

2c Lindfield Gardens, London NW3 6PU.

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

Ref Planning application 2014/ 3625/P - 8 Lindfield Gardens, NW3 6PU

Dear Sir or Madam

I write to object to the above planning application for the erection of a rear extension and a basement excavation to provide additional living space. The proposed extension to the basement is significant in scale and plan. The current application follows Application 2013/4006/P, rejected in summer 2013. My detailed reasons for objecting are:

1. **The potential impact on water levels.** There has been inadequate monitoring of water levels. The application does not demonstrate sufficiently that the development 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. **The construction of a basement will change ground water flow,** possibly increasing the risk of flooding to Flat A at No 8 and neighbouring properties. There has been no attention to this. The applicant does not demonstrate that attention has been paid to underground streams and water courses, potentially making the ground unstable and greatly reducing the ground's ability to bear loads. No contamination testing of the soil, water and hardcore has been done, resulting in an increased risk of ground water movement and flooding in the vicinity. The above are a requirement of DP27, as I understand it.
3. **Problems of land slope and stability. There is an increased risk of 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. The issue of the considerable slope on which No 8 is situated has not been addressed. Limited analysis of the soil conditions has been carried out. 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.
4. **Unchanged size of the basement from the time of the last application.** The basement, which was a factor in the refusal of the last application, is not reduced in size.
5. **The proposed rear extension has not been reduced in depth** since the last application in spite of the Officer's Delegated Report on that application stating "a significant scaled back rear extension that is subservient to the form and massing of the host building is considered to be the starting point".
6. **Light pollution, reflection, artificial light disturbance and light spillage affecting neighbours, including at night.** The new plans show larger light wells than in the last application, in spite of the fact light wells were a factor in rejecting the previous planning application. The glass rear box at night is still a major concern, especially with addition of side glass panels.
7. **The lack of assessment of the risk of damage to other neighbouring properties.** The applicant has not carried out a full assessment of the risk of damage to the other flats in No 8 and other neighbouring properties, resulting from these works. This is a requirement of DP27. This was a factor in the rejection of the last application. The following are of concern:
 - a. No 8 Ground Floor Flat suffered significant cracking and subsidence in recent years. The rear ground floor wall is to be opened up across the rear elevation, and the underneath of the house is to be excavated. This is a significant amount of structural

work to a building which has been moving. The neighbours in No 8 have reason to be very concerned about the potential impact on their own properties and their safety.

- b. The rear wall of the proposed basement development will be very close to the existing Flat A, and this could affect the structural stability of this flat and the building as a whole.
- c. Details of the space between existing Flat A and the proposed development have not been laid out. This lack of information is of concern since the soil in this space is likely to be loose, and therefore susceptible to movement resulting in possible structural instability.
- d. There is no mention of how No 8 will be propped up during the works, and no weight calculations are shown. Both of these are essential for the stability of the building.
- e. The design of the development does not take into account how internal structural alterations may affect ground movement, and therefore have the potential to damage neighbouring properties. Providing this information is a requirement of the Basement Impact Assessment.

None of the above risks to neighbours have been properly explored, in spite of the requirement under DP27.

8. **No Construction Management Plan has been submitted**, and no attention paid to the noise and disruption caused by this potential development. Since Camden is duty bound to consider the loss of amenity and disruption to other neighbouring properties this is unacceptable. No reference is made to the volume of soil and other waste materials needing to be transported away, or to the noise from the breaking up of existing concrete. These are likely to result in considerable disruption for neighbours during the works period.
9. **Green roof.** The applicants have rejected Camden's proposal for a green roof.
10. **Keeping in character and design with local properties.** The Officer's Delegated Report after the last application states "that alterations should always take into account the character and design of the property and it's surroundings." The new plans still propose a contemporary design, setting it apart from the original character and appearance of the host building.
11. **Examples quoted are largely irrelevant** since they (eg:1 Rosslyn Hill, 38 Arkwright Rd) relate to individually owned properties, and not converted multi occupied buildings like 8 Lindfield Gardens.
12. **No demonstrable means of escape is shown from the new No 8 basement** in spite of the increased risk of flooding.
13. **Consultation with local neighbours.** There was absolutely no formal consultation process with the 4 other owners of 8 Lindfield Gardens ahead of the new planning submission.
14. **The impact on local trees.** In a Conservation Area it is Council policy trees should be preserved. It appears T1, which has a TPO on it, a substantial horse chestnut, may be vulnerable, along with two other trees, T2 and T3, which may need to be removed because of the scheme.

I ask Camden Council to refuse this application for the above reasons.

Yours sincerely



Myra Farnworth