

Dr Caroline Cooper

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

From my desk I can SEE 6 Albert Terrace.

For the reasons argued below I am objecting to both these planning applications:

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

1. LOSS OF HOMES:

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.

The extensive pile driving proposed 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 2018/2342/P

2. RAISING THE HEIGHT OF THE PERIMETER WALL

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.

3. BASEMENT.

I recently objected to the strategy of arguing for a deepening of this, on the grounds that the so-called ‘lower ground floor’ IS already a basement. I, and everyone else in my house, are pleased that Camden are not going to give permission for what would have been a double basement and swimming pool. However the revised plans still appear to be in contradiction to Camden’s A5 Basement Policy which states that *‘the siting, location, scale and design of basements must have minimal impact on, and be subordinate to, the host building and property’*. And at 6.113, this policy says *“...it is important that”* [basement development] *“is done in a way that does not cause harm to the amenity of neighbours”*...

The revised proposal to deepen the basement by 40 cm would be out of keeping with this Victorian villa, and its construction would be of great inconvenience to neighbours.

4. TRAFFIC

The lorries etc 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 awkward.

I urge the Council to reject proposals 2018/2445/P and 2018/2225/P, 2018/2342/P