Printed on: 24/06/	2014 09:05	5:21
--------------------	------------	------

					Printed on: 24/06/2014 09:
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2979/P	Jemima Gore	Flat 5 76 Greencroft Gdns London NW63JQ	31/05/2014 19:12:25	OBJNOT	I live at 76 Greencroft Gardens and vehemently oppose this proposed basement enlargement project. We have had to endure a basement project for the last year opposite on Greencroft Gardens, prior to that in 2011 there was a 14 month reconstruction project on Canfield plus a conservatory build next door to that in the same year. The stress of the eternal noise from dawn to dusk is too much for any human being to have to endure. I worked from home in 2011 and 2012 and I was unable to think, let alone go on conference calls. I was diagnosed with cancer in 2012 partly to do with the stress of the previous year, there were then builders underneath me for 4 months towards the end of 2011. I don't think it is ethical or humane to allow another project close by and most if not all of the inhabitants close by will not agree with this basement proposal. I note that they also had major works done in 2004 just before I moved in in 2005. I also note that one of their requests was refused by the Council only to be allowed three months later. In addition to the impact on people's mental and physical health that this upheaval would cause, the damage it will likely do to the house is very worrying. There is an old plane tree that we are not allowed to take down, the roots are already causing some damage to the house which may mean we will all have to move out and spend a lot of money on underpinning, my neighbour already had to move out for a year while the house was under-pinned. There is a lot of noise already around this area, traffic and motorised gardening tools every day is one thing, but systemic noise, every day all day for months is quite another and we have had house bigger, different, etc, then maybe he should consider moving. I imagine that with the money that he has to do all these alterations ironically means that he and his family will probably not have to remain in the house whilst the alterations are made - leaving his neighbours to listen to the noise instead. I understand that you receive money from these appl

					Printed on:	24/06/2014	09:
Application No:	Consultees Name:	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	Received:	Comment:	Response:		
2014/2979/P	Edward Sorgenicht	Flat 3 76 Greencroft Gardens	19/06/2014 12:34:12	OBJ	We are the owners/occupiers of Flat 3, 76 Greencroft Gardens. Our property is in th to 78 Greencroft Gardens where this basement excavation is proposed to be carried		ding
		London NW6 3JQ			We object to this planning application on the strongest possible basis on the following	ig points:	
					We are concerned that there has not been a thorough ground investigation to the pro accompanying documentation suggests that the review has been conducted at a high "walk-over survey". In addition, we have not seen enough evidence to suggest that damage to our property (which is a connected building). To that effect we do not be impact assessment contains sufficient information to believe that a quality ground it taken place (for instance evaluating ground representative samples, tested for their re- properties together with an evaluation of water levels).	level and as there will be no ieve the basem nyestigation has	o nent
					Overall, we feel that there has not been enough examination to determine if the site excavation, assess the risk of flooding to the adjacent properties or an assessment of movement and their duration.		nd
					In addition the description of the proposed work as an enlargement of a basement is of the proposed scope of work given the existing structure in place is a small cellar ( livable basement) and therefore this is not considered a Residential Minor Alteration significant excavation and development.	not an existing	
					Separately we are concerned about the impact this work will have to insurance prem neighboring buildings. What happens if there is ground movement and damage to or area is already considered high risk. We are also aware of flooding and long term bu properties in the same street and in the area where an adjacent property has develop There is no evidence to suggest this will not be the same.	ir building? Thi ilding damage	to
					Our building at 76 Greencroft gardens has previously been underpinned in order to a ground movement and subsidence. However it is not clear to us whether it can susta change to the soil in the area and the resulting instability. We are concerned this wo damage to our building structure and those around the property. In addition, it is not excavation will do to the large plane tree in front of our property. Given the strict ru conservation area this should be given due consideration given the possibility the tree need to be felled as a result of the excavation.	in a significant k will likely ca clear what the les of the	ause
					Finally, in the event this application is approved and subsequent issues arise to our p hold accountable both the owner of the proposed flat development and the Council a for any and all damages to our property.		
					Sincerely,		

Edward Sorgenicht and Alexia Dogani

Page 64 of 160

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 24/06/2014 09:05:21 Response:
2014/2979/P	Edward Sorgenicht	Flat 3 76 Greencroft Gardens	07/06/2014 17:46:11	OBJ	We are the owners/occupiers of Flat 3, 76 Greencroft Gardens. Our property is in the adjacent building to 78 Greencroft Gardens where this basement excavation is proposed to be carried out.
		London NW6 3JQ			We object to this planning application on the strongest possible basis on the following points:
					We are concerned that there has not been a thorough ground investigation to the proposed plans as the accompanying documentation suggests that the review has been conducted at a high level and as "walk-over survey". In addition, we have not seen enough evidence to suggest that there will be no damage to our property (which is a connected building). To that effect we do not believe the basement impact assessment contains sufficient information to believe that a quality ground investigation has taken place (for instance evaluating ground representative samples, tested for their mechanical properties together with an evaluation of water levels).
					Overall, we feel that there has not been enough examination to determine if the site is suitable for excavation, assess the risk of flooding to the adjacent properties or an assessment of expected ground movement and their duration.
					In addition the description of the proposed work as an enlargement of a basement is a misrepresentation of the proposed scope of work given the existing structure in place is a small cellar (not an existing livable basement) and therefore this is not considered a Residential Minor Alteration as it requires significant excavation and development.
					Separately we are concerned about the impact this work will have to insurance premiums of neighboring buildings. What happens if there is ground movement and damage to our building? This area is already considered high risk. We are also aware of flooding and long term building damage to properties in the same street and in the area where an adjacent property has developed a basement. There is no evidence to suggest this will not be the same.
					Our building at 76 Greencroft gardens has previously been underpinned in order to manage issues with ground movement and subsidence. However it is not clear to us whether it can sustain a significant change to the soil in the area and the resulting instability. We are concerned this work will likely cause damage to our building structure and those around the property. In addition, it is not clear what the excavation will do to the large plane tree in front of our property. Given the strict rules of the conservation area this should be given due consideration given the possibility the tree could collapse or need to be felled as a result of the excavation.
					Finally, in the event this application is approved and subsequent issues arise to our property we would hold accountable both the owner of the proposed flat development and the Council and jointly liable for any and all damages to our property.
					Sincerely Edward Sorgenicht and Alexia Dogani

					Printed on: 24/06/2014 09:0
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2979/P	Anthony Charlton	80 Greencroft Gardens	02/06/2014 19:54:28	OBJ	I am the owner/occupier of the neighbouring property 80 Greencroft Gardens.
		NW6 3JQ			I must object to this proposed basement enlargement in the very strongest terms.
					I am most concerned about the instability problems such an excavation will create. This could result in damage, subsidence and probably flooding at my property. Indeed, based on a survey of residents living close to recent or ongoing basement excavations carried out last Summer by my Residents Association, CRASH, there is a very strong case as to why this application should be refused.
					Over 80% of respondents told of damage to their property resulting from neighbouring construction work, ranging from minor cracking to serious flooding with sewage.
					Over 80% reported further destabilisation and damage following completion of the construction.
					I understand that Greencroft Gardens is already considered a significant risk area by insurers and the potential combined effect on drainage and groundwater by allowing such excavations to proceed is another big concern of mine.
Imperial College elsewhere. If you which previously excavated, INEVI I would also like t COUNCIL by glo development of b significant impact development, may	Dr Michael de Freitas, a distinguished research fellow and emeritus reader of Engineering Geology at Imperial College has warned that " The movement of soil at one site INEVITABLY has effects elsewhere. If you dig a hole something will fill it, be it subsiding soil or a diverted water flow. Water which previously flowed around and through the foundations of one building will, when that building is excavated, INEVITABLY be re-coursed towards and around the structure of a neighbouring building".				
	I would also like to make reference to a report on basement excavation prepared for CAMDEN COUNCIL by global consulting engineers, Arup, that states " The cumulative effect of incremental development of basements in close proximity, particularly when these are large, potentially creates a significant impact. It is important to recognise that development itself, or the intensification of development, may be the triggering factor which INITIATES INSTABILITY PROBLEMS in an area which otherwise would have remained stable for the foreseeable future".				
					I am also very concerned at how LONG this enlargement will take to complete. More than half of the respondents to the CRASH survey commented that basement building works last 18 MONTHS OR LONGER. Given that such an excavation is bound to be noisy and create vibration I feel that 18 months is far too long to have to put up with.
					Finally, having experienced the regular obstruction to traffic by huge earthmoving lorries collecting the displaced earth at another site opposite I am really unhappy to have to face a similar scenario, this time next door.

Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2979/P	Christopher Charlton	80 Greencroft Gdns	09/06/2014 16:14:54	OBJ	Dear Sir/Madam,
	Charlton	Gdns NW6 3JQ			My name is Christopher Charlton and I am the part owner of the neighbouring property, 80 Greencroft Gdns. I strongly object to the proposed basement enlargement at No.78. Recent experience of similar projects has led to considerable distress for the neighbouring residents and damage to their properties, in some cases severe. It is also a fact that these sort of constructions can last up to two years, which in my view is totally unacceptable and can lead to health hazards and stress-related problems for the neighbours within the vicinity. It has been reported from various respectable and trustworthy sources that the potential risk from these sorts of excavations in the form of flooding, subsidence, cracking and more, is large. Construction companies can offer no form of guarantee that this is not the case and I am unwilling to risk the structure of the whole of my property for a basement development which is far from "simple" as the applicant has suggested. In fact, the application is totally misleading as the BIA report categorically
					states that the technical, hydrological and geological details have not been sufficiently explored. This part of Greencroft Gdns is built upon the northern tributaries of the river Westbourne and no Flood Risk Assessment has been provided by the Applicant. Since the street is included in Camden's list of Flooding risk, I expect the council to take this into serious point into consideration. What would happen if all the houses in the street were to excavate their cellars? Underground water levels are rising as shown by recent flooding of several gardens in the area. Is the council aware of this risk? Have the council addressed the long-term effects on the environment in our area? I will be forwarding this letter to my local MP. Yours faithfully, Christopher Charlton

Printed on: 24/06/2014

09:05:21