

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0160/P	Nicholas Hytner	06/03/2023 18:48:49	OBJ	<p>I write to object to the following proposals in planning application 2023/0160/P</p> <p>1. Basement excavation</p> <p>I am the resident of 9 St Mark's Crescent, a semi-detached house that shares a party wall with 10 St Mark's Crescent.</p> <p>I am not satisfied that the structural engineer's report on the proposed excavation is unequivocal about the structural risk to my property from the excavation. Any degree of risk seems unacceptable to me.</p> <p>There is no reference to the removal of the proposed debris. Any obstruction of St Mark's Crescent would be unacceptable to its current residents.</p> <p>I am not satisfied that the excavation is necessary or in keeping with a Conservation area</p> <p>2. Proposed rear extension</p> <p>I am not satisfied that the design for the rear extension is in keeping with the rest of the Crescent. In material and design it adversely affects the Crescent when viewed from the Regent's Canal.</p> <p>3. Disruption and disturbance.</p> <p>It is proposed that the works at 10 St Mark's Crescent will take 12 months which will cause extreme disruption to the entire Crescent.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0160/P	SARAH LIEBERSON	05/03/2023 18:48:44	OBJNOT	<p>I write to object to the above planning application 2023/0160/P for several of its proposals:</p> <p>1- Excavation of basement</p> <p>Unfortunately, several large-scale planning permissions have been granted in this Crescent recently and this current proposal for a sub-basement excavation of 3.5 m below the existing lower ground floor level across the entire front of the property is further over-development in a Conservation Area. Apart from questioning the actual justification for adding floor sq. footage to the size of the property of number 10, my principal concern and objection are to the safety and long-term structural effect to the adjoining buildings of 11 and 9 and to a lesser degree, number 12 St Mark's Crescent.</p> <p>I am the adjoining owner living at 11 St Marks Crescent and am extremely alarmed at the engineer's report that in the short term and long term my house will receive 'slight' structural damage. Any slightest negative impact to the safety and structural integrity of either numbers 11,9, or 12 is unacceptable.</p> <p>In addition, this development and the ensuing excavation building works will adversely affect a large section of the Crescents inhabitants whose ability to use the sidewalk and residents' parking will be severely restricted or removed.</p> <p>The important issue must be raised on how the applicants intend to remove all the excavation materials. It is crucial that they must transfer and remove all materials and clay/earth etc via the Canal ways and not be allowed to block the highways or suspend entry into the crescent for removal by enormous trucks. No skips should be allowed to remain overnight on the Crescent. No deliveries (or removals) should arrive before 9 am. No work should be allowed on the weekends. It is vital that the council pays attention and attempts to protect the affected residents of the Crescent and sensitive neighbouring occupiers against the long-term disturbance, upheaval, extreme noise levels and pollution caused by these proposed lengthy works.</p> <p>Please note that when planning permission was granted to 2018/4547/P at 31 St Marks Crescent they had to abide by these restrictions and remove all unwanted materials via canal and adhere to delivery regulations. There is already a width restriction for large vehicles entering St Marks Crescent and this must be strictly adhered to.</p> <p>Please also note that no planning permission was ever applied for or granted to the previous owners of number 12, who illegally installed a front lightwell at 12, St Mark's Crescent. The planning permission of 2017/0164/P was only for new glazing by its current owners.</p> <p>No other front lightwells have been installed in the frontage of any other house on the canal side and would most definitely not be in keeping within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>2- Erection of replacement single-storey rear extension with terrace above</p> <p>The proposals are not of a design which is in keeping with the scale, character, or appearance of St Mark's Crescent which is in a Conservation Area. Most of the existing extensions on the Canalside of the Crescent have preserved and maintained the character and appearance. The bulk and the materials to be used for the exterior cladding in this application are not of the traditional design standard and will most definitely not enhance the traditional look of the rear building. It is crucial to be able to see the entire Crescent as a collection of extremely similar, maintained historical homes when viewed from both the front and, crucially, the back. Local communities and the general public alike anticipate that the vista will stay uniform and typical in a conservation area. This new back extension, which is replacing an older one, is unsightly and will have a negative overall impact.</p> <p>I understand the works proposal will be 9-12 months (possibly longer) and run at a cost of approx. £2 million.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0160/P	Dr Hume-Smith	06/03/2023 14:44:57	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of St Mark's Crescent.</p> <p>I would like to raise some issues that I would like to be considered.</p> <p>The most recent development, with basement, to be constructed on the street is 31 St Marks Crescent (no 1 although approved, has not been constructed). The building of this basement took 2 years and lead to considerable disruption for residents, damage to the fabric of the street, and damage to residents cars parked in the street.</p> <p>St Marks Crescent is a single carriage street. It is not suitable for heavy or wide vehicles. 31 had the advantage of access to the site via Gloucester Avenue, and also used the canal for removal of waste and delivery of some materials. The plans need more detail of a traffic management scheme to minimise the disruption and damage we have previously witnessed with building works.</p> <p>St Marks Crescent is a conservation area. The rear view of the houses are very visible from the pedestrian footpath along the canal. It is my view that the proposed extension, cladding and balcony are not in keeping with the neighbouring houses and needs altering to be more sympathetic to the conservation area.</p>
