					Printed on: 10/07/2015 09:05:18
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Consultees Addr:	Received:	<b>Comment:</b>	Response:
2015/0369/P	Robin Kinross	24a York Rise London	07/07/2015 17:12:51	INT	I refer to the Construction Management Statement and the Revised Basement Impact Assessment.
		London NW5 1ST			Looking at the north-west elevations: the new elevations do offer slightly greater privacy to our house and to 46 Dartmouth Park Road. I welcome the changes made to the windows on the second floor and to the back extension on the first floor. I note the move to emulate here the original architecture of the house, though the dramatic, unexplained switch in style of architecture does not breathe confidence on the part of the architects or the developers.  The new reports suggest that the impact of the works on neighbouring properties will be 'neglible'. I would be more persuaded by this prediction if it had been made when the development was first proposed, in January, rather than produced after objections from neighbours.  It is good that this house can be renovated and made into well-provided flats. But my original objection
					remains: I do not see why a basement needs to be made, apart from to provide monetary gain for the developers through the creation of four extra bedrooms. Neighbours will suffer months of disturbance. A lot of non-renewable energy will be expended; extra polution will be generated. Neighbouring houses, as well as 44 Dartmouth Park Road itself, will be subjected to avoidable uncertainty, both in the disturbance of the ground and in the changes to patterns of underground water flow.

	G I V		<b>D</b>	6	Printed on: 10/07/2015 09:05:18
Application No: 2015/0369/P	Consultees Name: Dr Clare Halsted	Consultees Addr: 46 Dartmouth Park Rd NW5 1SN	Received: 06/07/2015 18:41:34	Comment: COMMBOB XI	Response:  I own 46 Dartmouth Park Rd and still have concerns about the effect of this basement development on
2013/0303/1					my house.
		INWS ISIN			In the Construction Management Statement the plans 1393/SK01 and SK03 show an assumed site boundary which is incorrect. My property boundary is immediately adjacent to the wall of No 44. As far as I can tell, the proposed foundations appear to extend into my land.  I am surprised that noone checked the accuracy of this detail before submitting these revised plans.
					From the Revised Basement Impact Assessment:
					<ul><li>2. 1 states</li><li>"The north-east of the site is bounded a narrow path approximately</li><li>1m in width, beyond which is 46 Dartmouth Park Road."</li></ul>
					As I pointed out in my first set of comments, this is not correct. There is no path between 44 and 46; the gap of 1m lies entirely within my property.
					It also states "Three mature trees are present within close proximity of the site adjacent to York Rise and within the garden of 24A York Rise, estimated to be between 8m and 10m in height.  Smaller trees approximately 4m in height were observed within the rear garden of 46  Dartmouth Park Road."
					In fact there is no mature tree in the garden of 24A York Rise -that tree is in my garden.
					2.3 states "The basement will be approximately 1m offset from its closest neighbour, No. 46 Dartmouth Park Road"
					As explained above this is not accurate as the proposed new basement would be directly adjacent to No 46.
					5.4.6 Groundwater  This refers to a single monitoring visit on 30.4.15.  I am confused by the use of the term monitoring here as I understand it to mean checking (something) over a period of time. So how can measurements obtained on one day only during a relatively dry period be used to confirm no increased risk of flooding from a new, solid impediment in the ground?
					9.12 Damage Assessment - states "In Critical Section A-A, combined ground movements are likely to result in potential damage to the structure of 46 Dartmouth Park Road equivalent to Category 1 'very slight' damage if lateral movements can be limited to a maximum of 9.0mm."

				_	Printed on: 10/07/2015	09:05:18
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	
					So I conclude from this that if movements are greater than 9mm damage to my house could be more significant.	
					12 Summary -this states	
					"The overall heave regime does extend over the neighbouring 46 Dartmouth Park Road, with a combined total heave of 8mm at the closest wall of the property. It is recommended a monitoring regime is adopted to manage risk and potential damage to underlying infrastructure as construction progresses on site."	
					In view of the potential to cause damage to my house, I am very concerned about the impact of this large basement proposal.	
					First Floor Terrace	
					This will still directly overlook most of my garden with the invasion of privacy that will result.	
					I would like to be notified of the committee date.	
					Thank you	