

## 2018/2342/P - 6 Albert Terrace

### **Agent Response to Objections received from Henrietta Goodden and David Thomas, Neil Chappell, Dr Caroline Cooper, Gavin Hunter, Jenny McCririck, Celia Hoyles, and David Widdicombe and Daniel Widdicombe dated variously**

A number of these objections also include objections to a separate application, 2018/2225/P, which also relates to 6 Albert Terrace. I will respond to those various comments in a separate note under that application.

Broadly speaking the concerns raised regarding this application fall into 6 areas as follows:

1. Not Complying with Local Plan Policy A5 Basements
2. Lowering the Existing Lower Ground Floor by 430mm
3. Robustness of the Basement Impact Assessment
4. Damage to the Lime Trees
5. Noise from Piling
6. Disturbance, Disruption and Traffic

I will respond to each of these in turn.

#### **1. Not Complying with Local Plan Policy A5 Basements**

The proposed basement extension has been the subject of a detailed Pre-Application Consultation process with Camden and we believe that it now complies with all the criteria of the above policy. Our Design and Access Statement systematically applies every criteria of Policy A5 to ensure that the proposal complies and we would ask that this is reviewed in detail to anyone who is concerned in this regard.

It should also be noted that this proposal has acknowledged all the comments raised from a previous refused application, 2017/2819/P, for this property. It does not, as some claim, include a basement below a basement or involve the demolition of the existing two storey side extension.

#### **2. Lowering the Existing Lower Ground Floor by 430mm**

The proposal to lower the existing lower ground floor level by 430mm to create a 3m floor to ceiling height would increase the amenity value of these rooms; increase the daylight into these rooms and would have no visible impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area.

#### **3. Robustness of the Basement Impact Assessment**

The BIA will need to be independently verified by Camden as part of this application and we, as the application agent, unfortunately are not qualified to respond in detail to the various concerns raised. The geotechnical engineers, RSK, and the structural engineers, Alan Baxter Ltd, will of course be responding if any comments are raised during the independent review.

#### **4. Damage to the Lime Trees**

None of these are to be removed, as claimed, and the Arboricultural Impact Assessment goes into great detail as to how the trees will be protected during the course of the works, assuming that the application is approved.

#### **5. Noise from Piling**

The proposed structural method of piling is a matter for the structural engineer but we would comment that this method is usually more efficient, taking less time than traditional methods of creating foundations and results in less spoil. The methodology proposed is also subject to a detailed Construction Management Plan (CMP) which, as a condition of consent, would need to be approved.

#### **6. Disturbance, Disruption and Traffic**

If this application is approved, we are committed to minimising the impact of the construction process. Pursuant of this, this application is accompanied by a robust CMP which demonstrates how impacts from the movement of goods and materials will be minimised during the construction process. It also demonstrates that implementing the scheme would not harm local transport routes. If approved, this CMP would be an enforceable document.

We trust these comments are of assistance.

Yours faithfully

Humphrey Kelsey  
13th August 2018