

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 April 2013 21:49
To: Thuairé, Charles; Minty, Stuart; Traynor, Deirdre; Planning
Subject: Objections to Planning Applications 2013/1141/P and 2013/1142/P

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object to planning applications 2013/1141/P and 2013/1142/P for development of The Garden House, Vale of Health, London NW3 1AN, which is located a few metres from my property in the Vale of Health and metres from the Vale of Health Pond and Hampstead Heath.

This planning application follows two previously granted Permitted Development (PD) applications for substantial basement excavation and extensions at the property. This work has not yet been carried out. These are the twelfth and thirteenth planning or PD applications on the site since 2004. Most recently a very similar application to the current ones was rejected by the Development Control Committee in December 2012.

The main reasons for my objection are the followings:

1. Lack of an Adequate Basement Impact Assessment and lack of details about the secant walls.

These applications request permission to carry out a considerable amount of excavation, an increase of 15-30% over the PD basement excavation permissions already granted (depending on which of the two applications you look at). Though the basement is supposedly a single storey 4m deep, the full excavation is almost 7m deep in some places due to the unusual design of the house whereby part of what is currently described by the applicants as the ground floor is submerged below ground.

This is obviously very significant increase in excavation in terms of flood risk, soil movements, and construction issues. As with previous applications, no adequate assessment of the impact of the proposed excavation has been carried out.

No new investigations have been carried out since these comments were made and the submission by the applicants largely relies upon a report written almost a decade ago for an entirely different application to demolish the existing house and replace it with a much larger one.

Because Camden Planning Department have consistently failed to order an independent review be carried out on the reports provided, a group of residents supported by the Vale of Health Society commissioned highly respected engineering firm Arup to carry out this work at considerable cost. The report has been submitted to Camden Planning Department and it's extremely critical of the impact on groundwater, on the limited and uncomplete quality and quantity of data and studies submitted by the applicants

The project poses flood risk to neighbouring properties, and this risk would be compounded by granting further permissions to excavate. Concerns have been raised over many years and through many planning applications about excavation and the likelihood that it will cause flooding. Given that the current application requests planning permission for substantial further excavation in addition to the basement excavation rights that have already been granted as PD but not yet carried out, the further excavations must be considered in that context. The development must be looked in its totality. No additional permissions for excavation should be granted due to the clear risk posed to surrounding properties and the environment.

Another important point raised by the Arup report is that the project does not address the issue of the secant walls required for the construction of the basement. I believe this omission by the applicants is deliberate since the construction of the secant walls would require additional excavation and would most likely contravene regulations for Permitted Development were they included in the original PD application. I would like to require Camden Planning Department to look into this issue and suspend the existing PD until this matter is clarified.

2. Construction Management Issues

A previous very similar planning application was refused by the Development Control Committee in December 2012, with one of the three reasons given relating to the inadequacy of the Construction Management Plan (CMP). The same plan has been submitted with this application, with only minimal changes. The plan, which is only a draft and is therefore subject to change, states that 'Frequency of delivery to and from site at various stages of the construction is not possible to accurately predict at this stage.'

This paucity of detail is wholly unacceptable for a major development at a site with unique restrictions on access. The only entry is through an archway not big enough for a small vehicle, above and below which are the cellars and rooms of my and other properties. Because of the restricted access to the site the work is likely to be extremely disruptive to neighbours and have a huge impact on all Vale residents.

The Arup report states:

"There is little discussion given to the removal of excavation spoil from site. The basement excavation is not insignificant, about 500m³ for the basement box and possibly up to another 150m³ for the secant wall piles with more from the terrace excavation. All spoil will have to be taken off site. We estimate this could be a total of 1200-1500t of soil removed. We query whether the author has fully understood the scale of this excavation and the manual handling and traffic issues that this implies."

3. The application has inadequate and misleading supporting documentation

The architects' drawings and information supplied are incomplete and insufficiently accurate for the application to be properly assessed. Arup have pointed out that the proposed secant piled

wall, an essential part of the scheme, is missing from the drawings, as it was from the previous PD application, and that as a result it is not clear how it is intended to interact with one of the lightwells.

The Arup report makes clear that on the available evidence the permission for the basement should not have been granted, and granting planning permission for the lightwells would only compound that error.

A proper assessment of these applications requires a clear understanding of:

- the increase in volume and floorspace from converting the shed to residential space;
- the volume and increase in excavation spoils;
- the increase in glazed window area.

The submitted drawings are marked "Do not scale from the drawing" and it is not possible to derive this information. I understand that Mr Thuairé has been asked to obtain either accurate drawings or these figures from the applicants, but they have not been provided during the consultation period.

As with the previous applications which was rejected by the DC in December, these applications are part of a continued attempt to gain permissions through the back door that would not have been granted in a single, transparent planning application, making a mockery of the rules on development on Metropolitan Open Land (MOL).

Regards,

Cristiano Campi



The information contained in this email is confidential and may also contain privileged information. Sender does not waive confidentiality or legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately; you should not retain this message or disclose its content to anyone.

Internet communications are not secure or error free and the sender does not accept any liability for the content of the email. Although

17/06/2013

emails are routinely screened for viruses, the sender does not accept responsibility for any damage caused. Replies to this email may be monitored.

For more information about the Tullett Prebon group of companies please visit the following web site: www.tullettprebon.com

© 2006 The Authors
Journal compilation © 2006 Blackwell Publishing Ltd