

[REDACTED]

Planning Officer, Camden Council, Town Hall Extension, Argyle Street, London WC1H 8NJ

August 9, 2013

Dear Sir or Madam

Ref Planning application 2013/4006/P. 8 Lindfield Gardens

I wish to make further objections to the above planning application following my recent submission, which is at the end of this letter for your ease.

To place my objections in context they relate to an application for a large basement/ two story development at the rear and side of No 8 Lindfield Gardens, known as Flat 1. No 8 Lindfield, assumed to be built on Hampstead clay, is a tall, imposing, very wide house, divided into flats, and on a steep slope in two directions – [1] front to back and [2] side to side. Many of the following objections were issues raised in a recent Report on No 8, carried out by Stephen Stark of Stark Associates. My concerns are as follows:

- a) Access to the building works will take lorries, carrying large amounts of waste soil and rubble [from the excavated rear basement] plus building materials including concrete, no more than a couple of feet distance from the front door and windows of the downstairs flat [Flat A]. This is because the access driveway for building works is exceptionally narrow [and steep]. *Camden Council should carry out a site visit to see for yourselves.* We believe this to be entirely unacceptable, especially since we understand from the Report that Camden has a duty to consider the rights of owners in neighbouring properties.
- b) The proposed basement, envisaged as immediately behind Flat A, is shown as being divided from Flat A's back wall by an area of soil. It is the considered view of Stark Associates this soil may be prone to movement, which could put at risk the stability of Flat A and the flats above. Moreover according to the Report, the applicants have failed to carry out investigations which are an essential requirement in this regard as part of a Basement Impact Assessment.
- c) Similarly, we understand from the Report the applicants have failed to carry out a number of other required and essential investigations, either wholly or to appropriate levels. We as neighbours are very concerned about this since the building of this basement could, we understand from the Report, lead to ground movement, changes in ground water flow and level, flooding and other, causing damage to local properties. The proposed development is very significant, and it therefore seems essential that all required investigations are carried out before Camden considers this application further.
- d) Equally we understand from the Report, the applicant has not demonstrated in sufficient detail how the building will be propped up whilst works are carried out. This is very worrying, especially since No 8 is known to have suffered previous not inconsiderable subsidence.
- e) The ground on which Hampstead is built is known to have subterranean watercourses, making the ground intrinsically unstable. Destabilising the ground further by digging deep for what is a large basement development may produce further destabilisation, we learn from the Report. This is especially so since No 8, assumed to be built on Hampstead clay, is a substantial tall house on a steep slope in two directions - front to back and side to side. The potential for destabilisation is of very real concern for those of us living nearby, especially since we understand the applicant has not produced a plan designed to ensure there is no ground or lateral movement.
- f) Further, we understand from the Report that the inevitable loss of trees resulting from the proposed development is likely to increase ground water levels.
- g) Also, it appears from the Report, underground bedrooms with no access to daylight or clear escape routes, are shown as being part of the plan. We would ask Camden to consider if this is acceptable in terms of health and safety.
- h) During the school run and rush hour, from approximately 7.30am to 9.15am, Lindfield Gardens is a through run downhill, where traffic moves very slowly and can get blocked. The addition of heavy lorries in and out of No 8 is almost certain to cause major traffic congestion for the duration of the building works, making it difficult for those of us who live here to leave our homes by car. *We suggest Camden Council inspect this rush hour traffic once the school term begins, and make a judgement about how heavy lorries and traffic will move under the circumstances.*

- i) We are concerned about the prunus tree immediately adjacent to and overhanging the access driveway, which we believe would be difficult to protect, and would almost certainly be damaged by heavy lorries and skips during the building process.
- j) Finally, we gather the owner of Flat 1 has not carried out a proper assessment of the risk of the likely damage to the neighbouring properties, and from the Report we understand this is an essential part of any Basement Impact Assessment.
- k) On the basis of the above information, it would seem this application if approved, could be a significant risk to neighbouring properties, and indeed to Flat 1 itself.

For the above reason and those already given below, we strongly object to application 2013/4006/P. My last letter is below, for your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Myra Farnworth

-----  
Dear Sir/Madam

I write to object to the application for a two storey side and rear extension at 8 Lindfield Gardens for the following reasons:

1. **The potential impact on water levels.** The application does not *"adequately demonstrate that it will not cause harm to the built and local environment and local amenity including local water environment, ground conditions and biodiversity"*. Lindfield Gardens, steep in parts, runs into Arkwright Road, a heavily used traffic road, and flooded in 1975 and 2002.
2. **Impact on a historic building and risks for occupants.** No 8 Ground Floor Flat suffered significant cracking and subsidence in 2011. The rear ground floor wall is to be opened up across the rear elevation and around the corner to the side extension. This is a significant amount of structural work to a building which has been moving. The neighbours above the proposed works have reason to be concerned about their own properties.
3. **Effect of wrapping a historic building.** The new extension would wrap the existing building side and rear on two levels. No 8 Lindfield Gardens is in the Conservation Area consent as a building which makes a contribution to the Conservation Area. In previous planning discussions Camden has been against extensions which 'wrap' a historic building as these mask the original extent of the building and cause the building to lose definition'.
4. **Scales of the proposed extension.** The proposed extension is two storeys, clearly visible from the street at the side; The Reddington and Froggnal Conservation Area Statement (2003) states *"Extensions should not be more than a storey in height in most circumstances"*.
5. **Size of the proposed extension.** The extension covers the side and full rear width of a very substantial building on two levels. It measures approximately 4.3m deep and 21m wide at the rear. This is excessive in size and therefore cannot be seen as subordinate to the historic building.
6. **The impact on local trees.** In a Conservation Area it is Council policy that trees should be preserved. Camden's guidance on Basements CPG4 states *"permitted development rights are removed within a conservation area if there are any trees which will be affected by the development"*. The Arboriculturalist Report accompanying the application identifies two trees T2 and T3, to be removed due to the scheme and T1, which has a TPO on it, a substantial horse chestnut, as being vulnerable.
7. **A risk of increased soil movement particularly as No 8 is on the border of a high-risk soil collapse area.** This is an area of heavy clay, and the property is on ground sloping steeply in two directions: [1] towards Lindfield Gardens and [2] towards Arkwright Road. At No 2 Lindfield, where I live, there is constant, measurable slippage. In the last few years we have also experienced substantial movement of a bank on the north side of the property, resulting in costly remedial works, and quite possibly associated with the recent installation of a swimming pool at No 6.

Yours sincerely,

Myra Farnworth