should be carefully integrated into a building. The insensitive replacement of windows and doors and the cladding and painting of masonry can also spoil the appearance of buildings and can be particularly damaging if the building forms part of a uniform group."

27.9 "A basement development that does not extend beyond the footprint of the original building and is no deeper than one full storey below ground level (approximately 3 metres in depth) is often the most appropriate way to extend a building below ground. Proposals for basements that take up the whole rear and/or front garden of a property are unlikely to be acceptable. Sufficient margins should be left between the site boundaries and any basement construction to sustain growth of vegetation and trees. Developments should provide an appropriate proportion of planted material above the structure to mitigate the reduction in the natural storm water infiltration capacity of the site and/or the loss of biodiversity caused by the development. This will usually take the form of a soft landscaping or detention pond on the top of the underground structure, which is designed to temporarily hold a set amount of water while slowly draining to another location. It will be expected that a minimum of 0.5 metres of soil be provided above the basement development, where this extends beyond the footprint of the building, to enable garden planting.

According to Camden's policy, basements should:

- a) "maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties;
- b) avoid adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment;
- c) avoid cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area; and we will consider whether schemes:

harm the amenity of neighbours;

lead to the loss of open space or trees of townscape or amenity value;

provide satisfactory landscaping, including adequate soil depth;

harm the appearance or setting of the property or the established character of the surrounding area; and

protect important archaeological remains." (I am not yet claiming this is relevant → unless we are the archaeological remains!)

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>In determining applications for lightwells, the Council will consider whether: 'the architectural character of the building is protected; the character and appearance of the surrounding area is harmed; and the development results in the loss of more than 50% of the front garden or amenity area.'</p> <p>Trees, water, subsidence and clay The roots of the (listed) cherry tree, in my front garden would be destroyed. It is one of a run of three. Various acers and a nurseryman's favourite rambling rose surround them -> all currently needing to be reduced as soon as I regain my spine and my car. Robins efforts at reducing the vine along the front of the house resulted in the main stem being cut! 27.2 It is important that this is done in a way that does not cause harm to the amenity of neighbours, affect the stability of buildings, cause drainage or flooding problems, or damage the character of areas or the natural environment. 27.3 'For larger schemes, where a basement development extends beyond the footprint of the original building or is deeper than one full storey below ground level (approximately 3 metres in depth) the Council will require evidence, including geotechnical, structural engineering and hydrological investigations and modelling, from applicants to ensure that basement developments do not harm the built and natural environment or local amenity.' This development involves going down 3.7metres 27.8 The use of sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) will be encouraged in all basement developments that extend beyond the profile of the original building. For basements that consume more than 50% of the garden space, and are considered otherwise to be acceptable, the use of SUDS will be required to mitigate any harm to the water environment. 27.10 Consideration should also be given to the existence of trees on or adjacent to the site, including street trees, and the root protection zones needed by these trees. Where there are trees on or adjacent to the site, the Council will require an arboricultural report to be submitted as part of a planning application.</p> <p>DP26 states: The Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors we will consider include: a) visual privacy and overlooking; b) overshadowing and outlook; c) sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels; d) noise and vibration levels; e) odour, fumes and dust; f) microclimate; g) the inclusion of appropriate attenuation measures. We will also require developments to provide: an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space;</p> <p>Page 63 of 82</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste;
facilities for bicycle storage; and
outdoor space for private or communal amenity space, wherever practical.
This proposal fails on almost all of these considerations.
Construction Management Plan
'The Council will assess whether any predicted damage to neighbouring properties from the development is acceptable or can be satisfactorily ameliorated by the developer. The Council will seek to minimise the disruption caused by basement development and may require Construction Management Plans to be submitted with applications.'
I would suggest that such a plan (if this nightmare is to continue) should limit digging to manual digging (as were my works) and with any Kanga work in controlled hours. It would help if work at the back of the house could be done at a different time from work at the front, to give us a chance to move into a different room to escape the noise and dust. Early starts are especially difficult for us and, given how often the workers in this house and our visiting daughters need to sleep late on Saturdays to catch up on a week of 3 or 4 hours sleep, Saturday working is particularly unwelcome. Dust barriers will be necessary.
'The Council will only grant permission for plant or machinery if it can be operated without causing harm to amenity and does not exceed our noise thresholds. The Council will seek to minimise the impact on local amenity from the demolition and construction phases of development. Where these phases are likely to cause harm, conditions and planning obligation will be imposed.'

Disruption and settlement - experience, but not a precedent
The applicant is planning to move out for the whole of next year while the builders move in. I may be forced to do the same. The plans involve excavation to 3.7m below ground level in the front and a lowering of the ground level throughout by 1.3m. A bathroom is to be built through the wall from my bedroom with drainage below that. Presumably a noisy sewerage pump is planned there. These works fall within the 1 metre controlled areas set by the council. Cracks of 5mm width are envisaged at basement level. An engineer friend tells me that these will be exacerbated up through the house, which was originally built on the limits of the amount of space that can be supported with few walls.
The original brick garden walls at the front and my patio/lightwell wall would almost certainly require rebuilding. That is a great deal of disruption of my life and premises.
I am still trying to recover from five years of subsidence works right up through the house, caused by the roots of a council tree planted on the street, whose roots disturbed our kitchen. The London clay swells and shrinks and causes movement. This was the reason for the kitchen and coal hole rebuild, what Rupert West is pleased to call my 'similar extension'. The plans were refused by Camden, but won on appeal without alteration. I lived here throughout the works, and there was not a single complaint of disturbance of any kind. I have installed tiny stained-glass panes, matching original glass in the main house. It is three metres from the pavement and the whole of the rest of the land is mature garden and pots, all much appreciated by the public.
Now, before I have even hung my pictures back on the walls, I am to enter party wall

Page 64 of 82

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>procedure. I cannot accept my house being made unstable by neighbouring excavation and vibration from the proposed works. The application admits expecting (ground movements at foundation level of neighbouring buildings), and remarks that (some ground movement, up to four times the depth of the excavation, is inevitable when basements are constructed.) (No 25, a precedent West cites, is visually opposite, in the bottom of Ainger Road, 50 yards away and backing on to flats and offices – not a similar property in any way.) The OS map shows no back extensions on this side of the road between Nos. 28 and 48.</p> <p>Ancient lights</p> <p>I suggest that any decision be deferred at least until a BRE daylight and sunlight assessment can be made on the effect of the proposed extension on my ground level glazed study doors and on the windows above them at the rear of the house. The light to the middle of them will be blocked (see rule of thumb rule). The proposed extension would be much more than twice the height of the existing garden wall and would block summer sunlight from the west.</p> <p>Our situation</p> <p>Like many on this stretch of road, I have lived here for decades. I am 67, and am struggling, as sole carer with no support, with four fractured vertebrae at present. My partner, Robin Moss, is 77. These works will confuse him, anger him, and make him much harder to care for. We hardly leave the house, which has been my life and work. My partner has dementia and is happy and familiar with this place. He rages if the peace is disturbed and is not always capable of holding an explanation in his head. I run my businesses (the original bed grab handles and health policy journalism) from my studies at the rear of the basement, and of course, am on the phone much of the day. Our sleep, (Robin often sleeps in the afternoons), my income and our ability to live here will be severely disturbed. It is likely Robin will have to be put into a home. I have already been looking for places to move to, but I realise I would have to try to stay here to protect the property, my belongings, and to maintain the garden, which is my prime pleasure.</p> <p>My main income and pension is from the long-term tenants at the top of the house. I have not dared to tell them about any impending works, as they are on the point of renewing their lease, so they probably will not be aware of them or able to comment. I do not expect to be able to relet if they leave.</p> <p>We welcomed the Wests for champagne at New Year when they first moved in, and I have hitherto been on good terms with them. They said I had a lovely garden. They casually mentioned at the recent street party (centred outside this house on grounds of the leafy, shady atmosphere of my front garden) that I would be hearing about their plans. In fact I was alerted only by letters from party wall surveyors. We feel betrayed.</p> <p>The proposal now submitted aims to extend to the absolute limits of No 34's land, destroying any hope of gardens for passers-by to enjoy. No fewer than seven skylights are proposed for this project!</p> <p>I have purchased, but not yet received, the title plan for No 34. I would have expected the front garden (currently deliberately neglected) and the bin area to be Camden's freehold, and not part of the applicants' land! Certainly there would be no land for bins, bikes, prams or tree and shrubs.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Page 65 of 82</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>The Camden planning website went down for most of July 7, the deadline when most people would have been writing their submissions. Neighbours I spoke to you were surprised (as I was) that they had not received letters about the application. They knew nothing about it and had not noticed the small yellow notice.</p> <p>Camden's policy aims to 'preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character of a conservation area and which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage.' These houses are locally listed as an 'intact and relatively unaltered group of high architectural quality creates fine consistent townscape'. The plans show no back additions between Nos 28 and 48.</p> <p>I urge you to keep a structure more suited to Primark out of Primrose Hill. Please do not allow a house and garden which has been my life's work and will be my family's future to be destroyed by the financial greed of others. A more modest extension which did not necessitate their vacating would be acceptable, but perhaps they have another home to go to.</p> <p>Caroline Jill Turner 32 King Henry's Road London NW3 3RP</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3029/P	Dr Eleanor Turner-Moss	11 Roman Courts Cambridge CB4 2TS	07/07/2017 12:44:01	OBJLETTE R	<p>I write as the 28-year old daughter of Robin Moss and Jill Turner. 32 King Henry's Road has always been home and I have been very lucky that my parents have continued to live there, nurturing the house and garden. I have many fond memories, and remember clearly playing in the garden as a child and unpacking the shopping with my mum in the kitchen. I have learned to love and appreciate the house even more over time, particularly the scale of rooms encapsulated in the original Victorian façade and windows. The proportions of the house are understated, unusual and beautiful. I stay at home whenever I can. I hope and intend to live and raise my family there.</p> <p>I was truly shocked to read the plans for a large glass extension to the side and rear of our neighbour's flat. The plans seem out of all proportion and very much at odds with the character of the building style. It surprises me that they wish to proceed with such work when their building even still retains original columns under the bay window. The proposed extension looks like an Oxford Street shop front and would be intrusive and unpleasant to live with even once the drilling and digging and scraping had finally ceased. Their proposed extension would overshadow and ruin my parents' enjoyment of their quiet and mature garden. We would for ever look back onto the scarred face of the original building.</p> <p>Further, it is clear that allowing this application would set a precedent for further, similar developments. This expansion is not addressing a housing crisis or creating new space for another family, it is just greedy. The neighbour on the other side has said that she would apply to do a similar expansion work if No. 34's application was approved, making it impossible for my parents (or our family) to live and enjoy the house for many years to come. Comparison has been drawn between my mother's knocking through to use the coal hole under the stairs to gain a few feet and make space for a seating area in the galley kitchen. At the same time renovation work following damage from tree roots from the street and subsidence was necessary. The kitchen was a carefully designed and sensitive project, very much in keeping with the fabric of the house and neighbourhood. It is hardly noticeable and caused no disturbance and it was never planned to have the glass ceiling that the applicants speak of.</p> <p>In all honesty, my parents have had a very challenging few years. It upsets me to admit that they are elderly and increasingly frail. With my father's diagnosis of dementia, my mother slipping on steps and fracturing her spine (and now suffering disabling back pain and further degenerative arthritis). I worry about them often and this application has added much anxiety, stress and apprehension. Our neighbours have been open about their intention to move out for a year during a building work. My parents would have to try to do the same, at the ages of 77 and 87. I don't think this is a fair or feasible proposal and I would ask you to please reject the application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3029/P	Mrs Louise Taylor	Carrer de Carreras 12-14 Pedralbes 08034 Barcelona Spain	07/07/2017 19:42:02	OBJEMAIL	<p>I write to object to 2017/3029/P</p> <p>I lived in No 32 King Henry's Road for five years and am horrified to learn of the application made by the owners of 34a.</p> <p>The destruction of the gardens and rear environment this would cause would be severe. The disruption and difficulties caused by the extensive building works would make life intolerable for those in No 32.</p> <p>No 32 is a carefully conserved house and nurtured garden and is a very unusually unspoilt house and garden.</p> <p>I also would like to point out that it contravenes all "Camdens Development Policy" namely the below sections:</p> <p>24.5: "Design should respond creatively to its site and its context. ... the design and layout of which should take into account the pattern and size of blocks, open spaces, gardens and streets in the surrounding area (the urban grain)."</p> <p>24.12: "Where townscape is particularly uniform, attention should be paid to responding closely to the prevailing scale, form and proportions and materials."</p> <p>24.7: "Development should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the character and constraints of its site; • the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development; • the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape; • the compatibility of materials, their quality, texture, tone and colour; • the composition of elevations; <p>24.13: "Overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. Extensions should therefore be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation"</p> <p>24.15: "Architectural detailing should be carefully integrated into a building. The insensitive replacement of windows and doors and the cladding and painting of masonry can also spoil the appearance of buildings and can be particularly damaging if the building forms part of a uniform group."</p> <p>27.9 "A basement development that does not extend beyond the footprint of the original building and is no deeper than one full storey below ground level (approximately 3 metres in depth) is often the most appropriate way to extend a building below ground. Proposals for basements that take up the whole rear and/or front garden of a property are unlikely to be acceptable. Sufficient margins should be left between the site boundaries and any basement construction to sustain growth of vegetation and trees. Developments should provide an appropriate proportion of planted material above the structure to mitigate the reduction in the natural storm water infiltration capacity of the site and/or the loss of biodiversity caused by the development. This will usually take the form of a soft landscaping or detention pond on</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>the top of the underground structure, which is designed to temporarily hold a set amount of water while slowly draining to another location. It will be expected that a minimum of 0.5 metres of soil be provided above the basement development, where this extends beyond the footprint of the building, to enable garden planting.</p> <p>According to Camden's policy, basements should:</p> <p>a) maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties; b) avoid adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment; c) avoid cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area; and we will consider whether schemes: d) harm the amenity of neighbours; e) lead to the loss of open space or trees of townscape or amenity value; f) provide satisfactory landscaping, including adequate soil depth; g) harm the appearance or setting of the property or the established character of the surrounding area; and h) protect important archaeological remains. The Council will not permit basement schemes which include habitable rooms and other sensitive uses in areas prone to flooding. In determining applications for lightwells, the Council will consider whether: i) the architectural character of the building is protected; j) the character and appearance of the surrounding area is harmed; and k) the development results in the loss of more than 50% of the front garden or amenity area.</p> <p>27.2 It is important that this is done in a way that does not cause harm to the amenity of neighbours, affect the stability of buildings, cause drainage or flooding problems, or damage the character of areas or the natural environment.</p> <p>27.3 For larger schemes, where a basement development extends beyond the footprint of the original building or is deeper than one full storey below ground level (approximately 3 metres in depth) the Council will require evidence, including geotechnical, structural engineering and hydrological investigations and modelling, from applicants to ensure that basement developments do not harm the built and natural environment or local amenity.</p> <p>The Council will assess whether any predicted damage to neighbouring properties from the development is acceptable or can be satisfactorily ameliorated by the developer. The Council will seek to minimise the disruption caused by basement development and may require Construction Management Plans to be submitted with applications.</p> <p>27.8 The use of sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) will be encouraged in all basement developments that extend beyond the profile of the original building. For basements that consume more than 50% of the garden space, and are considered otherwise to be acceptable, the use of SUDS will be required to mitigate any harm to the water environment. Further guidance on sustainable urban drainage is contained in policy DP23 - Water.</p> <p>27.10 Consideration should also be given to the existence of trees on or adjacent to the site, including street trees, and the root protection zones needed by these trees. Where there are trees on or adjacent to the site, the Council will require an arboricultural report to be submitted as part of a planning application.</p> <p>DP26</p> <p>The Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors we will consider include: a) visual privacy and overlooking; b) overshadowing and outlook; c) sunlight,</p> <p>Page 69 of 82</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>daylight and artificial light levels; d) noise and vibration levels; e) odour, fumes and dust; f) microclimate; g) the inclusion of appropriate attenuation measures. We will also require developments to provide: h) an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space; i) facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste; j) facilities for bicycle storage; and k) outdoor space for private or communal amenity space, wherever practical.</p> <p>I urge you to give thought.</p> <p>Kind regards Louise Taylor</p>
