

Dike, Darlene

From: Whittingham, Gideon
Sent: 24 October 2013 15:26
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Application comments for 15 South Hill Park - ob
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Gideon Whittingham
 Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 October 2013 16:24
To: Whittingham, Gideon
Subject: Application comments for 15 South Hill Park

[REDACTED]

DATE: 16th October 2013

TO: Gideon Whittingham, Planning & Development Management
 London Borough of Camden, Town Hall Extension, Argyle St. London, WC1
 H8ND
 RE: **PLANNING APPLICATION FOR 15 SOUTH HILL PARK -
 REFERENCE: 2013/5372/P**

Dear Mr Whittingham,

These are our objections to the above planning application.

1) **IMPACT OF BASEMENT AND REAR EXTENSIONS IN GENERAL IN THIS AREA.**
 New basements [mainly in big houses which are not cramped for space] have been plaguing this neighbourhood for some time now. Not only is the peace and quiet of the area disturbed with the long drawn-out continual noise of machinery and heavy trucks and dust in the road but it is taking its toll on the neighbouring Victorian buildings.

2) **DETRIMENTAL EFFECTS TO NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES**
 Neighbours have experienced flooding and structural damage and leaking roofs. Ms Lee was responsible for the architectural design of no. 94 South Hill Park which has left no. 92 in a state of very bad damage. So we are very concerned for our neighbouring block of homes next to no. 15.

3) **GEOGRAPHICAL NATURE OF THE LAND AND BUILDINGS**

Being on a clay bed, the Victorians built these houses in a very flexible way which allowed them to move freely up and down with the expansion and contraction of the clay. With underpinning and more rigid structures added to a part of the whole building a strain is put on the rest of the building and it cannot move freely. This particular block is on a slope so the movement is not only up and down but gradual movement down the slope. There could be both short term and long term cracking and tearing away for the neighbouring buildings. Great care is needed when disturbing the well-established equilibrium of the land and

building. Our concerns are very similar to those expressed for the withdrawn extension proposal for no. 35. Please see Ms Alice Gailey's comments and those of Michael De Freitas Ph DC Geol. Appendix 1 – the Summary and Conclusion of his geological report for no. 35.

4) GROUND WATER FLOW.

There is a river flowing under the houses this side of the street. Our building has a trough to carry the water. The Basement Impact Assessment is rather disconcerting as no water was found which can be expected in a long dry period. Flooding has occurred further up where underpinning creates dam walls and the installation of pumps can also disturb the natural balance of building and ground established over the years – eg drying out of clay. There is a gradient of more than 7 degrees on the slope of this site. We feel that more extensive investigations are required in this area for site no. 15. It seems appropriate given that there might be some uncertainty with the findings that the Council get an independent Basement Impact Assessment.

5) IMPACT ON THE CONSERVATION AREA

In this row of terraced houses no 2-storey extensions are more than 4 meters into the garden. There is a characteristic harmony to them.. An extension of 7 meters with basement of 9 meters [half the size again of the large family house] is way beyond the character of this Conservation Area. To allow planning permission would set a precedent for other homes and very soon our Conservation Area would be irreparably harmed. According to the conservation area building guidelines an extension should not extend beyond the footprint of the original building.

Also, the use of a large glass balustrades is out of character with the architecture of these buildings – e.g see no.25 façade in the front.

6) INVASION OF AMENITIES OF THE EXISTING EXTENSION FOR NO.17

The existing 8 meter single storey extension in no. 15 was seemingly put up without planning permission and it not in keeping with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Its height sorely obstructs our view and takes the light away from the lower flats especially. To have the wall moved right up to the boundary of our property will make it even more oppressive and not only take more of our southern light but also that which comes from the west.

This extension wall will be going beyond the line of the existing side wall. This would be visible from the street, would close down the space between the buildings and adversely affect the conservation area. The steep steps in the passageway would be very dark and potentially dangerous.

Another concern is the security issue for the upper flats.

It will also necessitate builders working in no. 17 for which there is very little space not to mention the inconvenience, as this passageway is our regular entrance.

7) MISLEADING ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS

The architectural drawings are misleading concerning the 2-storey rear extension of no. 17.. The actual 2-storey rear extension is no more than 3.5 to 4 meters from the main building in keeping with the other houses in this row. There is a low small 2 meter high lean-to conservatory in the garden which is not nearly as obtrusive as the no.15 extension. We would like the character and appearance of our Conservation Area to be more respected.

Note : Please see the Council's conservation area booklet about rear extensions and unobtrusive conservatories paragraphs SHP 18 to 21.

8) TREES AND LANDSCAPING

As trees greatly enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, we are deeply saddened that the beautiful apple tree, pear tree and lilac [not an elder as in the Arboretum Report] are to be removed. Now the apple tree has been ruthlessly cut back to basically nothing. There seems to be no record of permission for this.

To cut down one meter into the level of the lawn so far back into the garden will remove the

valuable top-soil. It could also create drainage problems for the garden in no. 17. There are trees and vines on the borderline of our hedge which will be affected detrimentally if the soil is removed the other side. It will not be in character with the neighbouring gardens which is to have a short terraced rise to the garden level. Trees and vegetation in the garden help with the drainage of the land which slopes towards the buildings.

No.17 has a well-established vine in the hedge which helps to hide the blank wall of the extension and adds to the greenery. This will be destroyed if the extension is going to be built to the boundary line. We do not want this to happen.

Please see the Council's conservation area booklet paragraphs 22 to 25.

QUOTES FROM THE PLANNING CAMDEN COUNCIL WEBSITE ::

" The width of any visible basement should not dominate the original building. Sufficient margins should be left between the site boundaries and any basement construction to enable natural processes to occur and for vegetation to grow naturally. These margins should be wide enough to sustain the growth and mature development of the characteristic tree species and vegetation of the area. The Council will seek to ensure that gardens maintain their bio-diversity function, flora and fauna and that they are capable to continue to contribute the landscape character of an area so this can be preserved and enhanced.

Excessively large light wells will not be permitted in any garden space. Light wells should be set away from the boundary to a neighbouring property in the rear.

The lowering of the natural ground level to the rear of the property should be minimised as much as possible. It is recommended that the rear garden be graded.

Such an extension will result in a large expanse of flat roof replacing the view of shrubbery and garden from the windows of adjacent buildings.

9) NOISE AND DUST

The impact of noise and builder's dust pollution for so long to the rear of the building will be harassing to the health and well-being of the neighbours.

10) CONCLUSION

In conclusion, there are multiple reasons why we feel strongly that the proposed application be refused.

Yours truly

