

2018/2225/P - 6 Albert Terrace

Agent Response to Objection from Patricia Callaghan, Labour Councillor for Camden Town with Primrose Hill Ward, dated 30th July 2018

We appreciate that Cllr Callaghan has shown an interest in this application however, given her public office, we find it unusual that there was no attempt to contact us, in order to ensure a balanced assessment, prior to issuing her public comments.

The objections raised by her focus upon the proposals for the boundary wall. We will respond to these comments below but assume that Cllr Callaghan has no objection to any of the other proposals within this application.

We comment as follows:

There is no intention, proposal or application that considers joining the two properties with any physical structure. The two properties will share the garden and there is no suggestion that they are to be physically linked otherwise, above or below, ground. Such a proposal would be wholly detrimental to the conservation area and would likely impact the limes trees which are protected by Tree Preservation Orders.

This appears to be a 'wild' assumption tenuously born from the proposal to stabilise the footing of a section of the rear garden boundary wall.

The boundary wall that fronts the lime trees has a very shallow footing of about 20cm and the roots of the large limes are causing the wall to move which is creating a potential health and safety issue. Structural cracks and heave to the wall are now noticeable. The owners wish to avoid any future collapsing of the wall and therefore we consulted both the structural engineer and the arboriculturalist on how we could stabilise the wall without damaging the tree roots. They both advised that the footing needed to be deeper but that given the root location the best course of action was to support the footing and wall on piles situated between each tree (avoiding the roots) providing long term stability.

This process would be an expensive one and one that provides a clear benefit to the community by removing a potential hazard. If the wall is rebuilt as is (and with the existing bricks) then is it hard to see why improving the footings is a cause for objection.

Piecemeal repairs to the visible cracks in the wall, as suggested, would not provide the required long term structural stability.

We are unclear as to how the process of stabilising a short section of garden wall suggests that there is a plan to amalgamate the properties. It does not and there is no such plan.

To limit any repetition, our further comments regarding the proposal to raise the wall by four brick courses, and its justification, can be found on the 'Agent Response to Advice from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee, dated 4th July and 1st August 2018' for this application.

Given that we do not feel her objection is valid we would invite her to meet us at the application property so that we can further present our proposal to her. Our hope would be that given the above, and the benefit of a site visit, she might be minded to withdraw her objections.

A copy of this response has been sent to Elaine Quigley, the application's Planning Officer, and to Cllr Callaghan.

We trust these comments are of assistance.

Yours faithfully

Humphrey Kelsey
13th August 2018