**OBJECTION to Application for Planning Permission (2017/2819/P) at 6 Albert Terrace by Applicant, M. Golinsky.**

**Opening Statement:**

We, Prof Dame Celia Hoyles and Prof Richard Noss own jointly the ground and middle floor of 52, Regent’s Park Road, NW1 7SX. We are registered to vote and pay Camden Council tax.

**Key objections:**

1. **Objection: Planned development contravenes Camden policy on basements**.

We understand that the property 6 Albert Terrace already *has* a basement, which has been the subject of a series of previous planning applications since 1939, most recently 2011/3948/P – ‘Excavation and extension of an existing basement.’ The new application refers to this existing basement as a ‘Lower Ground Floor’ *but it is a basement*. The proposal is twofold:

1. to lower the floor of the existing basement and
2. to excavate an entirely *new* basement level to some 3 metres below the current level. This contravenes rules **f.** and **g**. of policy A5 (Basements) of the Camden Local Plan (2016), which states that "Basement development should: **f.** not comprise of more than one storey; and **g.** not be built under an existing basement."
3. **Objection: Structural and subsidence risks.** Works to this depth and on this scale raises the risk of structural damage to 6 Albert Terrace, the attached 5 Albert Terrace, and also to properties in the mews. We understand that 5 Albert Terrace has suffered cracks and subsidence due to shifts in the London clay soil under the building: in fact we all have suffered this over the years. The application makes a series of assumptions about likely movement of the soil and the extent of underpinning needed to retain structural integrity and prevent heave and other issues. We question the validity of these assumptions, which draw on rules of thumb from other developments in other areas and which are not specific to this site and this proposal.
4. **Objection: Flood Risk.** As long term residents, it is our personal experience that flooding risk at the foot of Primrose Hill, where 5 and 6 Albert Terrace are situated, is high. Every year there are weeks where large pools of rainwater collect in that part of Primrose Hill.

The Applicant M Golinsky’s report asserts that the area is located in a low Flood Risk Zone 1. However, this is clearly **not the case**. The Government Flood Risk clearly shows 5 Albert Terrace to be within a **‘Medium to High’** flood risk area from surface water, and surrounded by **High Risk** areas directly in front and behind.

Furthermore, it is the case that flood zones don’t always take into account all the blocked drains, sewerage flooding, and areas impacted by very heavy rainfall etc. As a result, sites in a low risk Flood Zone 1, for example, could still experience flooding.

In preparing the proposal, the applicant’s agents conducted test drillings to establish geology and level of the water table. The Structural Engineering Proposals / Basement Impact Assessment included with the proposal states that the drillings were reviewed for ingress water over a period of one month. This is a woefully inadequate period of time to make an assessment that is essential to the structural calculations and the entire project. We refer to the subsidence already experienced in point 2 above – the view of the surveyors consulted was the movement was as a result of the London Clay drying out. Long term patterns of rainfall and changes to the moisture level in the clay need to be understood if the structural calculations are to be accurate. Our concern is flooding in the neighbourhood and that the risk associated with an excavation on this massive scale with respect to the inter-related issues of geology, water table, water content of clay, and flood risk is totally unacceptable.

1. **Objection: Impact on Conservation and Heritage Area.** We object to theimpact of this proposed development on the Conservation and Heritage area of Primrose Hill Conservation Area (Sub Area 1). While the property concerned is not Listed, it is an iconic building in Primrose Hill visited by hundreds of tourists and Londoners throughout the year. The fact that the proposed plan for 6 Albert Terrace includes knocking down the entire side extension of the house, and will include boarding and hoarding extending over the pavement into the street, will result in an long-term eyesore in this popular area and a huge inconvenience for tourists and residents alike.
2. **Objection: Disruption to traffic.** Albert Terrace is a busy one-way route linking Regents Park Road and the A505 (Prince Albert Road) and is on the route of the 274 bus. We object to the disruption to the flow of traffic that this project will create for a long period of time. The traffic on Regent’s Park Road is regularly severe at peak times. The excavation period of this project will likely involve an elevated excavation conveyor belt which will extend into the street which narrows at the junction on Regents Park Road. We can only imagine the chaos during rush hours.

**Development works in the immediate area and at 6 Albert Terrace**

1. **Objection: Developments in the immediate area.** Residents on Regents Park Road have been subjected to numerous, large-scale renovation and ‘improvement’ projects in the area in the last 10 years, resulting in noise, pollution, nuisance and disruption to flow of traffic and parking. Surely Camden needs to take a holistic approach to planning in areas subject to large-scale development projects by private owners. Shouldn’t approvals look beyond individual projects and consider the overall impact on the area of non-stop construction?

**Impact on neighbours**

1. **Objection:Impact and disturbance to elderly neighbour.** 5 Albert Terrace is the attached property sharing a party wall with 6 Albert Terrace. On the upper floors it is owned and occupied by David Widdicombe, a 93-year old with early-onset Alzheimer’s. David is attended to by a full-time, live-in carer. David is well known, a long-term resident (more than 30 years). Due to his age, David spends nearly all day at home. He is already despairing at the prospect of two years of noise, disruption, dust and increased vehicle emissions. The Council’s planning committee should take into account the impact on this elderly resident and reject the proposal.

**Other objections**

1. **Objection:Parking in Albert Terrace.** Residents parking places are already often full on Albert Terrace and on our road, Regents Park Road. The proposal is that several bays outside 6 Albert Terrace on both roads would be used by construction vehicles. This will increase the pressure on parking spaces. It really is intolerable. We have one car that we would like to park near our home – but also we need spaces for visitors and for workman when the house needs repairs.
2. **Objection**: **Carbon emissions.** The pumps and heating / cooling units required by a private underground pool and a deep basement will require considerable and continuous energy to run them. This is quite intolerable. We do not accept the calculations that the proposed solar PV panels with offset this.
3. **Objection**: **Relatively small size of the site**. It requires demolition of the side extension to be able to do the work. According to the Camden Local Plan, it would seem therefore that it is unsuitable for a sub basement. If even this compromised corner site is deemed suitable, then it will herald open season on sub-basements for the whole of Camden with awful results for residents.

11. **Objection**: **Disuption to traffic/bus route and danger to cyclists**

We understand that lorries will arrive for this massive construction via Albert Terrace and come round corner into RPR before swinging across the road and reversing. This is just too awful to consider in the light of the traffic congestion and bus route (274). And there is a *real danger* here: living opposite the site, we see near-misses and conflict at this very corner now – the interaction of speed bumps, very high bus traffic, cyclists, and lorries squeezing into a narrow space. **If Camden vote in favour of this application, we should all hope that there will be no fatalities on councilors’ conciences.**

1. **Objection: Noise of pool and basement pumps and cooling / heating units.** The units mentioned in point 14 will be running 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The proposal mentions the units will located externally in a housing. We object to the inevitable noise and disruption. This is quite intolerable.