

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5834/P	Dag Axelsen	10/03/2022 09:11:47	OBJ	<p>I would like to second the two objections below very strongly:</p> <p>Section 4 of the Application. Description of the works: "Enlarge existing basement...". This description is inaccurate as there is no existing basement. What there is is a half-height cellar created, as in so many Victorian houses, for the storage of coal and other 'dirty' materials. Such cellars were never intended as habitable spaces. The applicant is proposing to not only convert the existing coal cellar into a habitable space by its conversion into a basement, but to extend it throughout the footprint of the building. This is a gross over-development of a building that has already suffered numerous alterations, a number of which have been carried out without consent or not in accordance with given consent (as reported to LBC). The creation of front and rear lightwells, plus a further rear extension continue to degrade the site through loss of forecourt and garden resulting in loss of amenity. The Council has a duty to "pay special attention to the preserving or enhancing the special character or appearance of those [the SHCA] areas". The current application patently does neither, and the Council is urged to refuse permission.</p> <p>AND:</p> <p>CRASH (Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead) would like to object to aspects of this application. The addition of a light well to the front of the property with a structural grill will cause light spillage and is also in the area that the previously granted permission for this property required planting as a condition of the approval. It is not clear from the drawings provided with the application whether the car parked on the front "garden" will still fit without protruding onto the pavement if the lightwell is installed. The current state of the front of the property is already in breach of the permission granted previously - there is insufficient planting, the small area of front wall reinstated is not wide enough and there are supposed to be railings on top of it (in line with the conservation area) which were not installed. If permission is granted additional planting in the front garden should be required.</p> <p>In terms of the rear extension CRASH would request that a green roof is installed given the reduction in greenery and permeable surfaces already in the rear garden and front garden. The basement impact assessment also notes there are tree roots in evidence but no impact statement has been provided on potential impact on trees located in the rear gardens.</p>
2021/5834/P	Joseph Corbett	10/03/2022 09:46:22	COMMNT	<p>I would like to object strongly to the proposal to build a basement conversion at 73 Goldhurst Terrace. I live on the other side of Goldhurst Terrace and the residents here have already endured the extended disruption caused by the nearby basement conversions at Numbers 61, 63, 65 and 67. Combined, the work on those conversions lasted 18 months or so. The daily noise, dirt and traffic disruption were unbearable. There was no consideration for the people living nearby, many of them children and elderly, who had to keep their windows shut throughout a hot summer. Our quality of life was ruined and I am dismayed at the thought that we will have to go through all that again. It is completely unfair.</p> <p>Since the basement conversions at Numbers 61 to 67, here has been a recurrence of serious flooding at the junction of Goldhurst Terrace and Fairhazel Gardens. Families had to move out of their homes for months on end while repairs to the flood damage were carried out. I see from one of the other objections here that the building of the basement conversions has caused the many underground streams below the street here to be diverted, and that this is very likely to have contributed to the flooding. This argument makes perfect sense. It is reckless of the Council to consider permitting any more basement conversions in these circumstances.</p>