

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0705/P	Keith Gordon	19 Prince Albert Road London NW1 7ST	12/03/2017 10:54:48	OBJ	<p>It is an unnecessary project which will almost certainly have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties for a number of years.</p> <p>There will be pollution (noise and dust) during the works.</p> <p>There will be the risk of subsidence and flooding due to the changes to the soil and water table. The area is already prone to subsidence and this additional change in the soil is likely to increase the risk of repetition. My own property is partially under-pinned and therefore particularly vulnerable to changes in the ground nearby.</p>
2017/0705/P	16-22 Prince Albert Road RA	19 Prince Albert Road London NW1 7ST	12/03/2017 10:42:38	OBJ	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project will create noise dust and vibrations for a year amongst a significant number of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>2. There is a real risk of subsidence - in an area which has already suffered from such ground movement.</li> <li>3. There will be risks of flooding and other damage due to loss of water table.</li> <li>4. Additional light wells and windows will cause light pollution to nearby properties and loss of privacy.</li> <li>5. The additional vehicle movements in the area during the works will lead to a loss of three parking spaces and therefore additional aggravation for residents and the risk of additional pollution as cars will need to be driven for longer whilst a parking space is found.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017-0705P	Jenny McCritick	10 Albert Terrace Mews London NW1TA	12/03/2017 21:51:09	COMNOT	<p>We own 9/10 Albert Terrace Mews.10 has suffered subsidence. Our houses are directly opposite no 20 and I do not know how we could live with the noise/dust/pollution. The road is very narrow here. When even transit van parks we have no space to exit the house. If he has a moving conveyor it will be directly opposite our house where we live and will be dangerous to exit from front door in the narrow gap. How could you prevent the soil being thrown against our house when it is removed from the ground. There is no space to store any materials without blocking our access and emergency vehicles will be unable to access. We cannot as suggested approach this narrow Mews from West side and reverse out again into the busy main road pavement as we are totally concealed - extremely dangerous + illegal? He wishes to extend outside footprint of the house. Surely against Camden rules? If he extends out into his parking space then the car will block the road.</p> <p>The road has subsidence - look at no 19 by fence - no 20 by parking area - you can see where it subsided and has been refilled a few months ago- different shade. 21 has a basement which floods if they do not keep a pump working 24hrs a day. Please look at road outside 21 where it is subsiding. This is proof that there is a problem with water under this area. When 19 was being built they discovered an old well on the site.</p> <p>No 10 has already been costly underpinned and is has a crack from basement excavation at no 11.</p> <p>There is a mention of a front garden. There is no front garden only some paved but he puts the bins. It seems that you have already allowed him to extend at 1st floor level opposite 9/10. We ask that those windows are in obscure glass to prevent him seeing into our house as the gap between properties is so narrow. It is an invasion of our privacy and takes away light from the house. I have already told you that we need lights on throughout the day and this will mean I need to have more lighting installed and use more electricity - pollution- increased energy consumption. We feel that if you allow this work to be done it will make our home uninhabitable due to impossibility of access/ exit from the narrow street let alone vehicle access to/ from our house during the whole construction time. The air will be terrible due to pollution.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] have double glazed windows facing no 20 but there will be constant unhealthy dust within my house - pollution which is already above what is lawful in this area. I would ask that the committee make a site visit and meet some of the residents who can point out the problems. I have photos of the road subsidence if the planning officer does not have them. You can see clearly that there is already a problem, particularly in the area outside road 19,20,21 so it is completely untrue to state there is no subsidence in the area. We ask you to stop this basement being built. Thank you</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017-0705P	Jenny McCritick	10 Albert Terrace Mews London NW1TA	12/03/2017 21:50:52	COMNOT	<p>We own 9/10 Albert Terrace Mews.10 has suffered subsidence. Our houses are directly opposite no 20 and I do not know how we could live with the noise/dust/pollution. The road is very narrow here. When even transit van parks we have no space to exit the house. If he has a moving conveyor it will be directly opposite our house where we live and will be dangerous to exit from front door in the narrow gap. How could you prevent the soil being thrown against our house when it is removed from the ground. There is no space to store any materials without blocking our access and emergency vehicles will be unable to access. We cannot as suggested approach this narrow Mews from West side and reverse out again into the busy main road pavement as we are totally concealed - extremely dangerous + illegal? He wishes to extend outside footprint of the house. Surely against Camden rules? If he extends out into his parking space then the car will block the road.</p> <p>The road has subsidence - look at no 19 by fence - no 20 by parking area - you can see where it subsided and has been refilled a few months ago- different shade. 21 has a basement which floods if they do not keep a pump working 24hrs a day. Please look at road outside 21 where it is subsiding. This is proof that there is a problem with water under this area. When 19 was being built they discovered an old well on the site.</p> <p>No 10 has already been costly underpinned and is has a crack from basement excavation at no 11.</p> <p>There is a mention of a front garden. There is no front garden only some paved but he puts the bins. It seems that you have already allowed him to extend at 1st floor level opposite 9/10. We ask that those windows are in obscure glass to prevent him seeing into our house as the gap between properties is so narrow. It is an invasion of our privacy and takes away light from the house. I have already told you that we need lights on throughout the day and this will mean I need to have more lighting installed and use more electricity - pollution- increased energy consumption. We feel that if you allow this work to be done it will make our home uninhabitable due to impossibility of access/ exit from the narrow street let alone vehicle access to/ from our house during the whole construction time. The air will be terrible due to pollution.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] I have double glazed windows facing no 20 but there will be constant unhealthy dust within my house - pollution which is already above what is lawful in this area. I would ask that the committee make a site visit and meet some of the residents who can point out the problems. I have photos of the road subsidence if the planning officer does not have them. You can see clearly that there is already a problem, particularly in the area outside road 19,20,21 so it is completely untrue to state there is no subsidence in the area. We ask you to stop this basement being built. Thank you</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0705/P	Deborah Sacks	Deborah Sacks 19 Prince Albert Road London NW1 7ST	12/03/2017 10:52:05	OBJEMPER	I am concerned about the real risk of subsidence that these works will cause.  Our house is partially underpinned and the area has a history of ground movement.  I believe it will also increase the risk of flooding because of the effect on the water table.  In the shorter term, it will also mean unnecessary noise and pollution.
2017/0705/P	Thomas Woodcock	47 Regents Park Road London NW1 7SY	10/03/2017 09:37:18	OBJEMPER	I am writing as the owner of the basement flat in 47 Regents Park Road where I have lived since September 1974. 47 Regents Park Road was built in 1852 and is the end of a terrace adjoining Albert Terrace Mews. Some years ago (circa 2003) 47 Regents Park Road was underpinned. Since then there has been a great deal of building work in Albert Terrace Mews and my flat which never flooded with water from 1974 to 2003 has flooded in one room so regularly that I have given up trying to carpet or furnish it and it is simply a bare concrete area which acts as an entrance hall.  I am therefore opposed to further building works in Albert Terrace Mews which I remember as containing gardens and garages on the side backing on to Prince Albert Road and with which the water table and mews road could cope.
2017/0705/P	Ann Sullivan	3A St Marks Square, NW1 7TN NW1 7TN	10/03/2017 15:16:37	COMMENT	I wish to object strongly to another basement excavation in Albert Terrace Mews. The disruption, dirt and toxic waste emitting from a similar project over the last year was unbearable and affected myself and my neighbours health and the constant noise nearly drove us crazy.
2017/0705/P	michael arditi	Flat L 37 Regent's Park Road London NW1 7SY	09/03/2017 10:35:56	OBJ	Please add my name to the list of objectors to the proposed development at 20 Albert Terrace Mews. The recent work in Albert Terrace Mews was noisy (particularly for those of us who work at home) and dirty (preventing the back windows of my flat being opened in summer). The heavy lorries going down the side of 35 Regent's Park Road, which forms part of the freehold company with this house, caused cracks in the walls of the house and contributed to the recent subsidence, which has caused us to pay house insurance of £20,000 a year. It is unconscionable that Mr Cowan should put his personal greed over the wellbeing of the neighbourhood.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0705P	jesper groenvold	19 albert terrace mews nw1 7ta nw1 7ta	08/03/2017 10:15:24	OBJNOT	<p>In general I believe that a certain amount of development is to be expected when you live in an urban area, and that a certain discretion should be awarded to the developers. On that basis I have supported two earlier applications from number 20.</p> <p>In the case of 20 Albert Terrace Mews we are dealing with a developer who applies on a continuous basis for reasons he is not willing to share with others, but one is led to suspect that financial gain is the major driver and limited concern is given to the general amenity of the area.</p> <p>I would like to second the objection from the Conservation Advisory Committee. I think they are right on all counts.</p> <p>I would like to add some specific comments: The application refers to the Council signalling general support for basement development. This is indeed true but for the purpose of creating more living space, not as is the case here for steam rooms and media rooms.</p> <p>Further it is worth pointing out that the application refers to the house as detached. This flies in the face of reality as numbers 19 and 21 form a "terrace". You cannot see daylight between the buildings. One suspects that may be in order to avoid party wall agreements etc, and should the application be approved it must contain provisions to protect the two houses next door. Indeed I would prefer for a deposit or guarantee to be provided to protect us against the inevitable damages and expenses we will incur.</p> <p>The application also conveniently down grades trees in the garden of number 21 to a hedge. Again proper consideration should be given to whether it is suitable to build a basement under those circumstances.</p> <p>Finally the people living in the mews know that flooding of the existing basement of number 21 incurred during its construction and is indeed a constant issue. This raises concerns about the correctness of the reports that no flooding risks exist to which the developer refers in his application.</p> <p>I believe that enough is enough and number 20 has tested the patience of us all sufficiently by now and should desist from further speculative applications.</p>