

**Objection to Application for Planning Permission by M. Golinsky**  
**Redevelopment Plans at 6 Albert Terrace, NW1 and 6 Albert Terrace Mews**

I, Daniel Stillit, [REDACTED] am formally objecting to both these planning applications:

**6 Albert Terrace Mews NW1 7TA      2018/2445/P**

**1. LOSS OF HOMES**

I object to the use of 6 Albert Terrace Mews as ancillary accommodation to 6 Albert Terrace.

Until relatively recently 6 Albert Terrace contained SIX flats. The Mews house behind, which the developers wish to use for 'ancillary guest accommodation' is a four bedroom home. To lose both of these properties to the available housing in Primrose Hill would be a loss of SEVEN potential homes – contrary to Camden's Local Plan Policy H3, designed to prevent such a loss.

**2. PILING USED FOR CREATION OF AMALGAMATED SUPER-HOME.**

I object to the use of extensive pile driving as proposed which suggests plans to amalgamate the two houses. This sounds like the creation of a palatial home, totally **out of character with the Primrose Hill Conservation Area**.

**6 Albert Terrace NW1 7SU      2018/2225/P**

**1. RAISING THE HEIGHT OF THE PERIMETER WALL**

I object to the demolition and rebuilding of an even higher perimeter wall (some 35cm higher). This is unnecessary and - because it involves a massive concrete beam and piling, it is potentially one preliminary step in linking together house and mews house underground.

A high subterranean and partly concrete wall round two sides of the property (secretive and 'defensive') would also be out of character with the Conservation Area. Extensive pile driving would be intensely disruptive to neighbours, and have implications for sustainability and possible flooding – at the base of Primrose Hill, at a low corner where there is often extensive puddling in the park in the winter. Besides, a handsome old brick wall should be preserved, not demolished.

This is a conservation area. Surely historic walls are to be appreciated, repaired and not raised.

**2. BASEMENT DEPTH**

I believe that the proposed deepening the basement is not in line with the basement depth of existing houses in the area. The fact is that 6 Albert Terrace already has a basement, which has been the subject of a series of previous planning applications since 1939, most recently in 2017. Originally the basement area was for storage and worked well, now deepening of the existing basement by 40cm is unnecessary. The new application proffers the rationale to the increase in basement depth as "to create 3m internal floor to ceiling height which would be appropriate for a significant house such as this". We do not accept this characterisation at all. I am aware that the existing basement level within other houses in the same street

have comfortable ten-foot ceilings. Thus there is no need to go deeper with the corresponding risk of subsidence and flooding (see below).

### **3. PROLIFERATION OF ROOF LIGHTS**

I object to the proliferation of roof lights.

### **4. CONSIDERABLE FLOODING RISK**

The Basement Impact Assessment ("BIA") plan produced by RSK Environment Limited ("RSK") concedes in para 4.1.1 on P14 that "the lowest excavations at the site are for the sub-basement structures....will possibly take the excavation below the base of the Regents Canal and nearby ponds in Regents Park".

Flooding risk at the very foot of Primrose Hill, where 5 and 6 Albert Terrace are situated, is HIGH. Every year there are days and weeks where the foot of Primrose Hill becomes substantially flooded by accumulated rainwater that gathers in huge pools for days and sometimes weeks. ■■■ steps down to the Basement Flat are often inundated with surface flood water which goes up to ■■■ door entrance, and on occasion has entered into the Basement Flat.

The issue of flooding has been severe in the house opposite 7 Albert Terrace Mews, where a basement was built some 15 years ago, which has flooded and has a pump in operation 24 hours per day.

### **5. TRAFFIC**

The lorries and other heavy equipment, which would be needed for all the above proposals, would be enormously disruptive to traffic. The 274 bus already has some difficulty turning right from Albert Terrace into Regent's Park Road, and construction vehicles would make this even harder. The bus is shortly to become a double decker, which will make its manoeuvres even more problematic.

**I urge the Council to reject proposals 2018/2445/P and 2018/2225/P.**

Yours sincerely,

Daniel Stillit