

Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

From: Miller, Rachel
Sent: 07 August 2014 12:42
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 24 Quadrant Grove
Attachments: Engineering operation.pdf

Please log 2014/2070/p

Rachel Miller
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1343

From: Christopher Sallon [mailto:]
Sent: 27 June 2014 16:48
To: Miller, Rachel; frances.wheat.@camden.gov.uk; Minty, Stuart; Kelly, Alison (Councillor)
Cc: eatherley; Barbara Thorndick
Subject: FW: 24 Quadrant Grove

Dear Miss Miller,

Application no.2014/2070/P in respect of 24 Quadrant Grove NW5 4JN

Further to our letter dated 27th June and emailed to you and your colleagues a short while ago which was inadvertently sent without attachments, we are attaching **Appeal Decision Ref: H5390/X/09/209932** dated 27th August 2009.

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Sallon QC



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2009

by **Phil Grainger** BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
28 September 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/X/09/2099326

4 Turneville Road, London W14 9PS

- The appeal is made under section 195 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 against a refusal to grant a certificate of lawful use or development (LDC).
- The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Aziz Meshiea against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
- The application ref: 2008/03422/CLP, dated 7 November 2008, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2009.
- The application was made under section 192(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
- The development for which a certificate of lawful use or development is sought was described as: 'excavation to create rooms beneath a rear garden, non [sic] of the existing levels to be raised'.

Summary of Decision: the appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

1. As suggested in the description given above the development for which a certificate is sought incorporates two elements: the excavation of a very large part of the rear garden of this terraced house and the construction within that excavation of a structure to provide additional accommodation. Although the new structure would not project above existing ground level it would extend for almost the full length and width of the garden.

Inspector's Reasoning

2. The recent revisions to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order [the GPDO] do not make specific reference to basement or other below ground extensions. However, I do not consider that something that is not specifically mentioned must be permitted development. In my view, basement and similar extensions to a house come within the scope of Class A of Part 1 of Schedule 2, Article 3 of the GPDO. They will therefore be permitted development only if they do not infringe any of the limitations imposed by sub-sections A.1 (a) to (i) that are applicable to extensions of this sort.
3. The question remains which of those sub-sections, if any, are relevant to the appeal development, and whether there are any other factors that need to be taken into account. The Council appear to consider that only A.1(e) is relevant, but the appellants have also sought to refute possible arguments regarding A.1(a). I shall also consider both sub-sections, but before doing so it is worth recording that there is no dispute between the parties that the proposal would not comply with the limitations imposed by either of these sub-sections; the appellants' argument is that neither is applicable.

4. Looking first at A.1(e) this applies where the enlarged part of a dwellinghouse would have a single storey. I accept that single storey extensions are normally thought of as being above ground and that the different limitations imposed on single and multi-storey enlargements could be seen as reflecting this. However, like the appellants, I consider that it will not normally be appropriate to try to second guess what the authors of the Order had in mind.
5. Looking simply at the wording of the GPDO itself I have found nothing in it to indicate that A.1(e) is to apply only where the enlargement takes place above ground or that, as the appellants suggest, extensions have to have a height above ground level if they are to come into this category. The fact that A.1(e) includes a limitation on height is not, in my view, sufficient to establish this.
6. The appeal development is on one level and I consider that it can thus properly be regarded as having a single storey. Accordingly, in the absence of anything in the GPDO clearly excluding below ground extensions, I conclude that the limitations in A.1(e) apply to it. As the appellants accept, the development would project further from the rear of the house than A.1(e)(i) permits. It is not therefore permitted development and as it undoubtedly constitutes development this indicates that the appeal should fail. I conclude that the Council's refusal to grant a certificate of lawful use or development was well-founded and I will exercise accordingly the powers transferred to me in section 195(3) of the 1990 Act as amended.
7. Before doing so I have considered briefly the appellants' comments regarding A.1(a). This indicates that development is not permitted if as a result of the works the total area of ground covered by buildings within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse (other than the original dwellinghouse) would exceed 50% of the total area of the curtilage (excluding the ground area of the original dwellinghouse).
8. The appellants argue that an extension that is wholly below ground cannot affect the proportion of a curtilage that is covered by buildings. I have taken into account that in this case a large hole would be formed in the ground which would then be filled with a new built structure. The roof of this structure would, for the most part, form the new surface of the rear garden and whilst that surface would be no higher than the existing garden level, it appears that none of the original ground would remain. In addition, the new surface would be largely hard and part of one wall of the structure would be visible facing into what could be regarded as a light well. Even so, I consider that it would be rather contrived to regard the development as having increased the area covered by buildings.
9. That said, to keep the new structure below existing ground level requires the excavation of a substantial amount of material from across almost the entire rear garden and it appears that this material would need to be transported by lorries to another location. I consider that, as a matter of fact and degree, in the circumstances of this case this amounts to an engineering operation that falls within the definition of development set out in section 55(1) of the Act. Moreover, there is nothing in the GPDO to indicate that such an operation is permitted development. This supports my conclusion that a certificate of lawful use or development should not be granted but, in view of my findings regarding A.1(e), is not essential to it.

10. In concluding that the appeal should fail, I have had regard to the appellants' view that the intention behind the GPDO is to permit minor development that has no detrimental effect. However, even if that is correct, I am not satisfied that below ground extensions can never be harmful and that no purpose would therefore be achieved by excluding them from 'permitted development'. On the contrary, I am aware that the Council have drawn attention to an appeal decision where an Inspector concluded that a basement extension would cause harm. For the avoidance of doubt, these comments should not be taken as implying that I consider that the development involved in this case would have such an effect. The circumstances appear to be different, but planning merits are not at issue in an appeal of this sort and I make no comment on them.

Decision

11. I dismiss the appeal.

P Grainger
INSPECTOR

Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

From: Miller, Rachel
Sent: 07 August 2014 10:05
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Objection to 2014/2070/P application

Please log

Rachel Miller
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1343

From: Beardsmore [mailto:]
Sent: 28 July 2014 14:54
To: Miller, Rachel
Subject: Objection to 2014/2070/P application

Dear Ms Miller

As residents of No 23 (opposite no 24) we wish to record our strong objection to the above application for creation of a basement to no 24 Quadrant Grove via a certificate of lawfulness for permitted development.

All the original objections to the application for planning permission still apply. The road is far too narrow to accommodate such major engineering works.

It will make emergency access and rubbish collection impossible for the duration as well as parking. The creation of the basement will set a precedent which will alter the front elevation of these 'small', terrace houses, cutting into the front gardens which make the street so attractive. Nearly all the houses have already added a 3rd floor as well as rear extensions, an additional floor will more than double the original houses and must be considered over development.

The removal of so much soil will be detrimental to all surrounding properties which already show signs of some movement.

We ask the council to consider the other residents of Quadrant Grove.

Amanda and Brian Beardsmore.
23 Quadrant Grove

Enirayetan, Oluwaseyi

From: Miller, Rachel
Sent: 07 August 2014 10:05
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Re application 2014/2070/P

Please log

Rachel Miller
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1343

From: Lynn whiting [mailto:██████████]
Sent: 29 July 2014 15:29
To: Miller, Rachel
Subject: Re application 2014/2070/P

- Dear Rachel Miller,
- I write against Application no: 2014/2070/P. I object to this application being granted because the works involved are major and amount to engineering operations, which is outside the remit of permitted development.
- I am aware of the legal opinion provided by the barrister Gwion Lewis for Quadrant Grove residents and we want the council to take notice of this. I am also aware of two other legal opinions provided by David Lamming and David Altaras for other resident associations that support the view that basement excavation of this sort cannot be deemed permitted development.
- Basement development in such a small street as Quadrant Grove will have a major negative and damaging structural impact on a small community and change the character of the street and we are opposed to this .
- I trust that Camden council who acts on behalf of all residents will act with good faith in this erroneous application .
- Yours Sincerely
- Mr and Mrs L Whiting

Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED] yi

From: Miller, Rachel
Sent: 07 August 2014 10:04
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Proposed Basement Development at no. 24 Quadrant Grove (Application no: 2014/2070/P)

Please log

Rachel Miller
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1343

-----Original Message-----

From: Lucinda Sturgis [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 29 July 2014 18:14
To: Miller, Rachel
Cc: Kelly, Alison (Councillor); Wood, Abi (Councillor); Quadir, Abdul (Councillor)
Subject: Proposed Basement Development at no. 24 Quadrant Grove (Application no: 2014/2070/P)

Dear Rachel Miller

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed basement development at no. 24 Quadrant Grove (Application no: 2014/2070/P). I have previously written to state my objections when this was submitted as a normal planning application but I understand that the application has been withdrawn and that Camden Council is now considering this case under "permitted development", requiring only a Certificate of Lawfulness.

As you are undoubtedly aware, the works involved in creating such a basement are substantial and would amount to engineering operations, which I understand are outside the remit of permitted development.

I am aware of the legal opinion provided by the barrister Gwion Lewis for Quadrant Grove residents and I would like the Council to take notice of this. I have been informed that two other legal opinions, provided by David Lamming and David Altaras for other resident associations, support the view that basement excavation of this sort cannot be deemed permitted development. (It is iniquitous that the Council will not allow the opinion they have sought to be published.)

As I'm sure you realise, the works involved to create a basement development in such a small street as Quadrant Grove will have a major impact on the residents for many months - causing noise, dust and dirt, vibrations from large vehicles, disrupted access when large vehicles are delivering or taking away as well as skip deliveries and removals, reduced parking for residents whilst the works are taking place, and potentially disrupted access for emergency vehicles and service vehicles (in particular the weekly rubbish collection). Your own Highways Department estimates that around 6 parking spaces would have to be closed off in order to ensure access for emergency vehicles. That is a very large proportion in a very small street.

As you know, these terraced houses were built with minimal foundations and it is of very serious concern (indeed causing some anxiety) to the residents on either side of no.24 - and further beyond - that such excavation works would cause serious damage to their own houses.

Quadrant Grove is one of the few remaining well preserved Victorian streets in the area. None of the other small terraced houses have light wells in the front garden (the houses don't even have cellars) and the creation of one for a basement at no.24 would irrevocably alter the character of the street.

I therefore urge you please to take into account the objections of the majority of residents of Quadrant Grove and refuse permission for this development.

Yours sincerely,
Lucinda Sturgis
(17 Quadrant Grove)

[REDACTED]

From: Miller, Rachel
Sent: 07 August 2014 10:04
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Application no: 2014/2070/P.

Importance: High

Please log

Rachel Miller
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1343

From: Liz Sturgeon [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 30 July 2014 17:55
To: Miller, Rachel
Cc: Kelly, Alison (Councillor); Wood, Abi (Councillor); Quadir, Abdul (Councillor)
Subject: Application no: 2014/2070/P.
Importance: High

Dear Rachel Miller

On 29 November 2013 I wrote to you to object most strongly to the application to construct a basement extension under 24 Quadrant Grove and to create a new front light well. Application No. [2013/7107/P](#).

I understand that this application has been withdrawn and that the owners of 24 Quadrant Grove are currently applying for a 'certificate of lawfulness for permitted development for the proposed basement development at no.24'. I am now contacting you to oppose this application.

I would like to put on record that an overwhelming majority of the residents of Quadrant Grove wrote to you voicing their objection to the original application.

I and many other residents are enormously concerned about the impact of any basement development on our community and the character of the street and so we decided to contest the new application. Gwion Lewis from Landmark Chambers London was asked to give his opinion on the relevant law. I have read his document and, as I understand it, his opinion is quite clear. And I quote: 'In my judgment, the only lawful response to the application would be to refuse it because, as a matter of fact and degree, the proposal would involve an "engineering operation" that does not benefit from any permitted development.' Given his opinion, I object to this application being granted because the works involved are major and amount to engineering operations, which is outside the remit of permitted development.

I am asking the Council to take notice of his opinion. I am also aware of two other legal opinions provided by David Lamming and David Altaras for other resident associations that support the view that basement excavation of this sort cannot be deemed permitted development.

I understand that the new application does not include a light. However, even without a light well we believe the basement proposed under no.24 will require engineering works to be constructed and our legal argument is simple – it therefore cannot be permitted development.

Quite understandably Camden Council also asked for legal advice. But it appears that the residents of Quadrant Grove are not allowed to see these opinions. I find that very strange and would be grateful if you could explain why this is so.

I would also like to put in writing again my main reasons for objecting to the construction of a basement at 24 Quadrant Grove which I voiced last time. I think it is important for the new councillors to have this information.

Harm to the established character of the street

Quadrant Grove is a very small street with a unique character. Residents have played a part in 'looking after' the street, for example, concrete lampposts have been replaced with 19-century heritage lamppost, with substantial funding from residents. All front gardens have been preserved. The street was the runner up some years ago for best-kept small garden in the area.

There are only 32 houses in the street and this has made us a very strong community. The original application was opposed by a very great majority of the members of the street.

On 28 October 2013 Camden Conservation and Heritage Placeshaping Service informed us that the street has been identified as being of local heritage significance and has been included on Camden's draft Local List.

Local impact

Quadrant Grove is an exceptionally narrow street and cars are allowed to half park on pavements to ensure that cars, rubbish and recycling lorries, and most importantly emergency vehicles, have access at all times. The above development would require many skip moments (estimated at 60'+), plus delivery of materials. Skips and lorry deliveries could seriously interfere with access on this very narrow street and would inevitably block the street at times. My husband has type 1 diabetes and on several occasions I have had to call an ambulance in emergency situations. Lack of access and subsequent delays at these times could have serious implications on his health if it resulted in delaying the time it would take to get to the nearest hospital (The Royal Free).

There is also potential damage to other vehicles in the street. Camden rubbish collection lorries know the street well and take considerable care not to damage parked cars. We are concerned that drivers of skips and lorries delivering materials will not know the street and may not be as careful.

This development and ensuing traffic of skips and lorries may cause damage to the trees which line our street. People living in the street take great care of the trees when parking, as well as watering them, as required.

This proposed excavation work will last for many months. Total build time is unknown but our understanding is that similar builds have taken six to nine months. There is no doubt that it will cause a high level of noise, vibration, dust and dirt.

Technical issues

Our understanding is that there will be inevitable damage to the structural stability of the neighbouring properties. Currently, no properties in the street have basements. We know of other basement developments locally that have caused substantial damage. Our concern is that this may occur some time later when the responsible agents may no longer be in business.

Quadrant Grove is one of the finest small streets in Kentish Town. We strongly believe this development will destroy the unique character of Quadrant Grove and its community.

I look forward to hearing from you

Elizabeth Sturgeon (29 Quadrant Grove, NWS 4JP)

[REDACTED]

From: Miller, Rachel
Sent: 07 August 2014 10:03
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Application No 2014/2070/P

Please log

Rachel Miller
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1343

From: Sturgeon, David [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 30 July 2014 18:49
To: Miller, Rachel
Subject: Application No 2014/2070/P

Dear Ms Miller,

I live at No 29 Quadrant Grove NW5 4PJ and am writing to object most strongly to the proposed basement development at No 24 Quadrant Grove. I understand the owners of No 24 are applying for a 'Certificate of Lawfulness' to proceed with this development..

Quadrant Grove is a small and narrow street where pavement parking is permitted to ensure council and emergency services can gain access. If this basement development were permitted the works operation would be enormous, causing extreme disruption and danger to the street and possible structural damage to other buildings in the terrace. The street is lined with small trees and it is inevitable that these would be damaged by the enormity of the building works, by delivery of skips and lorries to take away the detritus.

The street residents have been told by Camden Conservation and Heritage Service that the street is identified as being of local heritage significance and is due to be included on Camden's Local List.

Many Quadrant Grove residents, including me, do believe that Camden should be making an effort to preserve what is good and beautiful in the borough without allowing any potential damage that this proposal could cause.

I would strongly urge you to not allow this basement excavation to continue.

With kind regards

Dr David Sturgeon

31 July 2104

Rachel Miller
Planning Officer
Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
LONDON WC1H 8ND

Barbara Thorndick
22 Quadrant Grove
NW5 4JN

Diana and Michael Eatherley
26 Quadrant Grove
London NW5 4JN

Dear Rachel

PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT FOR A BASEMENT BELOW NO. 24 QUADRANT GROVE

We know that you are required to make your recommendations for the issue of a Certificate of Lawfulness based on the legal provisions of the case set out in the Town and Country Act of 1990 (TCPA) and the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 as amended (GDPO). However the length of time taken suggests to us that you do not consider these provisions as clear cut and we would like to summarise again our objections to the proposal with some further legal points to consider that may persuade you that this development does not qualify as Permitted Development. We should add that we have now taken further legal advice.

1. It is disingenuous to apply for a Certificate of Lawfulness in place of a Planning Application for a very similar proposal which has met with almost universal objections from those who live in the street and because of severe deficiencies in the supporting documentation and Basement Impact Assessment. The objections included arguments about the provision of a light well which would damage the character of a largely unspoiled street. It is difficult to see how the current proposal can work as a habitable room without a light well. Access to build any new basement would involve excavating a large part of the front garden and it seems probable that a retrospective planning application would follow for a new light well.
2. The Department for Communities and Local Government publish a document entitled "permitted development for householders. Technical Guidance". There are number of revisions to this document, but what is of special relevance is that the October 2013 version which was sent to us from your legal department includes the following clause:

Class A covers the enlargement, improvement or alterations to a house such as rear or side extensions and the creation of basements, as well as general alterations such as new windows and doors, and from 30 May 2013 to 30 May 2016 a neighbour consultation scheme for larger rear extensions.

We have discovered that this version was almost immediately withdrawn and replaced by an amended version. The current version dated April 2014 has this clause:

Class A covers the enlargement, improvement or alterations to a house such as rear or side extensions as well as general alterations such as new windows and doors, and from 30 May 2013 to 30 May 2016 a neighbour consultation scheme for larger rear extensions.

Note that references to basements are removed. As you know none of the diagrams that follow in the guidance has anything about basements.

3. The case against the granting a Certificate of Lawfulness is clearly set out in the legal Opinion we have obtained from Gwion Lewis and in two other Opinions we had access to which set out very similar arguments. Apart from the common English meaning of the words “Engineering Operations” as opposed to “Building Operations” further clarification is given in the two cases we have previously identified, perhaps the more significant one is Wycombe District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment and Trevor (1995) JPL 223. We would accept that the “digging of a trench which is to contain the foundations, or part of the foundations, of a building” might be regarded as a “building operation” where applied to a simple extension to a house in the back garden. However the methodology of underpinning of the walls of a house, safely excavating the ground, analysis, design of the retaining walls and propping arrangements is an “engineering operation” which must be carried out by a qualified civil or structural engineer with a knowledge of geotechnics and structural analysis and design. Building Control would certainly require this. The work itself would have to be undertaken by a specialized contractor under supervision of an engineer. We note that some Councils seem to regard forming a light well to be an “engineering operation” whereas forming a new basement, as opposed to converting an existing cellar to be “building operation”. Such an opinion does not make any engineering, or for that matter any common sense; basement work under a house is obviously far more critical.

4. A further argument that we have expressed before concerns the immediate effect on the neighbours to no. 24. A new basement under a detached house away from the curtilage of the property would still fall foul, inter alia, of the arguments in 3 above, but it would have considerably less consequence for the neighbours. Apart from noise, disruption, loss of parking, restricted access for emergency vehicles our houses would be damaged by the work. It is well known that it is not possible to excavate soil, particularly clay soil without consequent ground movement that will damage the party walls and adjacent structures. The proposal shown on the submitted drawings shows new retaining walls to be constructed directly under the party walls. this means that the proposal is for a construction that extends beyond the footprint of the developer’s house and includes half the thickness of the party walls to the adjacent houses, in other words on the neighbours’ properties. We strongly object to this and do not consider it to be a matter for party walls surveyors to resolve. The Council should not issue a Certificate of Lawfulness in such a case. The TCPA clearly only applies to a single dwelling house; in this case three houses are directly involved.

Yours sincerely

Barbara Thorndick
Diana Eatherley
Michael Eatherley

Cc Counsellor Alison Kelly
Priteji Mistry – Camden Legal Officer

[REDACTED]

From: Miller, Rachel
Sent: 07 August 2014 10:02
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 24 Quadrant Grove - Application No. 2014/2070/P

Please log

Rachel Miller
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1343

From: JULIAN SABATH [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 05 August 2014 14:05
To: Miller, Rachel
Cc: Kelly, Alison (Councillor); Wood, Abi (Councillor); Quadir, Abdul (Councillor); [REDACTED]
Subject: 24 Quadrant Grove - Application No. 2014/2070/P

Dear Ms. Miller

I understand you are overseeing the application for basement development at 24 Quadrant Grove.

As a resident of Quadrant Grove, I strongly oppose this proposal. This is an intimate Victorian street of rare character which should be valued and maintained. The extension of No. 24 in the proposed way would be totally out of keeping with the rest of the street and would inflict permanent damage to it.

The construction work would also be very disruptive for several months. Because this is such a narrow street, the impact of dirt and noise from the excavations is going to be exaggerated. Road access, too, would be limited, and often totally blocked throughout this extensive period, because of the inevitable builders vehicles, diggers, skips, etc. which a development of this scale would require. I work from home - in video and sound - and inevitably this is going to be seriously affected. Can you assure me that I will be compensated for work lost because of all the disruption?

I understand that Camden's position is that the proposal does not require planning permission as it falls under 'Lawful Development'. You will be aware (it is on your website) that my neighbours have taken legal advice on this, and it essentially states that engineering works of such scale do not fall under this heading, and that the usual planning application route should be followed. Apparently, Camden has also sought legal opinion, but refuses to divulge the findings. This is not only unhelpful, it is clearly undemocratic. Apart from having paid for your legal work through our Council Tax, how can we examine your conclusions when we do not know what they are? So, please include the opinion on your website. It is a relevant document.

I have enjoyed the character and community of Quadrant Grove for over 15 years, and I fear that this proposed development would fundamentally damage it. Please join us in opposing it.

Yours sincerely

Julian Sabath

*Julian Sabath
9 Quadrant Grove
London NW5 4JP*



[REDACTED]

From: Miller, Rachel
Sent: 07 August 2014 10:01
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Quadrant Grove. Objection to Application no 2014/2070/P

Please log

Rachel Miller
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1343

From: Marina Bassano [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 06 August 2014 10:21
To: Miller, Rachel
Cc: Kelly, Alison (Councillor); Wood, Abi (Councillor); Quadir, Abdul (Councillor)
Subject: Quadrant Grove. Objection to Application no 2014/2070/P

Objection to Application no 2014/2070/P
Quadrant Grove. Basement

Opposed by the majority of the street residents as well as failing in accuracy, on June 11th Mr Ireland withdrew his Planning Application 2013/7107/P. The Council informed the street residents of the withdrawal - and we all felt reassured. Peculiarly Mr Ireland's new application to obtain a Lawful Development Certificate (Application no 2014/2070/P) was already in place since March 2014. I understand that there is no obligation for the Council to inform in writing the neighbourhood of such applications. Which - considering that the street residents' opinion was well known to our Council - in our case is disappointing.

Just like I objected to Planning Application 2013/7107/P, I am writing to object to Application no 2014/2070/P. Please refer to my letter 28 November 2013 for more details. I would like to add here that a Certificate of Lawfulness should not be considered as an alternative way to by-pass risks of rejection of a planning application and that it should not be offered as a viable route and remedy to obtain permission for a project obviously involving extensive engineering operations in scale and undoubtedly affecting its neighbourhood.

Last May, Gwion Lewis legal advice was requested by a significant number of street residents including me. Although published on the Council website since then, Mr Lewis' opinion has not yet received the Council reply. Some of the more immediately affected residents already filed in their objections. I share entirely their views.

As I wrote in my objections to the withdrawn Planning Application, life in our street will be strongly affected by the impact and disruption of a basement development that in turn will bring only modest advantages for the single applicant - other than property value. Quadrant Grove is a beautiful small street of exquisite Victorian terraced cottages. Although not in a Conservation Area, it has been included in the recent Camden's draft local list because of its historic quality and beauty. The Council knows well how the vast majority of the houses have been sympathetically extended and elevated, with our community working hard to preserve Quadrant Grove's unique character and beauty. There is no need for basements here - with or without lightwell to front gardens.

I fully share the legal and substantial concerns expressed by our barrister Mr Lewis in his legal opinion and by the other residents in their objections.

I ask you to refuse this application.

Kind regards,
Marina Bassano

Marina Bassano
20 Quadrant Grove
London NW5 4JN
[REDACTED]