

Planning Portal Ref: PP-06021477: 6 Albert Terrace Redevelopment Plan

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

Opening Statement:

I, David Widdicombe am the owner of 5 Albert Terrace, London, NW1, 7SU. I have lived at this address for more than 30 years I reside there year-round. My son Daniel lives in the basement with his three children.

David Widdicombe, 19th July 2017



Key objections:

1. **Objection: Planned development contravenes Camden policy on basements.** 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 the existing basement as a ‘Lower Ground Floor’ and proposes not only lowering that floor but also excavating 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.”
2. **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. 5 Albert Terrace has suffered cracks and subsidence due to shifts in the London clay soil under the building. These were monitored overtime as a requirement for a mortgage application by David Widdicombe, the owner of 5 Albert Terrace. 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.
3. **Objection: Flood Risk.** As long term residents, it is our personal experience that flooding risk at the very 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 the part of Primrose Hill directly opposite the house. The steps down to the Basement Flat are often inundated with surface flood water which goes up to our door entrance, and on occasion has entered into the Basement Flat.

The Applicant M Golinsky's report asserts that the area is located in a low Flood Risk Zone 1. However, for your information, as laid out below, 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. This would tie in more with what is actually happening in the locality.

GOV.UK Long term flood risk information

BETA This is a new service – your feedback will help us to improve it.

6
ALBERT TERRACE
LONDON
NV1 7SU

This address is in or near a flood risk area

Be prepared: things you should do

- 1** **Monitor news and weather forecasts**
Use radio, television and social media to keep up to date with flood events and weather conditions in your area
- 2** **Learn about flood planning**
Know how you'll respond to a flood if:
 - your home is at risk, for example how to get sandbags
 - you're responsible for a school, hospital, care home or other community group
 - you run a local business
- 3** **Protect your property**
Get organised now and improve your property's flood resilience.

Basic view Detailed view Location

Flood risk from rivers or the sea
 Extent of flooding

Flood risk from surface water
 Extent of flooding

Flood risk from reservoirs
 Extent of flooding

Flood risk
High
Medium
Low
Very low
Location you selected

5 Albert Terrace

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. We would request that a Critical Drainage Areas assessment be undertaken specifically addressing the perennial flooding problem at the foot of Primrose Hill as part of a planning application, with areas deemed to be at high risk of flooding from rainfall being clearly marked.

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. My view is that the level of uncertainty of an excavation of this scale with respect to the inter-related issues of geology, water table, water content of clay, and flood risk is totally unacceptable.

4. **Objection: Impact on Conservation and Heritage Area.** We object to the impact of this proposed development on the Conservation and Heritage area of Primrose Hill Conservation Area (Sub Area 1). While 5 and 6 Albert Terrace, as a complete property, are not Listed, it lies 30 feet to the south of Primrose Hill Drinking Fountain (Grade II listed) which is a popular local tourist spot for photographs. 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.
5. **Objection: Risk to the roots of protected trees.** We object to the risk to the lime trees in the garden of 6 Albert Terrace. The works risk impacting the root area of the trees closest to the house.
6. **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. 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. The planning proposal has not dealt with traffic issues in any serious or detailed way, and in any case the proposal is not able to mitigate for this impact.

Development works in the immediate area and at 6 Albert Terrace

7. **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, nuisance and disruption to flow of traffic and parking. Camden needs to take a holistic approach to planning in areas subject to large scale development projects by private owners. Approvals should look beyond individual projects and consider the overall impact on the area of non-stop construction.

8. **Objection: Building works at 6 Albert Terrace.** Number 6 Albert Terrace has already undergone 6+ years of renovations and building in the last 15 years. In the last decade alone there have been over 4 years of disruption as each successive owner unravels another set of increasingly grandiose plans. There should be a point where enough is enough for any particular building. The Council planning committee should exercise its discretion to grant a reprieve for Albert Terrace, particularly for the residents of 5 Albert Terrace who have endured many years of disruption already next door.

Impact on neighbours

9. **Objection: Impact and disturbance.** 5 Albert Terrace is the attached property sharing a party wall with 6 Albert Terrace. I live full-time at this address and I would be severely affected by noise and disturbance during 2 years of works. I am 93 and am looked after by live-in carers.
10. **Objection: Impact and disturbance to other neighbours.** I object to this proposal due to the severe, immediate and close impact it will have on my son Daniel and his 3 young children who live in the Basement Flat of 5 Albert Terrace Two of the bedrooms face the back garden which will be a major area of work, while the third bedroom faces the front. While we strongly recommend this project be rejected, at a bare minimum, if approved, the working hours schedule should be amended, and enforced, such that it completely EXCLUDES works on any SATURDAY.

Other objections

11. **Objection: Use of the property.** We object to this proposal on the basis that it appears to be designed for business use. The plan includes design features including a large bicycle store-room and separate changing rooms for women and men at the swimming pool. This raises the question: is the background plan to run this area as a boutique hotel or private recreation business? We request that Mr Golinsky give a definitive legal commitment that the premises will not in any form be used for commercial or business purposes.
12. **Objection: Parking in Albert Terrace.** Residents parking places are already often full on Albert Terrace and 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. Due to my age and condition I need to be able to park my car (I am driven by carers and family) directly outside my house.
13. **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. We do not accept the calculations that the proposed solar PV panels will offset this.

14. **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 be located externally in a housing. We object to the inevitable noise and disruption these units will cause so close to the windows at the rear of 5 Albert Terrace – and to our neighbours in the mews.
15. **Objection: Owner's long-term intentions.** The new owner of Number 6 has also purchased No 6 Albert Terrace Mews. While the current application does not mention any plans to include the Albert Terrace Mews property at the foot of the garden, Camden Council needs to make clear its policy on work that could be a first step towards joining the two properties. In particular, Mr Golinsky should give a binding commitment that the Mews house he has recently purchased will not be connected in any way to the current proposed basement/swimming pool project.