

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2018/1610/P	Debora Mateo	06/07/2018 20:20:55	OBJ	<p>Total objection as this project will obstruct the enjoyment of our home located just in front. We have a small baby who deserves a relax daily time free of construction site noises. We will be forced to find another place to life it this happens.</p> <p>We also consider the project changes the nature of the building and surrendering area and someone who wants a bigger house should just find one where the construction of it will not disturb many other people lives.</p>
2018/1610/P	Jean-Pierre Noel	08/07/2018 13:38:35	OBJ	<p>As shared freeholders in the property captioned, we were advised by counsel that the applicant does not have the right to carry on the proposed project without our prior approval. We thus believe It would be premature, inappropriate and a waste of taxpayers' money for the Council to proceed any further at this stage.</p> <p>The consultants who wrote the technical reports in support of the application never had access to our property and, as per expert advice, their assertions about the sturdiness of the building could not be relied upon. Given it's not possible to establish that the execution of the project would not compromise the structural integrity of the building without such access, we believe the Council should not be entertaining this application at this time. We also note the contemplated garden extension will directly affect the views, light, air, quietness and enjoyment of tenants living in the second and third floor of the property and should thus be rejected.</p> <p>Furthermore, it appears no study has been made on the cumulative impact the constant digging of basements around this section of Goldhurst Terrace might have on the underlying ground subsidence over time. While this may not be the responsibility of the applicant, it seems it would be reasonable for the Council to commission an overall study on this important matter before granting any new applications.</p> <p>We oppose this project at this time and would like to be invited to any related meetings/hearings organised by the Council regarding this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1610/P	Peter Symonds	05/07/2018 11:45:20	COMMNT	<p>From CRASH (The Combined Residents" Associations of South Hampstead)</p> <p>This association wishes to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed excavation for yet another basement in Goldhurst Terrace, this time at No 71. Residents of this street have had their lives blighted by continuous pollution, dust and noise during the non-stop such developments which have gone on here over the past four years and there is already a further application being considered by Camden Council for No 59. (Application 2018/0462/P). That application, if finally approved, will mean that there will then be five basements in a line of five adjacent terraced houses - i.e. No's 59, 61, 63, 65, 67. Now this latest application for the development at No 71 would leave just one undeveloped basement in a row of seven properties. In addition there have been three further recent basement developments almost immediately opposite the aforementioned properties, on the other side of the street. CRASH has warned on numerous occasions in the past of the disastrous cumulative effects of unlimited basement development in a any one street - a fact confirmed by Dr Michael de Freitas Faculty of Engineering, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Imperial College, London. (His articles on the subject of basements and their cumulative effects should be studied by all Town Planners and Council Structural Engineers!) There is already depressing evidence of existing water courses and underground springs having been diverted as a result of the huge amount of additional concrete injected into this immediate area for the necessary footings of these developments. This has had some disastrous effects for neighbouring properties where it is now not unusual for gardens to remain waterlogged for long periods - something that was not previously apparent. Camden Planning can surely no longer ignore the all-too-evident proofs of such occurrences or any longer fail to investigate thoroughly the cumulative effects of this number of basements in one short run of properties. The applicant in this latest application has shown no regard or consideration for his neighbours or the other tenants of a property at No 71, which is currently divided into flats. The fact that he, as an absentee landlord, will inflict severe hardship, inconvenience and distress on them during building works - while not having to endure it himself - as well as blighting their lives, health and well-being, has been given absolutely no consideration. Nor has he attempted to ameliorate, in any way, the problems for the other residents which will inevitably result from these works, should they go ahead. CRASH respectfully asks Camden to refuse this application. Peter Symonds Chair CRASH</p>
2018/1610/P	Heidi clyne	08/07/2018 16:20:42	COMMNT	<p>We agree to every issue that has been raised in regards to opposing yet another basement application along Goldhurst Terrace. If this and the subsequent proposals go ahead it will result in another 5 basements taking place during the next two years . There have already been 7 basements in this half of Goldhurst Terrace. Camden council MUST draw a line at some point as there is and will be serious building environmental repercussions!</p>