

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4094/P	Gabriele Griffin	1 Hillside Highgate Rd NW5 1QT NW5 1QT NW5 1QT	12/08/2015 16:46:17	INT	<p>Camden Regeneration and Planning Development Management London Borough of Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 8ND</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Highgate Rd London NW5 1QT</p> <p style="text-align: right;">12 August 2015</p> <p>1 Hillside</p> <p>Dear Madam/Sir, Response to Planning Consultation Application Ref 2015/4094/P Having read the submitted planning application documents and as a directly affected party whose dwelling borders immediately onto the Bull and Last pub, we strongly object to the planning application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The building of a 4-storey house (including the proposed new basement) at the rear of the pub will effectively block off all light to our ground floor kitchen which has 2 velux skylights on the side bordering directly on the Bull and Last, as well as to our very small rear courtyard (3.5 metre x 5 metres). In the kitchen our skylights will be overlooked by a sheer glass wall, and although some of it is apparently being proposed to be blocked off with screens, the effect of being imprisoned by walls will be the same, as will the cutting out of the light. This is exacerbated by the sloping structure of the building which rises towards our house to the height of almost 3 storeys.</li> <li>2) The proposed new dwelling will lead to a complete loss of privacy since the windows to the rear of the elevation on the proposed elevation directly overlook the back of our house and garden, as well as the gardens of our neighbours and the conservatory of 2a Woodsome Rd.</li> <li>3) The Basement Impact Assessment for Proposed Basement Works maintains under 4.04.7 that there are no trees and that 'The new basement will not suffer from seasonal shrink and subsidence as there are no trees in close proximity.' This is simply untrue. Both gardens of the immediately adjoining houses, 1 Hillside and 2A Woodsome Road, have trees within '25 metres of the proposed basement', as, indeed, do other gardens in adjoining houses, not least because this is a densely built up area with small gardens.</li> <li>4) The Desk Study and Ground Investigation Report makes clear that 'elastic heave and long term swelling of the underlying London Clay' will result from the proposed basement excavation' (7.1.2), and, alarmingly, points to the issue of 'differential movement through lowering the existing basement and beneath the remainder of the house'. The Basement Impact Assessment for Proposed Basement Works maintains that 'there is no reason to suggest that the construction of the basement will cause adjoining properties to become more susceptible to subsidence, particularly since the adjoining buildings to Woodsome Rd have been shown to have deeper foundations due to their existing coal cellars.' As is evident from this statement, this is NOT TRUE for the Hillside houses. Our house, immediately adjoining the Bull and Last, has no cellar at all immediately adjoining the Bull and Last, and its coal cellar which borders 2 Hillside and is only hall-width (ie about 1 metre wide), is only about 1.6 metres deep and does not run the whole width of our house. Any underpinning to the boundary and party walls therefore is highly likely to cause movement and subsidence, and we are therefore completely opposed to any basement excavation.</li> </ol>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

5) Ground stability, which is constructed in the reports as either of moderate concern or of little concern, is in fact, as everybody living in this area, and particularly in Woodsome Rd., knows, a major concern. Most insurers will not insure properties here, or only at extremely high costs (£2000 plus per annum) because of this. Evidence of subsidence and ground movement in the form of cracks and house movements is common, and the proposed works will obviously exacerbate this.

6) The application suggests that there will be no negative consequences for water dispersal, and that there is no evidence of groundwater rising. This, again, is simply not true. Many of the cellars in surrounding houses, e.g. 1 and 2 Hillside, are known to be damp. We had standing water in our coal cellar at 1 Hillside within the past 12 months. The proposals are likely to exacerbate this problem for us and neighbouring houses.

7) Given that the application proposes at minimum two new flats and six bedrooms for the bed and breakfast it will exacerbate noise, especially at weekends when the pub is busiest and drinkers spill out onto the road. Whilst residents on Woodsome Rd have been able to get the pub to move its outside space – which is uncontained – to the front at Highgate Rd, those living on Highgate Rd, especially 1 and 2 Hillside, have to put up with the noise, overspill, rubbish etc from drinkers outside the pub in what is a generally quiet residential area.

8) The proposed developments will clearly necessitate increased parking, including a proposed reserved bay for drop-off/pick-up on the Woodsome Rd. side. This is an issue in a cramped area where demand outstrips supply, and where parking is already difficult.

9) The increase in traffic and footfall will occur at the junction of Highgate and Woodsome Roads which has already been identified as having the highest levels of car pollution in the borough.

10) The increase in traffic in the immediate vicinity of the pub risks an increase in the chances of traffic accidents, given the simultaneous rise in pedestrian and traffic usage from the building of the new La Swap sixth form building immediately opposite on Highgate Road from autumn 2016, with two new school entrances for hundreds of sixth formers facing the junction of Woodsome and Highgate Rd. The congestion at this point is going to become a major concern.

11) The proposed building is clearly out of character with the architectural lines of Highgate and Woodsome Roads in which the pub is located.

In view of all these issues we are completely opposed to the planning application in question, and ask that it be turned down.

Yours sincerely,

Prof Gabriele Griffin, Prof Simon Gunn