

[REDACTED]

From: env.devcon@camden.gov.uk
Sent: 05 May 2014 11:28
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on 2014/2060/P - Case Officer Niall Sheehan - Received from Lisa Schneider at Flat 3, 83 Greencroft Gardens, NW63LJ

1. The site in question is underlain by London Clay which is known to be a highly plastic material susceptible to volume changes caused by changes in its moisture content. The absence of any current signs that either house is suffering from these effects does not mean that the proposed excavation and construction could not lead to such effects, especially when just one of no.83's walls will be underpinned, unlike no.85 where this will be done to all walls. In addition, there are sycamore and robinia trees within a few metres of the proposed structure which may then extract greater amounts of moisture from land belonging to no.83.
2. No evidence was provided that the structure of the wall between no.85 and no.83 will not be compromised. The generic opinion of negligible or very slight likely damage by the applicant's structural engineers is unacceptable.
3. No evidence has been provided that the proposed extension area under the ground floor level of the applicant's flat is part of its demise, or that legal title to that area has been obtained from the freeholder and the deed to flat 1 amended accordingly.
4. The applicant has provided no commitment to bear the consequences, financial or otherwise, including increased insurance coverage should any structural damage occur to no. 83. Nor has the applicant's financial solvency been shown, should any damage occur and claims owing to the lessees of no. 83 arise.
5. The noise and disruption of the works, which are likely to take over a year, are likely to affect both the rental and resale potential of flats at no.83 and will likely cause traffic disruptions and add a strain on parking availability in the area.
6. The style and material of the new aluminium windows do not appear to be consistent with the guidelines for the Swiss Cottage conservation area.

Comments made by Lisa Schneider of Flat 3, 83 Greencroft Gardens, NW63LJ Phone [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] EMail [REDACTED] Preferred Method of Contact is Post

Comment Type is Objection

[REDACTED]

From: env.devcon@camden.gov.uk
Sent: 05 May 2014 10:09
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on 2014/2060/P - Case Officer Niall Sheehan - Received from Paul Maley at 83 Greencroft Gardens

1. No evidence has been provided that the proposed extension area under the ground floor level of the applicant's flat is part of its demise, that legal title to that area has been obtained from the freehold and the deed to flat 1 amended accordingly.
2. The style and material of the new aluminium windows are not consistent with the guidelines for the Swiss Cottage conservation area.
3. No evidence has been submitted that the structure of the wall between nr.85 and nr.83 will not be compromised. The generic opinion of negligible or very slight likely damage by the applicant's structural engineers is completely unacceptable. More firm and substantial evidence is required.
4. The site is underlain by London Clay which is a highly plastic material susceptible to volume changes as a result of changes in its moisture content. The absence of any sign that either house is currently suffering from these effects is not a reason to believe they may not be caused later by the proposed excavation and construction, especially when just one of nr.83's walls will be underpinned, unlike nr.85 where all walls will be. There are also a sycamore and robinia tree within a few metres of the proposed structure which may end up extracting a greater amount of moisture from land belonging to nr.83.
5. No evidence was provided of any commitment on the applicant's part to shoulder the consequences of any structural damage to nr.83 and any increase in insurance premiums, nor of their financial solvency. The owner is expected to provide full coverage of any costs, damages or liabilities incurred by nr.83 in the event of any damage or increased risks. No one would repay lessees at nr.83 for the significant time and therefore money that would be spent dealing with any potential claim.
6. The noise and disruption are likely to affect both the rental and resale potential of flats at nr.83 for as least as long as the works will be carried out, which given the scope of the proposal is likely to be over a year. This would potentially cause an unacceptable economic damage to all lessees at nr.83.

Comments made by Paul Maley of 83 Greencroft Gardens Phone [REDACTED] EMail [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Objection

From: feedback@camden.gov.uk
Sent: 29 April 2014 00:09
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on a current Planning Application
Attachments: 9370573.htm; 9370573.xml; 9370573.pdf

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

Year: 2014

Number: 2060

Letter: P

Planning application address: Flat 1, 85 Greencroft Gardens

Title:

Your First Name: Cristina

Initial:

Last Name: Ferraioli

Organisation:

Comment Type: Object

Postcode:

Address line 1: Flat 4

Address line 2: 83 Greencroft Gardens

Address line 3: London

Postcode: NW6 3LJ

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Confirm e-mail: [REDACTED] contact number: [REDACTED]

Your comments on the planning application: 1. No evidence has been provided that the proposed extension area under the ground floor level of the applicant's flat is part of its demise, that legal title to that area has been obtained from the freehold and the deed to flat 1 amended accordingly.

2. The style and material of the new aluminium windows do not appear to be consistent with the guidelines for the Swiss Cottage conservation area.

3. No evidence was provided that the structure of the wall between nr.85 and nr.83 will not be compromised. The generic opinion of negligible or very slight likely damage by the applicant's structural engineers is unacceptable. What is very slight damage?

4. The site is underlain by London Clay which is a highly plastic material susceptible to volume changes as a result of changes in its moisture content. The absence of any sign that either house is currently suffering from these effects is not a reason to believe they may not be caused later by the proposed excavation and construction, especially when just one of nr.83's walls will be underpinned, unlike nr.85 where all walls will be.

There are also a sycamore and robinia tree within a few metres of the proposed structure which may end up extracting a greater amount of moist from land belonging to nr.83.

5. No evidence was provided of any commitment on the applicant's part to shoulder the consequences of any structural damage to nr.83 and any increase in insurance premiums, nor of their financial solvency. No one would repay lessees at nr.83 for the significant time and therefore money that would be spent dealing with any potential claim.

6. The noise and disruption are likely to affect both the rental and resale potential of flats at nr.83 for as least as long as the works will be carried out, which given the scope of the proposal is likely to be over a year. This would potentially cause an unacceptable economic damage to all lessees at nr.83.

IF YOU WISH TO UPLOAD A FILE CONTAINING YOUR COMMENTS THEN USE THE LINK BELOW

-

No files attached

ABOUT THIS FORM

Issued by: Camden Council
Customer feedback and enquiries
Camden Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE
Form reference: 9370573