

[REDACTED]

From: Marlene Fenton [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 April 2015 17:49
To: Planning
Subject: 2015/1628/P 2014/1037/P

We have previously given our reasons for objections to the original scheme in August 2014 in respect of 10A Oakhill Avenue.

These additional plans must be covered by our previous objections.

For the attention of Olivier Nelson

Marlene and Gordon Fenton
Flat 5 10 Oakhill Avenue
27 April 2015
Sent from my iPad

28 APRIL 2015



Comments Form

Name... ABBAS KHADIVI (MR.) & MONIRE ABOTORABI KHADIVI (MRS.)

Address... FLAT 1, 10 OAKHILL AVENUE, LONDON NW3 7RE

Email address... [REDACTED]

Telephone number... [REDACTED]

Planning application number... 2015/1628/P, 2014/1037/P

Planning application address... 10A OAKHILL AVENUE, LONDON NW3 7RE

I support the application (please state reasons below)

☒ I object to the application (please state reasons below)

We

Your comments



1 - The Original Planning Proposal – Application No: 2014/1037/P

Under our letter dated 18 August 2014 we sent our strong objections to the proposed planning permission for 10A Oakhill Avenue London NW3 7RE. Also we sent you Michael de Freitas lecture to the Highgate Society regarding Basement Excavations/Developments in Hampstead and Highgate Area. Based on that report we sent you another letter of objection dated 19 August 2014.

Regrettably the permission was granted by the Planning Department who did not pay any attention to the reasons of the objection and subsequent damages that will occur in the future to our building at 10 Oakhill Avenue London NW3 7RE. The brief of those expected damages are:

1 – The site stands on the Claygate Member – Clay, Silt and Sand. It is highly shrinkable type of clay hence it is subject to potential subsidence and movements. This will make substantial subsidence and movements of our building caused by deep excavation with its generated earth movements and vibration.

2 – Diversion of existing natural underground water current because of proposed basement deep excavation with its concrete building, from boundary to boundary, causing flooding to the neighbouring buildings (more serious for our building due to being on the downstream).

Continued to next page

Please continue on extra sheets if you wish

28 APRIL 2015

Comments Form

Planning Application No: 2015/1628/P, 2014/1037/P

Page 2

2 - The New Proposed Work:

Variation of condition 3 mentioned in your letter dated 15 April 2015 has been looked at and noted the enlargements of the previous approved layout as follows (the measurements are taken from the drawings with the scales shown on each drawing, so the accuracies are as good as the drawings accuracies themselves):

Basement Floor:

- 1 – 12 M X 7 M added
- 2 – 1.5 M added in the whole length of the building on the NE side
- 3 – 2 M X 9 M added in the garden side
- 4 – 1.5 M added in the three sides of extended part at the garden side

Lower Ground Floor:

- 1 – 3.5 M X 4.5 M light well extension (more than twice)
- 2 – 1.5 M X 7 M at the left side of the plot
- 3 – 2 light wells extended at 3.5 M X 10 M

Height of the Building:

The building is higher by about 600 MM


The above extensions and enlargements will exacerbate the risk of subsidence and movements of our building with higher risk of flooding explained in our letters dated 18 & 19 August 2014, a brief of which shown here above.

Therefore we strongly object to the New Proposed Work.

Yours faithfully



Abbas Khadivi



Monire Abootorabi Khadivi