

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7556/P	Carol Gay	The Village School 2 Parkhill Road Belsize Road London NW3 2YN	07/01/2015 17:27:38	COMMEM AIL	<p>We have had a brief look through the proposed plans, elevations and other associated documents for the above proposal and have a number of objections as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed work is within the local conservation area and the existing building is in keeping with the historic architecture that resides with the area. Indeed it is precisely the existing architecture that would have created the conservation area in the first place. It is generally presumed that the total demolition of any building within a conservation area is to be resisted, even if it is to replace with a façade that is like for like. This application requires the total demolition of this building and a replacement of a far larger building. 2. The proposed building is to be more than doubled in size by the digging of a two storey basement at the rear and a single storey basement at the front of the property. This is to be done between a Georgian building at No.2 Parkhill Road and a Victorian building at No.4 Parkhill Road. The structural impact on these two buildings causes much concern with a 4.6m deep excavation for the basement. The 'hit and miss' underpinning proposal doesn't seem to take into account the effects of vibration, local settlement or lateral forces that may apply to this excavation and the fear is that the existing historic buildings may be damaged during the construction period. We feel that the method of underpinning in small segments is insufficient to support the existing buildings on either side. A new basement designed from scratch and not having to bear the weight of the existing adjoining buildings would have to have reinforced concrete basement walls that were structurally a single unit and not standard concrete blocks butted together as the underpinning would be. We feel that there is a considerable risk to the existing adjoining buildings caused by the proposed excavation depth and methodology. 3. Local policy allows for modest basement and light well development, which is sensible, stipulating that the development does not extend beyond the original building's footprint and be no lower than one storey below ground. The section on drawing 1.016.300 quite clearly shows that the proposed building is one storey below ground at the front but is almost two storeys below ground level at the rear. Whilst the 'Basement Construction Sequence' drawing #J2171-S-010 clearly quantifies that the depth of the excavation is to be 5.05m from local ground level to the underside of a 450mm thick slab, meaning that the finished floor level of the lowest basement room is to be 4.60m below ground level. Both drawings also show that the excavation for the basement and light-well extend well beyond the original building footprint. This means that this proposal is in breach of the local planning policy CPG4. 4. The size and depth of the excavation also brings fears that this may affect the hornbeam tree at location T1, in the rear grounds of No.2 Parkhill Road. This is currently 12m high, according to the tree survey, but the mature heights of these trees can be 17m high. The tree is described as tree category A1 – high amenity value. I question the accuracy of the stem diameters given on the 'Tree Survey Schedule' as 60mm supporting a 12m high tree and would suggest that the figure should be 600mm, this would mean a root protection area radius of 7200mm [BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition & Construction - formula for calculation of single stemmed tree as $RPA (m^2) = (\text{stem } \varnothing \text{ mm} @ 1.5\text{m high}) \times 12/1000 \times 12$] The NHBC Standards Chapter 4.2, Building Near Trees, states that the sphere of influence of the tree roots of the Hornbeam at mature

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>height are in excess of 8.5m from the tree centre. The proposed excavation is only 5m away from the centre of the tree, which we believe should have a root protection radius of 7.2m and so a proportion of smaller roots will be severed. This may damage the trees future growth but even if due to the local walls and paving this is not the case there will be some structural damage done to the tree. By removing a proportion of the shallow root system due to the closeness of the light well excavation (5.05m deep) the tree could be more prone to being blown over in storms.</p> <p>5. The proposed building is to be higher than the existing building. This will cause loss of light and amenity to the existing flank wall windows in No.2 Parkhill Road that face the proposed building. There will be a greater visual impact of the proposed parapet wall being substantially higher. Whilst we appreciate that there has always been a wall opposite these flank wall windows the new parapet is now half the distance away from the old flank wall at No.4 Parkhill Road, the roof of the existing No.4b Parkhill Road was previously below this window's sight. This new parapet will be overbearing and as there is to now be a roof garden terrace behind this parapet there will also be a loss of privacy in the flank wall windows of No.2 Parkhill Road.</p> <p>6. Finally the proposed drawings have the wrong house numbers shown on the elevations. The property marked as No.6 Parkhill Road should actually be shown as No.2 Parkhill Road.</p> <p>In summary we object to the proposed development for the above reasons. While we can appreciate the reasons why the application has been made we feel the plans are too ambitious for this infill property.</p>
