



# The Heath & Hampstead Society

P.O. BOX 38214 LONDON NW3 2XD

The Society examines all Planning Applications relating to Hampstead, and assesses them for their impact on conservation and on the local environment.

## To London Borough of Camden, Development Control Team

Planning Ref: 2012/6484/P

Address: RO 1 Ellerdale Road NW3

Description: New house; basement extension

Case Officer: Elaine Quigley

Date 1 January 2013

We note that it is contended that this application relates only to the new basement, and to internal alterations to the proposal already permitted (per 2010/5841/P). We objected to the series of original proposals leading eventually to 2010/5841/P, on the grounds of overdevelopment of this tiny backland site, and loss of garden space. These objections still stand, confirmed by this enlargement of the original plans. We are still concerned at the garden loss, and the fact that the new house will itself have *no* garden or open space. This is not only bad Planning and bad design, but is out of character with the CA, one of whose major characteristics is open green space and gardens.

Our objections to this application as presented are:

1. No effective account has been taken of the very large tree on the adjoining site, whose root zone extends into the area of the new basement. No tree assessment report is submitted, and we are clear that this tree is endangered by the excavation work proposed.
2. The Basement Impact Assessment is unsatisfactory in several respects, and indicates a misunderstanding of the purpose of such a report. No reference or assessment is made of the effects of the basement excavations on adjoining buildings, notably Arthur West House, despite the fact that they extend up to all the site boundaries. The structural report, in great detail, describes the proposed structural processes, including underpinning of the external walls of Arthur West House, but does not attempt any assessment of risk, or the extent of potential damage. It also avoids any reference to the adjoining tree. This is unacceptable.
3. No assessment is made of the long-term sustainability of the proposal, especially that of the swimming pool and its plant. This does not fit with the requirements of DP22.

Please refuse