

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

2015/3882/P James McGrath on
behalf of Mary
Casey 75 Constantine
Road
Hampstead
London
NW3 2LP 13/08/2015 21:40:12 OBJ Dear Madam/Sir

Having read through and studied the submitted planning application documents of Planning Application 2015/3882/P and as a directly affected party whose dwelling borders immediately onto No.73 Constantine Road, we fervently object to the planning application on the following grounds:

1. There is too much use of the party wall - The beams may be driven too far into the party wall to secure them, which means they could break through the party wall damaging our property. Only half of the party wall belongs to No.73, so the beams which are proposed to carry the entire weight of the house should only be inserted into their half of the party wall. We are extremely concerned about this as we strongly believe this is not enough to carry the entire weight of the main house, rear projection and roof.
2. We are very concerned about the proposed amendments to the plans as we are uncertain how these changes can be carried out without the party wall with No.75 being appropriated to support the weight of No.73. It is our wall too and are very uncomfortable with the new proposal. Any work carried out at No.73 should not;
 - Prejudice the integrity of the party wall shared with No.75.
 - Prevent us doing the same.
3. Under close inspection of the new plans there are a number details which give cause for concern;
 - There are what appear to be thinner walls in the basement when compared to the original approved plans. Is this a result of less lining to the walls or more worryingly, thinner walls?
 - There are no support pillars in crucial weight pressure points (the front and rear corners of the rear projection) anymore. This means the whole weight of the house, rear projection and roof is sitting on beams driven into the party wall.
 - The party walls of these houses were built to support the weight of wooden floor boards, not steel beams and the weight of an entire house. At the very least some sort of supporting wall should be present in the basement below the beams at weight pressure points to lessen the strain put upon the party wall. We are very worried about how this will affect our wall and the structural integrity of our house.
 - We remain unconvinced that the party wall is thick enough to carry the weight of the entire house and roof. The old bricks are likely to crumble under the immense weight of the house as the beams should only sit in No.73's half of the party wall. As they are not supported from below by reinforced new walls, we fail to see how this will be enough support to carry the house stably. Additionally, as No.73 sits higher than No.75, the location of the beams mean they would sit in the original brick walls above the new foundations. The bricks used in the construction of these houses were not intended to support such exorbitant weight. Such excessive weight should be carried solely within No.73s curtilage not entirely within the thin party wall. Any supporting walls should be built new within their property to support the weight. Any original walls should be preserved and repaired not replaced.
4. We object to the proposed bridge across the new enlarged and reshaped rear light well. The new bridge will cause a severe loss of privacy to No.75's rear garden. The plans also suggest a new taller,

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

Comment: **Response:**

timber boundary wall with No.75 causing a loss of light. There are no measurements of how high this new boundary wall is but from looking at the plans it appears significantly taller than the current boundary wall. The sun shines from the west in the evening however, this new boundary wall would be well above No.75's kitchen window meaning the kitchen would be in shadow. There is also a shed next to the kitchen window which currently sits no higher than the existing boundary wall, a new taller boundary wall is completely different.

5. Furthermore the new plans show the new basement walls into the light well now sit below the party line well into the garden whereas before they shifted to within No.73's curtilage upon reaching the garden. If this change is approved, our shed, which has stood for a number of years, will be at risk of collapse during construction due to the excavation of the earth below.

6. The new rear light well is now purely a light well with store cupboard. There are no longer steps rising from the basement to the garden and the loss of these steps, we believe, would threaten the stability of the surrounding ground both during and after construction. In the original plans (2014/0617/P) the surrounding ground would be held up by the retaining walls on both sides and the steps which would rise from the basement doors, thus having a buttressing effect on the garden and surrounding earth. Yet the new plans show a fully dug out 'box style light well' which, for us, would have a less reassuring effect on the stability of our land.

7. We are dreadfully concerned about how close the proposed development comes to the party wall. The Victorian houses on Constantine Road are over 100 years old and have very shallow foundations and such extensive drilling and excavation next to the shallow foundations could cause the party wall to become destabilised. Also, the party wall along the basement and in the rear light well needs to be reinforced as the weight of our garden is now sitting purely on a vertical wall. The buttressing effect of the steps has been removed.

8. The plans put forward indicate the removal of the front boundary wall. We strongly object to this alteration for the following reasons;

- No.73 is located within the Mansfield Conservation Area so the removal of this wall would prejudice the character of the property and adversely impact the street scene.
- There are many original front walls along the length of Constantine Road which have been preserved throughout the years; the removal of this front wall would be of detriment to the character and integrity of the front elevation of No.73.
- There are no other front walls along Constantine Road with such drastically reduced heights, so the lowering of this wall would create a blemish on both the property and the street scene.
- Walls any lower than the standard wall height adjoining pavements in this street risk being tripped over by the elderly and sight-impaired: at the current height they can be toppled against, any lower and they will be toppled over; moreover, at their current hand-height, the visually impaired use the tops of the walls as a guide, if the wall is lowered they will be confused.
- The other basement extension at No.9 Constantine Road (ref:2007/3892/P) did not lower the front boundary wall, therefore to preserve the character of the property and the street scene; the front wall

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

should not be lowered at all.

9. The new plans indicate a new basement WC with shower which would be accessed by going down two steps from the bottom of the new staircase to the basement. This puts the new WC lower than the main basement. We object to this aspect of the proposal as it would imply more excavation under the house which has the ability to prejudice our property. Moreover, should there be any problems with the plumbing in the new WC, water will seep into the ground which would then undermine the integrity of our property meaning our front path and bay windows would then be at risk. Should any plumbing issues cause water to seep into the ground, this could also give rise to soil being eroded from under our property putting it at further serious risk. We would like to remind the planners at this stage that as mentioned in our OBJECTIONS to planning application 2014/0617/P, No.75 has already had extensive repair work carried out to the gable end wall as a result of subsidence. Any excess ground water causing a loss of structural integrity could cause a reoccurrence of this issue and exacerbate it considerably.

We are concerned here that the general volume of earth being removed to construct this basement has been increased and not appropriately considered as there were THREE superseded Basement Impact Assessments submitted for the original plans, which to us suggests that something was missed or misinterpreted so a revised BIA was required. Why is this not the case now? Also a revised Section drawing of the proposed new work has not been provided, leaving us uncertain as to how the floor of basement will sit in the ground.

10. The elderly residents of No.75 are now some years older than when the original application was submitted. They are now totally housebound meaning the noise created by the excavation work and drilling and banging in the main house will be utterly deplorable and they are unable to escape it. The elderly residents also suffer from disabilities which were not present at the time of submission of granted planning application 2014/0617/P. One resident now suffers from Dementia and is totally housebound and sits in the kitchen all day whilst the other is a wheelchair user and is only able to move from the kitchen to the living room and whilst being a wheelchair user she is also a full time carer for her husband. The residents of No.73 will most probably not be living in the house during the works so will not have to endure the disproportionate noise, however the elderly residents of No.75 will have to bear the full extent of the noise produced during the proposed work which would only be intensified by being resonated throughout the house, top to bottom, front to back by the adjoining halls. Having lived in No.75 for over 46 years, the residents of No.75 are almost being driven from their home purely for their neighbours gain.

Whilst the original plans were approved, owing to the considerable change in circumstances at No.75, we request there be reduced working hours should planning application 2015/3882/P be approved.

We would like to take this opportunity to strongly remind the planners of our strenuous objections to the original planning application ref:2014/0617/P. Although our objections were not considered because they were submitted on what turned out to be the decision day, so they were not considered and permission was granted, we implore the planners to consider them when deciding on this proposal.