

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	Baston House Ltd, Freehold company for 21 Netherhall Gardens	21 Netherhall Gardens Hampstead	23/07/2015 19:10:00	OBJ	<p>Having compared this application with the previous ones from 2014, there are changes to the forecourt design, our multiple objections remain.</p> <p>We object to the demolition of the current Victorian house which shares features with other houses in the Netherhall conservation area (24-32 Marshfield Gardens) and brings several unique features to Netherhall Gardens. It is an imposing residence which just needs to be looked after and treated respectfully.</p> <p>We object because the large size and visage of the proposed build will detract from the area as it does not fit well with the smaller and unusual character of the adjoining buildings. The current building does fit the area, it just needs renovating and extending.</p> <p>We object because the new proposed application negatively impacts on street parking as the five apartments proposed have only three off-street parking spaces.</p> <p>We object because the proposed excavation into the terrace is risky given the land slippages along the road, which surprisingly are not mentioned in the application as far as we are aware.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	Caroline Formstone	Flat 4 21 Netherhall Gardens Hampstead NW3 5RL	23/07/2015 18:52:24	OBJNOT	<p>This planning application appears to be essentially the same as the previous (2014/6224/P and 2014/6473/C) except that the arrangement of one side of the forecourt has been altered.</p> <p>I still object to the demolition of the current Victorian building which has much in common with the architecture and design of numbers 24-32 Maresfield Gardens and as such is an important building for the Netherhall conservation area.</p> <p>The heritage statement attached to the application is therefore wrong in its assessment of the current building at 26 Netherhall. It is a majestic house which has an imposing visage wholly appropriate to the eclectic nature of other buildings in the area. It brings several unique features to Netherhall Gardens. These are currently under threat due to lack of renovation e.g. the features of the upper windows and second floor window as well as the front porch.</p> <p>I also still object to the proposed new construction because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The position and proportions of the new building do not respect those of the adjoining properties. <p>The developers propose to replace a wide single storey extension with a brick construction which is equally wide but both deeper and taller. This extra mass should be offset by a decreased width. The design statement details the gaps between the properties along the row of houses including 26 Netherhall. The proposed gap between no 24A and no 26 is the smallest of all whereas it should be at least no less wide than the gap between no 28 and no 26.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The proposed building requires excavation into the terrace to generate two basement levels. This plan favours only the purse of the Developer and will be detrimental to the local community in both the short and long term. <p>I have very strong objections to the excavation into the terrace. There can be no justification for such a development especially because there is a risk of damage to both the adjoining properties and to the mature oak in the neighbouring garden. Notably the deepest excavation is on the side where the gap between the proposed building at no 26 and no 24A is the smallest between properties along this row. I strongly believe that Camden should actively discourage basement excavation in the Netherhall conservation area given the camber of the land and the noticeable slippages we are currently experiencing along the edges of the terraces.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) There is slippage on the front aspect at the boundary between 24A and 26 Netherhall and on the opposing side of Netherhall Gardens which is obvious to anyone who cares to look along the road. I see no mention of these land movements anywhere in the documentation of the planning application. (b) We have already seen one mature Oak lost from the garden of 26 Netherhall, nothing should be done which could risk the health and long-life of a second mature oak. <p>In the short term there will be considerable noise and vibration as well as other nuisances associated with the excavation and demolition. The proposed building does not enhance the local area and so the several detrimental aspects of this proposal cannot be justified.</p> <p>26 Netherhall occupies a good sized plot which should allow for a new build of reasonable mass which</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

would mirror the proportions of the adjoining properties.

A more modest plan with fewer apartments would :

- (a) Reduce the burden of street parking on Netherhall Gardens. The new application will increase the parking burden.
- (b) Enable design of a unique building which would respect the position and the proportions of the adjoining properties.

3. The design of this building does not mirror or enhance neighbouring properties.

The proposed visage of the new building does not pair at all with no 28 Netherhall. The windows are too tall and too numerous. There is nothing unique about this building and it does not enhance the conservation area.

The appalling appearance of the current building results from recent changes in the use of the property.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	c harris	24 Netherhall Gardens NW3 5TH NW3 5TH NW3 5TH	23/07/2015 23:13:04	COMMNT	2015/3314/P

It is clear that this new application has not addressed at all the serious issues I raised in my objection to the earlier applications (Planning Ref 2014/6224/P and 2014/6473/C). 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. This revised application proposes the same depth as the earlier applications (Planning Ref 2014/6224/P and 2014/6473/C). Hence I reiterate my objections.

As the owner of 24 Netherhall Gardens, I very strongly object to this application on following grounds:

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.

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. This revised application proposes the same depth as the earlier applications (Planning Ref 2014/6224/P and 2014/6473/C). The serious concerns raised in the Basement Impact Assessment and accompanying structural reports of the earlier applications (Planning Ref 2014/6224/P and 2014/6473/C) are completely ignored in this application. These reports very clearly acknowledged that potential damage to adjoining properties is very likely, yet no design undertakings were made in the earlier applications nor in this revised application as to how such damage could be avoided. This is totally unacceptable. Indicative statements in these reports included "... 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 not good enough, especially in an area which is prone to subsidence.

2. MASSIVE EXCAVATION OF REAR GARDEN

The rear garden will almost completely be destroyed 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 report accompanying the previous applications (Planning Ref 2014/6224/P and 2014/6473/C) highlighted many of these issues, but yet again, the current application does not provides any design undertakings as to how such damage or impacts will be avoided or addressed..

3. LOSS OF TREES IN THE REAR GARDEN

The development of the hard paved rear garden will involve several existing trees to be felled and said

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

'to be replaced'. The Basement Impact report of the earlier applications (Planning Ref 2014/6224/P and 2014/6473/C) was 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 have been made in this application as to how such damage will be avoided. This is just not good enough.

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 surround properties, and potential damage to 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 of the earlier applications (Planning Ref 2014/6224/P and 2014/6473/C), which again have not been addressed in the current application:

- "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",
- "... 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 will flows down the hill from the rear garden of number 26 to 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 flow in between number 26 and 28, but most water will flow straight to numbers 24, 22 and beyond 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 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 issues and potential structural damage to the foundations of my house due to the obstructed water flows and altered water courses resulting from this excessive development.

No designs undertakings are made in this application to address these issues, if a solution would at all be possible.

CONCLUSION– The proposed development is aggressive, too large in masse, 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

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

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.

Please refuse this application.

Catrien Harris
