

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2024/0447/P	Abel Gorchein	14/05/2024 12:53:17	OBJ	Dear Mr Nicholls,

The proposal for a rear extension is out of line with the Redington Frogmal Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum version 2021; 2021 to 31:12:2045) which includes restriction on the extension of buildings over garden space. In this case the loss is at least one quarter (the length of the garden is just under 12 metres and the proposal is for the extension to be 3 metres into the garden; the width of the building is about 10 metres.

In the application plan submission, there appear to be misrepresentations: in answer to the question about loss of garden space the answer given is "no"; in response to the question about area involved, the answer given is 20 square metres, but  $10 \times 3 = 30$  square metres.

The introduction to this application states that it is a duplicate of the previous plan (2020/2691/P) which became time-expired and had to be resubmitted. It is notable that this required excavation to a depth of 1.2 metres. Thus a volume of  $3 \times 10 \times 1.2 = 36$  cubic metres of earth would be removed (approximately 36 metric tonnes)

I find this alarming: 7A Langland Gardens is at the bottom of a hill and there is a delicate equilibrium in the area between surface/standing water and water drainage. Disturbing this pattern could result in flooding, pooling of water and damage to the foundations of adjoining buildings, especially if downhill, as is number 5 Langland Gardens, and attached number 3, a Council property.

This is well-known to Buildings Insurance companies (e.g John Lewis and its underwriters) which will not quote in this area because of the increased risk of subsidence, while others impose a substantial excess on premiums.

A direct example of this delicate equilibrium, which still affects us, is that about 10 years ago (April 2014), the side path bordering 7A was dug up (by a Mr Sadoo) for a purpose unknown to me. Since then, our side of the path floods after even a modest rain shower and remains under water for several days.

In all these circumstances, the possible effects of altering the existing water table by removing 36 metric tonnes of earth from the rear garden of 7A Langland Gardens, which is only 1.8 metres away from number 5, is of serious concern.

While recognising that if Camden Council permits this development, the possible effects of excavation would be considered by Party Wall surveyors, I believe that the scale of earth removal here is so substantial that it also, and primarily, becomes an intrinsic element of the planning application. Effects may be manifest on 7A Langland Gardens itself, with standing water and impairment of existing water drainage from its own garden.

I am not aware of whether locally specific hydrological or hydrogeological studies have been carried out here, as listed under "exceptions" for this type of application.

Another aspect with negative impact includes the replacement of the "open" outlook onto the adjoining Frogmal Gardens by a 3-metre wide by 3 metres high brick wall surmounted by a grey felt roof. This cannot improve the general appearance of a building in this Conservation Area.

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**                    **Comment:**    **Response:**

On all these grounds I object to this proposal.

Yours sincerely

---