

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0524/P	James Knowles	12/02/2025 16:16:29	OBJ	<p>This application to dig a swimming pool into the basement of a semi-detached house, built on clay, on a sloping property, with other houses tightly packed around it, is entirely inappropriate.</p> <p>We have had similar disastrous pool developments nearby (94 South Hill Park) where its adjoining house (92 South Hill Park) was so disturbed by the digging that its front wall began to collapse and had to be reinforced with massive wooden braces.</p> <p>There are 2 local swimming pools within 10 minutes walk from the property and 3 outdoor swimming ponds. There is no case to be made for this as a necessary development.</p>
2025/0524/P	Mark Ellingham	12/02/2025 16:39:53	INT	<p>I understand that this proposal has already been turned down twice after numerous objections from neighbours. It is madness to dig a swimming pool in clay on a tightly packed terrace of houses, on a hill, where there have been many historic issues of subsidence.</p> <p>It seems that the proposer is trying to slip this application through, by repeated applications, knowing the opposition of their neighbours, and that there are well established grounds for concern. How many times are they allowed to submit the same application?</p>
2025/0524/P	Jeremy	12/02/2025 16:41:02	OBJ	<p>The topsoil here is 20cms max before hitting clay. Having dug a hole one metre deep in my own garden (South Hill Park) and watching it very quickly fill with water I feel I am in a position to say that the displacement that considering the position of this house this will cause flooding to the gardens and around the foundations of other houses particularly downhill. This area is just not suitable for such a construction.</p>
2025/0524/P	natania Jansz	12/02/2025 16:47:03	OBJ	<p>I wish to complain about and object to the inclusion of a swimming pool in this development. This is an area of closely packed houses on a hill on clay soil, where subsidence is a very significant problem and where water rushes down the hill at two different angles and floods the lower houses. It seems highly unsafe to both dig deeper into this soil and create a pool in such a situation and is entirely unnecessary as we have ample swimming facilities nearby (the Royal Free rec, Kentish Town Baths as well as the Lido and three ponds). I would like to join our neighbours in opposing this. The continual presentation of this highly opposed plan is moreover causing distress.</p> <p>Yours Natania Jansz 7 Parliament Hill, NW3 2SY</p>
2025/0524/P	Alex Finer	12/02/2025 16:47:44	OBJ	<p>Madness to allow such a development. A threat to neighbouring properties and further damage to the water table incurred by previous basement developments.</p>
2025/0524/P	Stella von Boch	12/02/2025 18:00:17	OBJ	<p>I am concerned about the swimming pool excavation. These deep holes have consequences in the form of cracks and movement of the surrounding properties. The property is on a slope and on clay, i.e. potentially unstable.</p> <p>The work time will also be extended by the excavation and if you allow this one many others who can afford such a thing will follow, resulting in more noise, more traffic and an inflation in house prices. A trend like this can change a neighbourhood. Not of the better in my opinion.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0524/P	John Ward	12/02/2025 18:53:52	OBJ	I live in 71a Parliament Hill, so am a neighbour to number 28. There have been several threats of subsidence locally. The idea of digging a swimming pool in the clay on a hillside property between tightly packed houses seems crazy so I object strongly to this application.
2025/0524/P	Cathy Mason	12/02/2025 19:04:13	COMMNT	This feels like a really bad thing for the road. It makes no sense building under tightly packed houses. And it just isn't the kind of community that suits basement swimming pools...
2025/0524/P	Olivia Olsen	12/02/2025 18:38:59	PETITNOBJ E	<p>This is the second swimming pool form I am responding to since April 2024.</p> <p>Is this a precedent now and you are only letting the neighbourhood speak as courtesy? Is the council bought out? If one is allowed then two three etc happen.</p> <p>A precedent then.</p> <p>REASONS AGAINST</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are swimming options in the area. Both swimming pools and the Heath. 2. Excavation of land means less land to absorb waterfall. Is climate change a reality in the UK in term of flooding? Yes. So how will this loss of land drainage effect the gardens, foundations of buildings and businesses level with pool properties and down to the bottom of the hill? Obviously it will. Has South End Green experienced flooding in the past? Yes. So why allow a increased means for disruption and cost to the council, homes and businesses all for the sake a private greed/indulgence? 3. As this pool and the other one you allowed is being built who endures the noise, drilling and trucks? Not the owners. The community near by endure it. <p>People live here because of peace. A pool building site destroys this peace and extends over a long period of time. If one is allowed so the precedent for another and the quiet streets are invaded on and on by construction.</p> <p>Many people like myself work at home. Our lifestyle is of value. The people with money to buy pools, is an extravagance where others pay the cost.</p> <p>If pools continue to be given the go ahead by the council who recognise one family of more value than a whole neighbourhood, I am worried who we have elected. Please take care of the environment long term wise, and respect community living.</p>
2025/0524/P	Maria Margaronis	12/02/2025 19:25:52	OBJ	As a local resident, I believe that approving this application may put neighbouring properties at risk and will set a dangerous precedent. The entire neighbourhood is hilly and built on clay. Given the increasing flood risk in London, excavating a swimming pool here seems foolhardy. It is also completely out of keeping with the character of the area, which is a conservation zone. There are no other back garden swimming pools on any of the streets in the "egg" or the "triangle" that make up the South End Green residential area near the Heath. There are also plenty of public swimming facilities a short walk away: the Lido and the Heath and Highgate ponds.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0524/P	Anne Elton	12/02/2025 19:42:58	APP	<p>I am seriously opposed to this proposal. The land here is unstable clay and any deep digging risks affecting adversely not only the property itself but also neighbouring houses. The same consideration applies to applications to enlarge basements to create more room space. Camden has recently refused permission for basement building.</p> <p>Given the number of easily accessible local swimming facilities it is to say the least a curious request.</p> <p>Heating such pools costs a great deal in power and given the climate emergency surely everybody should be trying to reduce their usage of power.</p> <p>Anne Elton. 63 Parliament Hill NW3 2TB</p>
2025/0524/P	Marsha Sanders	12/02/2025 21:33:40	OBJ	I object to this proposal because not only is it irresponsible, antisocial and unsafe to propose digging a swimming pool in the clay on a hillside property between tightly packed houses but it is also entirely inappropriate in an area that is exceptionally well served with swimming amenities: the swimming ponds, the lido and Kentish Town baths all within close proximity.
2025/0524/P	Julia Leyland	12/02/2025 22:14:28	OBJ	Objection to swimming pool Harmful to environment
2025/0524/P	sara wood	12/02/2025 22:57:09	OBJ	There are 4 public swimming areas and 5 private but accessible swimming areas, including the Royal Free Hospital pool. A pool is therefore not necessary. The hill is steep and clay mobile. There are many underground rivers which find new courses when blocked by deep concrete structures to the detriment of buildings in the area. In 1994 South Hill Park made a swimming pool which highlighted these problems and revealed a new one, of the Victorian pipes lying above the pool causing flooding and pollution problems. I therefore object to the swimming pool and lower ground excavation.
2025/0524/P	Nigel Knight	12/02/2025 23:09:40	COMMENT	I object to this application. We live in South Hill Park and object for two main reasons: the potential damage caused by installing a pool like this on neighboring properties given the soil types and elevation in this area as well as the significant disruption involved during construction.
2025/0524/P	India Bourke	13/02/2025 08:06:29	OBJ	I have concerns about the excavation needed for elements of this project impacting negatively on the wider integrity of the hillside and its resulting potential for subsidence.
2025/0524/P	Marion Lester-Card	12/02/2025 16:37:31	OBJ	I would like to submit an opposition to this proposal. We live in an area which is known for movement due to the house being built on clay. This proposed lower ground swimming pool would present a danger to surrounding properties. Like with teeth, when you mess with the foundations, they all start to move. There is also dreadful works going on at the top of Parliament Hill which have disturbed the neighbours for three years now. and it sounds like this proposal will do the same. It is understandable that wealthy individuals are buying up the houses in this lovely area, but the hubris of undermining them in this way and causing so much distress to neighbours is unacceptable. This would be a dangerous precedent which could lead to the rest of this quiet little community being subject to copy-cat developments. I should also point out that this area is very well served with swimming amenities so a private pool is totally unnecessary.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0524/P	Frederick Penberthy	12/02/2025 16:37:09	COMMNT	This is the latest application being submitted for digging under this house to install a swimming pool. The previous applications were rejected for good reason. This application has been submitted with minor inconsequential changes but the problems recognised as being the reasons for previous rejections remain.
2025/0524/P	Jane Barclay	12/02/2025 16:32:05	OBJ	I would like to voice my objection to this planning application. It seems foolhardy to dig a swimming pool on a clay hillside in such close proximity to other houses (and in such close proximity to the Lido and the swimming ponds). If the property owners wished to have an underground swimming pool they should have bought a property in a more suitable area for this kind of excavation.
2025/0524/P	Fanny Bostock	12/02/2025 16:29:20	OBJ	This is the fourth time that this application is being submitted. I would like to re-register my objection to this application for the fourth time. I live in the basement flat of the adjoining property. The noise of the work, the ongoing noise of the pump room once up and running, the smell of the chemicals to maintain the pool not to mention the threat to subsidence and the property foundation are all unacceptable. It should not be allowed for the planning permission to keep being withdrawn before rejection and then being submitted over and over again in the hope that neighbours will get bored of objecting! It is a travesty. There are numerous places to swim locally both in-doors and out. This application is totally unnecessary and unfair to neighbouring properties.
2025/0524/P	Rachel Campbell	12/02/2025 16:52:26	COMMNT	I live at 49 Parliament Hill. I strongly object to the proposed pool - this would throw up all sorts of issues with the clay foundations plus being on a hill with tightly packed houses along the road and on either side of the property. Within very close proximity there is the Lido, 3 swimming ponds on the Heath and pools in Swiss Cottage and Kentish Town. It is simply not appropriate or necessary to have your own private pool in a road like Parliament Hill.

Total: 5