

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 August 2015 15:13  
**To:** English, Rachel  
**Cc:** Planning; Wheat, Frances  
**Subject:** Objections to application 2015/4179/P 8 Pilgrim's Lane

Objections to: Application 2015/4179/P

Attention: Rachel  
English,  
20<sup>th</sup> August 2015  
Senior Planning Officer  
London Borough of Camden

Dear Rachel,

Background: This application should not be considered on its own but only as part of a larger scheme.

This application was filed on 28<sup>th</sup> July 2015 at the same time (27<sup>th</sup> July 2015) as two other applications: 2015/4157/P and 2015/4053/P. As a whole, the set of these 3 applications are very similar to application 2012/5825/P, save for a basement and protrusion into an inner court. Application 2012/5825/P was refused on March 2014 and is the subject of an appeal that is due to take place around Q1 2016.

The application 2012/5825/P was refused for several reasons, some of which still apply to this application: breach of DP 23, no construction Management Plan, no Highway plan and overdevelopment. The proposed content and details in this application 2015/4179/P appears totally identical to the corresponding content and details that were part of application 2012/5825/P and which are the subject of an appeal. Accordingly, until the outcome of the appeal takes place, all its content should be left pending.

In addition to the above comment for putting a stop to this application until the appeal's verdict has been pronounced, there are reasons for refusal of this application which we will explain below.

1- Driveway at severe risk of flooding – breach of DP23

The applicant proposes, as per his drawing "proposed side elevation and driveway details", new railings in order to prevent cars entering the inner patio. This was the result of objections by Camden's Transport department to the initial and previous application by the applicant in 2012 to let cars enter the patio. We fully and wholeheartedly support Camden's objections on the matter and the resulting idea to have fixed metallic railings that will stop cars entering the patio.

Unfortunately the proposed scheme by the applicant is totally flawed as it will create flood risk to both 8 and especially 10 Pilgrim's Lane.

The proposed "new look" brick wall is located at the bottom of the downward sloping car port and this together with the proposed raised stair case platforms will act as a perfect rain water dam where water will have nowhere to go but into 10 Pilgrim's Lane. Furthermore, the downward sloping car port is itself at the junction of two downward streets in this part of Pilgrim's Lane. As a result, you have the perfect conditions to create flood risk in periods of heavy rain. This is all the more so that, in dry weather conditions, water was found very close to the ground surface. During the trial pit that took place in July/August 2014 along the southern column and next to the proposed brick wall, water was found at only ap 0.7 meter from the surface in dry weather conditions. We have documented photos taken at the time and with the presence of our expert consultant, Mr Michael Eldred and in the presence of the applicant that proves this. Long term this may also weaken the base of the southern column due to increased rain water stagnating near by and hence potentially weakening the ground base of the column that critically supports the very sensitive flying freehold of 10 Pilgrim's Lane. DP 27 may also be breached.

The result is that the rain water will have nowhere to escape as is presently the case and will therefore flood both 8 and 10 Pilgrim's Lane. 10 Pilgrim's Lane is especially exposed at this location due to the presence of an

entrance to a room located in the basement where the boiler, gas and water control facilities of 10 Pilgrim's Lane are located. The applicant has not proposed any drainage and/or means for the water to escape; preferring instead to expose 10 Pilgrim's to clear risks of flooding.

This is all the more inadmissible in that we had made exactly the same objections when the applicant filed his application 2012/5825/P. The ongoing and continued lack of irresponsiveness of the applicant to these concerns that we previously expressed in writing during the previous application is shocking. DP 23 would clearly be breached. This alone should be cause for rejection of this application.

## 2- No Construction Management Plan

This was the fourth reason for rejection of application 2012/5825/P by the DCC on the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2014. The applicant proposes to do a substantial amount of work – both internal alteration and external work. As the applicant is fully aware, Pilgrim's Lane is a narrow one way street at this location. There is absolutely no information on the sequence of work and delivery schedule, let alone a Construction Management Plan. In such circumstances, this is very likely to contribute to unacceptable traffic disruption and hazards for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users and would be detrimental to the amenities of the area generally, contrary to policies CS5, CS11, CS19 and DP 20 and 21. This was the fourth reason for rejection of application 2012/5825/P and this applies for this application.

## 3- Safety of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles

There are no provisions whatsoever on the adequate provision for and safety of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles contrary to policy CS11, CS19 and DP 17. This was the 5<sup>th</sup> reason for rejection of application 2012/525/P by the DCC on the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2014. Please also note that Pilgrim's Lane is used a lot for the school run of the many schools near by and please also note that the inhabitants of the nearby houses have young families with several children (e.g. 4, 6 and 10 Pilgrim's Lane).

## 4- No attempt to minimize negative impact on the neighbourhood

The current house is already a very large house of approx. 5000 square feet. The absentee owner has never lived in this house and owns several properties. The owner has also refused in the past to engage in consultation with the neighbours contrary to the recommendation stipulated in CPG4. In my clear opinion, this application is just an application for maximizing profit and do not correspond to conventional housing need. The nuisances and negative impact on the amenity of the neighbourhood created by this application far outweigh the benefit to the community and as such are contrary to planning principle.

Furthermore, it is a stated objective of Camden to minimize the negative impact of construction to neighbours and follow the lead on the matter of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea ("RBKC"). RBKC is proposing to limit noisy construction activity in many ways and any high impact works from 9am to 12 noon and 2pm to 5.30pm, Monday to Friday and at no time on Saturdays and Sundays and Public Holidays.  
<https://www.rbkc.gov.uk/sites/default/files/atoms/files/RBKC%20-%20Code%20of%20Construction%20Practice%2028v37.1%20-%20Final%20Draft%29.pdf>

The Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum has also proposed similar working hours restrictions in order to protect the amenity of neighbours.

## Overlooking and light pollution

The applicant proposes in section E-E & Elevation E, three new conservation type roof-lights. This would result in 6 Pilgrim's Lane being overlooked and suffering light pollution.

## 5- Overlooking and light pollution

The applicant proposes in section E-E & Elevation E, three new conservation type roof-lights. This would result in 6 Pilgrim's Lane being overlooked and suffering light pollution.

## 6- Planter removed

We object to the planter being removed as the applicant proposes in his drawing "proposed street elevation A(1)". Hampstead is one of the very first conservation areas in the country and its residents are very conscientious in preserving all its unique aspects.

Conclusion: we object to this application for the above six reasons and request that this application be accordingly rejected.

I look forward to your reply.

Thank you.

Best regards

Oliver Froment  
10 Pilgrim's Lane  
NW3 1SL