

From: Avishai Moor [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 May 2025 00:01
To: Planning
Cc: Avishai Moor
Subject: Planning Application 2025/1698/P - objection

You don't often get email from avishai.moor@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important.](#)

[REDACTED]
car

To: Development Management, London Borough of Camden
planning@camden.gov.uk

Planning Application: 2025/1698/P
Address: Flat 1, 18 Platt's Lane, NW3 7NS
Submitted by: Avishai Moor
Neighbour at: Flat 4, 2 Ferncroft Avenue, NW3 7PH

Objection to Planning Application 2025/1698/P – Flat 1, 18 Platts Lane

I am writing to formally object in the strongest possible terms to planning application 2025/1698/P for a proposed basement excavation, including a swimming pool, spa, and extensive landscaping alterations, at Flat 1, 18 Platt's Lane. As the immediate next-door neighbour at 2 Ferncroft Avenue, I am gravely concerned about the severe and unacceptable structural, environmental, and amenity impacts this development would inflict on my property, other residents, and the wider area.

Unacceptable Impact on Residential Amenity

This proposal would directly and disproportionately affect my household. As I live and work from home for significant proportion of the time, the prolonged and intense construction noise, vibration, and dust associated with deep excavation will render my property uninhabitable for work, meetings, and rest. The tranquil residential environment will be severely disrupted by:

- Continuous drilling and excavation noise.
- Heavy vehicle movements, including skip lorries and concrete deliveries, causing obstruction and significant disruption to the street and local access that is also used heavily.
- Health and safety hazards for pedestrians and local children walking to/back from school due to construction traffic and activity.

This unacceptable disruption is projected to persist for many months, potentially years, solely for the benefit of one flat seeking a private swimming pool. This level of intrusion is unjustifiable within an area of multi-occupancy buildings and a quiet conservation area. It imposes an intolerable burden on neighbouring properties for a private luxury.

Significant Technical and Structural Concerns

The application details excavation beneath and beyond the existing building footprint, in close proximity to shared walls and boundaries. Even the developer's own Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) acknowledges critical risks:

- The site is situated within an area identified with historic groundwater flow and spring activity, raising serious concerns about hydrological impacts.

- The building shares party walls and foundations with my property, yet the proposal involves underpinning using high-risk "hit-and-miss" techniques.
- The BIA predicts up to 10mm of settlement and 5mm of lateral yield even under optimal conditions. This predicted movement, whilst categorised as 'very slight' (Category 1) within the BIA, is based on theoretical modelling and fails to adequately account for cumulative risks, unforeseen ground conditions, or potential construction errors.

Camden's Policy A5 explicitly requires that basement developments demonstrate no greater than 'very slight' (Category 1) risk of structural harm. However, the predicted movements, coupled with the inherent complexities of basement excavation in this geological context, mean the risk to my property's structural safety is simply not acceptable. Furthermore, there is no evident plan for full party wall consent, consultation, or independent oversight, which is a critical omission for a project of this scale and risk.

Non-Compliance with Planning Policy

The proposal fundamentally breaches several key planning policies:

- Camden Local Plan Policy A5 (Basement Development):
 - The proposed excavation extends beyond 50% of the rear garden, contravening limitations on the extent of subterranean development.
 - It intrudes into the root protection zones of protected trees, threatening their long-term health and the green infrastructure of the area.
 - The site's location within groundwater risk zones, coupled with insufficient or vague drainage solutions, presents a clear risk of altering groundwater flows and potential future flooding or damp issues for neighbouring properties.
 - The development will undeniably have a material and detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity, as detailed above, which Policy A5 seeks to protect.
- RedFrog Neighbourhood Plan Policy UD1 (Basement Development):
 - The application fails to preserve adequate garden soil depth necessary for the health and stability of existing trees and green spaces.
 - It disrupts groundwater flows in an area historically associated with a pond site, with only vague mitigation measures proposed for water ingress and potential flooding.

Furthermore, the scale and nature of this private luxury development undermine the architectural character and shared integrity of a multi-tenant 20th-century building, setting an unwelcome precedent.

Concerns Regarding Inadequate Drainage Assessment

The drainage report prepared by Happy Drains surveys the existing drainage infrastructure but does not provide a comprehensive analysis of whether the local sewerage system can cope with the additional discharge from surface water and the proposed swimming pool.

The limited upgrades suggested fall short of demonstrating that run-off levels will not increase, particularly during periods of heavy rainfall or storm events. Without a robust, forward-looking drainage strategy, this proposal risks contributing to downstream flooding and overburdening the existing network.

Detrimental Communal and Conservation Harm

The proposed removal and relocation of the communal bin store to the rear garden is highly problematic:

- It reduces existing shared amenity space for other residents.
- There is no evidence of genuine consultation with other residents regarding this significant alteration to communal facilities.
- The relocation could lead to issues with odour, vermin, and visual blight in an area intended for communal enjoyment, failing to preserve the conservation character of the Redington Froggnal area.

Additionally, the proposed new timber gate on the southern boundary is intrusive, unnecessary, and inconsistent with existing boundary treatments and the established character of the conservation area.

Conclusion

This planning application is ill-conceived, overly ambitious, and completely inappropriate for a shared residential building in a sensitive conservation area. It seeks to provide a singular personal luxury to one flat owner at the direct expense of neighbours' peace, safety, and the established character of the locality.

I urge Camden Council to uphold its own robust planning principles and policies, particularly Camden Local Plan Policy A5 and RedFrog Neighbourhood Plan Policy UD1, and refuse this development outright.

Please confirm receipt of this objection. Thank you for your careful attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Avishai Moor

Flat 4, 2 Ferncroft Avenue, London NW3 7PH

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]