dondon, Hay 4Th

## Dear Planning Officer,

I'm writing to object to application 2025/1084/P as a resident of Palace Court, which sits directly beside the proposed development site.

From the outset, it's clear this proposal is attempting to force too much onto a plot that simply cannot support it. The scheme is overbuilt, poorly integrated into its surroundings, and carries serious risks to the safety and amenity of neighbouring homes — risks which have now been confirmed in black and white by Camden's own appointed engineering consultants.

The independent audit of the Basement Impact Assessment, commissioned by the Council, identifies major technical failures in the developer's submission. Among them:

- The damage assessment assumes surrounding buildings are structurally sound, yet provides no evidence or inspection to justify this despite local records of previous subsidence.
- The soil conditions are misrepresented. While the design is based on compact gravel, the actual ground model shows soft London Clay, known for instability and high water sensitivity.
- The predicted settlement figures are based on optimistic, non-conservative models. The auditor specifically recommends that the methods used be replaced with more appropriate, risk-based tools.
- The qualifications of the BIA authors have not been verified, which breaches the requirements of Camden's basement policy.
- Even the suggested monitoring trigger points were found to be higher than the movements predicted, making them essentially useless for early warning.

These are not minor technical quibbles — they amount to a fundamental failure to show that this scheme could proceed safely.

Beyond the basement risk, the overall design fails to respect the local context. The building's bulk and height are out of scale with surrounding

properties, and the massing pushes aggressively into the boundaries of Palace Court and Ashley Court. Camen has already flagged the façade as being "packed together and of poor quality" in pre-application feedback—yet nothing meaningful has been done to address this.

As a resident, I'm also concerned by the impact on our shared spaces. The proposal would cast permanent shadow across the communal garden at Palace Court — a space that many residents rely on, especially those without private outdoor access. The internal layouts and window placements of the new development also raise obvious privacy issues that obscure glazing will not fix.

There is no affordable housing, no public benefit, and no serious response to Camden's previous reasons for refusal. Instead, this is a denser, riskier version of a scheme already found to be unacceptable.

Given the scale of objections — from residents, professionals, and Camden's own commissioned engineers — I urge the Council to reject this application in full.

Yours sincerely

Jean-Christophe Labbe