

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0462/P	Peter Symonds	48 Canfield Gardens London NW6 3EB	09/03/2018 14:44:06	OBJ	<p>From The Combined Residents Associations of South Hampstead, (CRASH)</p> <p>This association wishes to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed excavation for yet another basement in Goldhurst Terrace. Residents of this street have had their lives blighted by ontinuous pollution, dust and noise during the non-stop such developments which have gone on here over the past four years. As CRASH has warned on numerous occasions in the past when objecting to other such developments in the South Hampstead Conservation Area, the cumulative effects of unlimited basement developments in any one street has already been seen to have the effect of redirecting existing water courses and underground springs with, frequently, disastrous effects for neighbouring properties. This is already apparent in the garden of the property at No 57 Goldhurst which immediately neighbours the site of application 2018/0462/P. Camden Planning must no longer go on ignoring the all-too-evident proofs of such occurrences and should ensure that the saturated state of the garden at No 57 is investigated thoroughly before any decision is made on this current application.</p> <p>CRASH respectfully asks Camden to refuse this application.</p> <p>Peter Symonds Chair CRASH</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0462/P	Mr & Mrs Clyne	57 Goldhurst Terrace	27/03/2018 21:53:31	OBJEMPE R	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>We wish to express our deepest concern at the proposed construction of a basement in the property next door to our family home, namely 59 Goldhurst Terrace for the following reasons:</p> <p>To date the only information we have received in relation to this application is the information we have managed to obtain through our own efforts. We only became aware of the proposed development when we read the notice on the lamp post.</p> <p>This notice was initially only displayed for one day. We informed the Council and it was subsequently replaced.</p> <p>We do not know the owner personally as he does not live at the address and therefore he will not have to suffer any loss of amenity arising from the construction works.</p> <p>We attempted to contact the property owner in order to obtain further information in respect of the proposal but were unable to do so successfully for the following reasons:</p> <p>He does not in fact live at the address specified on his application. This is not his private residence and is in fact for sale. This gives rise to concern as to future accountability and the credibility of other assurances provided to council; and,</p> <p>When I contacted a telephone number provided for Mr Ambrose I spoke to a person identified only as 'an agent of Mr Ambrose' who told me in no uncertain terms not to contact him until after planning permission had been granted.</p> <p>Further we understand that no consultation of any nature has taken place with any local residents and in fact Mr Ambrose failed to inform the residents living in number 59 who were only made aware of the nature of the development when informed by me.</p> <p>As I am sure you can appreciate the aforementioned attitude is deeply concerning given the significant nature of the works proposed to be carried out next door to our family home and the concern to be shown for what would inevitably be a difficult and stressful time for us and the detrimental effect on our amenities of life.</p> <p>However, our concern is even greater when one considers how this attitude is in direct contravention of the letter and spirit of the Council guidance. The guidance enshrines that consultation should take place with neighbours at both preliminary and planning application assessment stages and throughout construction. In this instance not only has the Council guidance been ignored but the order to us not to contact the applicant or his servants or agents until they have secured their valuable planning permission is a sign of flagrant disregard for both Council and neighbours. This cannot bode well for either Council or neighbours during the course of any construction works.</p> <p>We therefore know nothing about the effects of site management safety issues, dust, vibrating works, waste issues, parking [vans, trucks, cars, skips] and traffic issues and noisy work. No doubt the applicant will have his team provide assurances to council but the fact that he has ignored the Council guidance encouraging applicants to inform and engage with affected neighbours at an early stage has simply been ignored.</p> <p>We note that the planning notice was removed from its lamp post after one day.</p> <p>In addition to the above the council also encourages developers to offer security for expenses in respect of both party wall and non-party wall awards. We have not even been provided with a verifiable insurance policy and our own insurance broker has informed us that our current insurer may refuse insurance at the next renewal. We have received no proposals as to how the increased cleaning costs will be met should this application be</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>granted. Again the failure to make appropriate provision in advance of planning leaves little confidence that it will be appropriately dealt with at a later stage.</p> <p>Our lack of confidence in the applicant as a fit and proper person to be granted planning permission is evidenced by his failure to ensure that hazards in boundary fencing created by him have been rectified expeditiously, adequately or at all. Further scrutiny of the extension already completed demonstrates little or no appreciation of the character of the area or for neighbours pride in the appearance of their properties.</p> <p>The applicant clearly sees this as a purely commercial development and shows scant regard for the Council, the neighbours or the locality in general.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the Council has accepted that it is its duty to ensure that no damage is caused to neighbouring properties and we presume that the knowledge that if proceedings require to be issued in due course that they will be issued against both the developer and the Council will cause the Council to ensure that all applications will be scrutinised to ensure that they fulfil not only every letter of the regulations but also comply with the spirit. Whilst we have no expert knowledge we have the following concerns in relation to the proposed development, namely;</p> <p>Goldhurst Terrace is part of Camden's conservation area, this one of many basements along the road and will if granted be one of 5 houses directed joined to each other. House numbers 61, 63, 65, 67 already have basements. We are gravely concerned that the cumulative effect of the incremental increasing level of basement developments will create significant adverse impact to neighbouring gardens specifically and generally to the detriment of ground water flow and local hydrogeology. Further we believe that Goldhurst Terrace is listed as being a primary location of surface water flood rise</p> <p>If hording is erected outside the front of the building of 59 this will result in a lack of natural light coming into the front room of our house .</p> <p>We are only too well aware of the disruption such basement excavations cause and impact on those living next to such work; noise, pollution, vermin, dust, traffic and parking.</p> <p>HMO Guidelines state that such properties should not exceed eleven occupants. We suspect that as it contains seven apartments this development is likely to exceed to suggested occupancy limit.</p> <p>It is our respectful submission that the pending application should properly be rejected as failing to satisfy to the requisite standard the applicable criteria for significant construction works of this nature.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can assist further.</p> <p>Yours Faithfully Mr & Mrs Clyne and Family</p> <p>Letter by post sent to council</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0462/P	Stav Danaos	54 Goldhurst Terrace	11/03/2018 15:24:10	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the application for a basement excavation at Number 59 Goldhurst Terrace.</p> <p>I am a professional BBC TV Weather Presenter and I have to work shifts, often through the night. While I appreciate that I have to accept a reasonable amount of noise from traffic during the day, the amount of noise disturbance resulting from the basement digs is completely unacceptable. There have been three excavations in numbers 58, 50 and 66 on my side of the road and in close proximity and also four adjoining excavations on the street opposite resulting in continuous disturbance and disruption for several years. I really feel that the residents in the street have had enough and wish to object to this planning application.</p>
