

8.January 2015

Beverley Griffiths, Ground Floor Flat, 37 South Hill Park, London NW3 2ST

RE: Planning Application 2014/1938/P — KATHRYN MORAN

35 South Hill Park, London NW3 2ST

**THIS RESPONSE IS IN OPPOSITION TO THE ABOVE APPLICATION**

1. I wish to point out that contrary to comments made in a response from LEC Alice Gailey IS NOT the sole owner of the property at 37 South Hill Park. I personally own the ground floor flat where I have lived since 1970.
2. The original BIA was innacuate and misleading (based on assumptions) as no inspection of our property at No. 37 was undertaken. The independent review of the document states they 'did not perform any observations, investigations, studies or tests and accept no liability for innacurasies/ommisions from 3<sup>rd</sup> parties.' Neil Quinn writes that 'the BIA does not provide comprehensive details to enable the Council to reach an informed conclusion that these proposals DO NOT form an inappropriate risk to neighbouring property.
3. The description of our property at 37 is incorrect as it is not SEMI-DETACHED.
4. Inspite of asking continually, no explanation has ever been given to us as to why the Certificate accompanying the application refers to Carol Markey as the sole owner of 35 when the land registry lists Andrew Markey as joint owner.
5. Given an extension for reply by K. Moran, (over the Christmas and New Year holidays) no further documentation was put on line until 5-7 January, with a response date of 12 Jan.
6. The DP27 policy comments indicate 'the proposed basements will significantly increase movements associated with construction of 33's basement which might therefore extend northwards to 37/39 party wall.
7. Under residual impacts it comments that 'potential damage to the exposed flank wall of 37 cannot be considered 'slight' by underpinning and Temporary support.'
8. No. 5.1.7 states 'assement of ground movements associated with traditional underpinning is inevitably subjective and cannot be quantitatively predicted by modelling.'
9. 5.1.8 acknowledges 'probability of significant damage where 35 and 37 join' In my flat this party wall join is in my bedroom.
10. 5.2.4 I would be interested to know who the qualified geotechnical specialists were to provided the advice – without visiting No.37.
11. It would seem little attention has been given to the traffic of heavy lorries etc. For these proposals, as South Hill Park is a narrow, circular, modified cul-de-sac around South Hill Park Gardens and the 3 existing projects cause immense problems at present – including damage to resident's cars.

I would point out that excavation in the front would be contrary to the Conservation regulations and as the owners of 35 sold the bikes when their sons outgrew them, a bike shed would only be a good point for resale of the property upon completion when/if the work goes ahead.

PLEASE REFUSE THIS DOUBLE BASEMENT PROPOSAL.