

# **Comments Form**

Planning application number	Name JEAN L	CRENIZ	
Planning application address	A CIE		
Planning application address	Т	2010 10	3.0
Support the application (please state reasons below) lobject to the application (please state reasons below)  Your comments  Please See attained Sheet.  RECFIVE  0 8 JUL 2013	Planning application num		3855 /P
Support the application (please state reasons below) object to the application (please state reasons below) Your comments  RECFIVE  0 8 JUL 2013	Planning application addr	ess 86 CANF	=1EZD EARDENS
Please see attached sheet.  RECFIVE	support the application ( object to the application	olease state reasons belo please state reasons bel	DIAN
RECFIVE 0 8 JUL 2013	Your comments		
0 8 JUL 2013	Pleone	see attache	d sheet.
CULTURE & ENVIRONMENT			
		ı	CULTURE & ENVIRONMENT

## Objection Comments for: 86 Canfield Gardens

Application Ref: 2013/3855/P

### FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE

Our street is in a high risk flood area, and displaced surface water will continue to create major problems of flooding and drainage. It is very likely to affect the water table and have implications for the underground water flow. A recent investigation by ARUP on behalf of Camden, in relation to another basement application for Canfield Gardens confirmed this.

I am aware of these problems occurring on our street and when they renovated our neighbour on the other side, 90 Canfield Gardens, there were three instances of major flooding in our house. In the 23 years that I have lived here, we had never had these sorts of problems. We have had regular (and costly) drain cleaning service because of an inexplicable bad smell when it rains. The drain cleaner company 'Pimlico Plumbers' cannot solve nor indentify the problem which began in 2008 when the works at number 90 were completed.

### NEIGHBOURHOOD OPPOSITION

Crash, which is our local residents' association, is strongly opposed to granting applications for basement excavations. Almost all residents who have lived near buildings that have been excavated have had serious problems in their own buildings as a consequence, and are opposed to further applications being granted. Granting another basement excavation would not only increase the drainage and related problems in the area, but set a precedent for future applications.

Apparently, Kensington and Chelsea no longer allow basement excavations and I would like to know why Camden is even still considering them.

## Application Ref: 2013/3855/P (continued)

## LANDSCAPING AND VEGETATION

The rear excavation would require removal of long and beautiful standing vegetation that would affect both water levels and soil integrity and perhaps building foundations. There is a beech tree in the garden which has protection order and I imagine it would be impossible to guarantee that the tree would not be damaged, particularly as it placed close to where the proposed works would happen.

#### **BUILDING STABILITY**

The heavy drilling and excavation at 90 Canfield Gardens resulted in significant cracking at 88, which necessitated major repairs, and considerable time in dealing with insurance claims and the repair process. Being between two basement excavations would almost certainly compromise the stability of 88 through differential movement and most likely lead to similar problems.

#### TRAFFIC FLOW

Canfield Gardens is one of the main arteries connecting Finchley Road to West End Lane, and is served by the C11 bus, which has two stops on Canfield Gardens. It is worth noting that skip removal generally results in a 5-10 minute traffic disruption, with the backup affecting the adjoining streets (Broadhurst Gardens and Fairhazel Gardens), often as far back as Finchley Road. If planning permission were given for this basement excavation, the increased number of skips to remove earth would affect the flow of traffic and increase congestion and pollution in the area considerably.