
From: Rosaleen Quinn [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 March 2018 19:45
To: Lester, Robert; Bushell, Alex
Subject: PROPOSED BASEMENT DEVELOPMENT AT 44 GOLDHURST TERRACE
2017/6906/P

Dear Mr Bushell and Mr Lester

I had a long telephone conversation this morning with Robert Lester, the case officer for the above application.

We are very concerned that an development of this type, which has structural implications for the adjoining properties can be processed without any notification being served on the adjoining and affected residents.

It was brought to my attention only by a resident in another location ,who has an alert set up for planning applications .

To my knowledge all other London Boroughs still operate a system of serving notices to adjoining properties, and it seems inexcusable that Camden have abandoned the practice. As I said especially when there are serious structural implications.

Can you assure us that comments/objections period will be extended to allow for all residents to be informed ?

There are TEN immediate , adjoining owners /occupants , plus Freeholders who have an interest in this proposal, and share a party wall with the applicant site.

METHOD STATEMENT

It is concerning that the council has not demanded a METHOD STATEMENT as part of the application. This is customary for Basement extensions in most Boroughs. I fail to see how the application could be considered without it .

PREVIOUS CONSENTS

Although basements have been consented on this street, this one has a number of factors which make it uniquely unsuitable.:

1 Almost all previous consents were given for basements in single family dwelling houses, not houses of multiple occupancy, which no 44 is .

2 All the previous consents have been for basement extensions below ground floor. In this case it is proposed to excavate a sub -basement, below an already semi- basement property, mid terrace, on a sloping ground in an unstable area.

3 No 67 formed a basement below the Ground floor flat, but in that case the developer acquired the entire property ,which was end of terrace , vacated all tenants and substantially rebuilt the whole house.Only one party wall would have been involved.

4 The development at No 44 involves TEN party walls awards.
Those at nos 61, 63 65 and 67 would have had a maximum of two party walls in each case.

5 Other Boroughs routinely demand a Method Statement as part of an application for Basement extensions due to their complexity, structural implications, duration and nuisance value. Camden has not asked the applicant to provide a Method Statement.

yours sincerely
Rosaleen Quinn
42c Goldhurst Terrace.