

From: gavin hunter [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2018 06:44
To: [REDACTED] McClue, Jonathan [REDACTED]
Cc: gavin hunter [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS 2018/2342/P and 2018/2225/P, 6 Albert Terrace, NW1 7SU and 2018/2445/P, 6 Albert Terrace Mews NW1 7TA

Dear Elaine Quigley,

The following are my objections to the three planning applications related to 6 Albert Terrace and 6 Albert Terrace Mews. Thank you for considering them.

My name is Gavin Hunter; my wife and I have lived for ten years at [REDACTED] Albert Terrace Mews NW1 7TA and within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area for 25 years. We are the lawful owners of our house, which is some 15m [REDACTED] behind 6 Albert Terrace NW1 7SU and shares a party wall with 6 Albert Terrace Mews NW1 7TA - both of which are the subject of planning applications.

2018/2342/P Basement Extension, 6 ALBERT TERRACE - OBJECTION

- I object to the deepening of the existing basement by 40cm. Far from being appropriate for a house of this importance, doing this would change the very deliberate hierarchy of floor levels, where the basement was clearly designed to be subservient to higher floors - the workplace and even home of kitchen and other "below stairs" staff. Changing the levels here and then going further by lowering the window thresholds to create a courtyard as proposed would be interesting in another context, but usurps the grand, early-Victorian form. ("The Council will only permit basement development where it is demonstrated to its satisfaction that the proposal would not cause harm to...d) the architectural character of the building".)

- To the lowering of the existing lightwells (as above)

- To the creation of a new, lowered, basement extension. This was rejected in 2011 and it should not be resurrected now - the more so if it involves piling around two sides of the house.

- To the use of piling - ie the creation of a subterranean concrete wall going down as far as 15m below ground level around two sides of the house - that is at least 7m below

ground level where the existing basement would be lowered by 40cm. (See Table 11, P23, RSK Geo-Environmental Site Assessment and RSK Introduction 2.2 p3) The implications of that for amenity, sustainability and flooding, (policy CC3) are unreasonable. ("The Council will only permit basement development where it is demonstrated to its satisfaction that the proposal would not cause harm to:..b) structural and ground water conditions of the area").

It should be noted that two of the three main reason for the Appeal dismissal on the previous application were:

"i) The effect of the development on the character of the host building"

ii) the effect on groundwater, surface water and structural stability"

- I object to the same engineering methodology being re-presented as when originally specified for constructing a whole new sub-basement plus swimming pool. That plan was thrown out first by Camden planners and subsequently on appeal. There is to be no sub-basement here, (unless it is done without consent), and that engineering method is now wholly inappropriate. Please, Camden must now pay close attention to the method by which planned schemes would be built and not just the forms represented by the plans - because Camden now has a Local Plan that aims to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. (Policy A1). And the only way to do that will be to have a fundamental understanding as to what the implications of a particular method are in terms of their impact on amenity. (And here it bears repeating)

A note should be made - and was made in the Appeal Judgement - that Camden's new Local Plan aims to ensure development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. (Policy A1). At 94, my dear friend and neighbour, David Widdicombe, still lives very happily and fully looked after in his home, 5 Albert Terrace. So how does Camden's policy on basements and amenity take account when the neighbour is more fragile than most? When their life expectancy is perhaps years rather than certainly decades? When the potential impact on their amenity is so much greater because of their stage of life?

- I object to the amount of waste that this needless excavation will generate and the amount of ultra-heavy lorry traffic that would be created to remove it. (A peak of four to five 4-axle tipper lorries per day).

- I object to the site access map in the Construction Management Plan that shows this traffic leaving the site and heading down Regent's Park Road, past St Mark's Square towards Camden Town...A route that takes it straight over the canal bridge... The canal bridge is a 5 ton limit, while a 4 axle tipper lorry, fully laden, is close to 30.

- To the pressure put on the bus route.

- To the risk posed to pedestrians on the 2nd busiest corner of Primrose Hill.

- To the recycling of the Clements Acoustics Report which uses a false premise to justify

noise levels of machinery intended for the rear/garden side of the house (when all the base level acoustic tests were done on the road-side/front side of the house).

- I object to Holland Park being asked of Primrose Hill

2018/2225/P. 6 Albert Terrace, NW1 7SU - OBJECTION

- To the demolition and rebuilding of the perimeter wall (some 35cm higher). This is unnecessary and - because it involves a massive concrete beam and (again) piling, it is potentially a step towards linking together 5 Albert Terrace and 5 Albert Terrace Mews underground.

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

- To the inappropriately large number of roof lights on so prominent a roof.

(no objection to 5.2.3 Roof terrace; 5.2.3 Reinstatement of Historic Raised Window opening; 5.2.4 Other minor Alterations)

2018/2445/P 6 Albert Terrace Mews. NW1 7TA - OBJECTION

- To the use of 6 Albert Terrace Mews as ancillary accommodation for 6 Albert Terrace.

6 flats were lost in 2003 to create one, six-bedroomed house. Now, that one house is supposed to absorb another (4-bedroomed) house. Loss of accommodation on this scale is unacceptable and has to be resisted. Camden Local Plan policy H3 includes..."resisting development that would involve the net loss of two or more homes (from individual or cumulative proposals).

- To the lowering of the Mews House floor level to the point that there is no longer a step. Having the step is a feature of these original Mews.

(no objection to glass access enclosure, roof terrace)

Thank you again for considering my objections to these 3 separate but inter-related applications. I apologise for not being able to use the automated system today and would be grateful if you could process this on my behalf and acknowledge receipt.

Kind regards

Gavin Hunter

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and resid