

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6224/P	Mrs Harris	24 Netherhall Gardens NW35th NW35th	16/11/2014 12:29:41	COMMNT	<p>Planning Ref 2014/6224/P and 2014/6473/C</p> <p>As the owner of 24 Netherhall Gardens, I very strongly object to this application on following grounds:</p> <p>1. The development poses a serious risk to the ground stability of the surrounding properties because of the massiveness of the basement construction, the huge excavation of rear garden and loss of trees proposed by the development.</p> <p>1.1. Basement Construction This development involves the construction not of a single basement as presented in the application, but of a multi-level, ie two-level, basement. Compared to the existing level of foundations of no 26, the proposed will excavate an additional two levels or adding approximately 7 meters of depth below the existing foundation, which is massive. The Basement Impact Assessment and accompanying structural reports are most unsatisfactory. These reports very clearly acknowledge that potential damage to adjoining properties is very likely, yet no design undertakings are made as to how such damage could be avoided. This is totally unacceptable. Indicative statements in these reports include "... installation of the proposed basement and excavation is likely to increase the differential depth of foundations relative to adjoining properties, which may result in structural damage". This is unacceptable, especially in an area which is prone to subsidence.</p> <p>1.2. Massive Excavation of Rear garden The rear garden will almost completely be destructed by the basement construction and paved patio gardens. The excavation at the rear extends to a depth about 10 meters, which is excessive and dangerous. This large differential depth of foundations relative to the adjoining properties, will undoubtedly affect ground stability and interfere with existing ground and subterranean watercourses. The accompanying report with the application highlights many of these issues, but it provides no design undertakings as to how such damage will be avoided or impacts will be addressed.</p> <p>1.3. Loss of Trees in Rear Garden The development of the hard paved rear garden will involve several existing trees to be felled and said 'to be replaced'. The Basement Impact report is not very reassuring, stating "... felled trees could lead to loss of binding effect of tree roots and instability of slopes due to changes in moisture content." Yet again, no design undertakings are made as to how such damage will be avoided. This is just not good enough.</p> <p>1.4. Surface Flow and Flooding Effects All of the above points will clearly interfere with the surface and subterranean water courses, posing serious settlement issues for all surrounding properties, and potential damage to their structure and foundations. This is of great concern to me. Here are a few of the very worrying conclusions made in the Basement Impact report: - "The proposals may affect local ground water flows and quality of water running down the hill", - "Water would simply flow around the basement and continue on its existing path",</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

- "... through increased hard surfacing may result in changes to the moisture content of the Clay ground affecting ground stability." and "... with a potential for increased surface water runoff volumes".
 "Should the basement extend below the water table surface (which the report later confirms that this is the case) there is the potential to cause the ground water level within the zone encompassed by the new flow route to increase or decrease locally. This may affect neighbouring basements and structures".

The fact is that the existing path of water flow, which now naturally flows down the hill from the rear garden of number 26 to the street, will be completely obstructed because of the massive basement excavation which will literally form a concrete barrier to all water flow. Nor will the water be able to flow around the basement, as there is only 1 meter gap between the proposed and 24a. The result is very easy to anticipate: some water will run down in between the gap of number 28 and 26 through to the street, but most water will flow straight down to numbers 24a 24, 22 and lower trying to find the lowest point as these houses sit about 5 to 10 meters lower than the proposed number 26. The amount of water flowing down is considerable as the development and its rear garden sit on a hill, with the garden adjacent/opposite number 26 on Maresfield Gardens being 5 to 15 meters higher than number 26.

I have great concern for the settlement of my house and the potential structural damage to the foundations of my house as a result of the obstructed water flow and altered water courses which directly result from the construction of this excessive development.

No designs undertakings are made in the application to address these issues, not that a solution seems possible.

Conclusion – The proposed development is aggressive, too large in masse and construction-wise very risky. This risk is compounded by the fact that the proposed sits on a hillside in an area which is already very prone to subsidence, and has witnessed over the years visual effects of subsidence. The changes to the ground stability and the altered water flows proposed in this development will significantly increase this risk. The proposal totally misrepresents these risks, and if it acknowledges some of them, it fails to provide undertakings as to how to solve or avoid them, if a solution is at all possible. As an owner of a house in this post code, I only know too well how difficult it already is to find buildings insurance, because of the risk of subsidence. This development could very well make our buildings insurance unaffordable or impossible to get. I have great concerns regarding the impact on subsidence and very real potential structural damage which will be done to my own property if the basements, the massive garden excavation as well as the small gap between the proposed and the property of 24a (and thus 24) were permitted.

2. Reduced Day and Sunlight and No Consideration for Privacy

The Daylight and Sunlight study completely overlook our window on the second floor (approximately

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>2 meters by 2 meters), which faces north. This window sits above the flat roof of number 24a, faces the southern wall of the proposed development front-on and will only be 7 meters from the proposed south wall of the proposed development. The development will significantly reduce the daylight and sunlight of that habitable room.</p> <p>The two roof terraces proposed on the south side will blatantly overlook into the whole rear gardens of both numbers 24a and 24. There is currently no overlooking issue as the existing bungalows adjacent to 24a are 1 floor lower than the 2 floor building at 24a. However, the new development and proposed roof terraces on the 3rd and 4th floor will be one and two floors higher respectively than 24a. As the whole development stands just 1 meter from the site boundary with 24a and is positioned approximately 4 meters further into the rear garden (compared to the position of the existing bungalows) the privacy issues are enormous. The proposed scheme shows no consideration for the loss of privacy and amenity of numbers 24 and 24a.</p> <p>3. The Building is Out of Character in this largely Victorian Conservation Area It can be seen that this length of the street was designed to have and retain closely built semi-detached houses on its west side with larger substantial detached ones on its east – with significant gaps between them allowing views through to the rear gardens of Maresfield Gardens. The proposed development clearly breaches this look. The front façade is also not in keeping architecturally with the look of the street, having too many long tall (French type) windows. A new building on the site would fit in better with largely sash windows in this largely Victorian Conservation Area.</p>

Please refuse both applications.

2014/6224/P	Ruth Basrawy	44 Netherhall Gdns london NW35RG	14/11/2014 12:35:36	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms Ryan</p> <p>please see my email to you dated 14/11/14</p> <p>You have not acknowledged this email nor replied to it.</p> <p>I own flat 2 ,22 Netherhall gardens but live at 44 Netherhall gardens NW3 5RG.</p> <p>to repeat my objections 1)the proposed building is too large in masse compared to what is there now and it will project forward too much and the gaps between it and the neighbours will be too small</p> <p>2)basements well constructed are a good use of space but sub basements are dangerous and excessive.</p> <p>There has been subsidence in this area in the past and such a huge amount of excavation will lead to more problems for the neighbouring buildings. please refuse the sub basement and suggest a smaller building for the site</p>
-------------	--------------	--	---------------------	-----	--
