

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3753/P	John Lobek	1 Gardnor Road Hampstead NW3 1HA	21/08/2015 10:53:25	OBJ	<p>I wish to strongly object to the proposed application. Very careful consideration should be given by the planning dept before granting permission for this type of over development in such a restricted site. No one case officer should be tasked with this extremely un neighbourly application. As a minimum, if not rejected immediately it should go to a full Planning Committee hearing. The resultant precedent this could create may saddle local residents with disruption misery for years to come. Flask Walk is an important Hampstead street much frequented by locals and visitors alike. Even a single delivery van frequently creates havoc. For such a tiny amount of additional space created against what would be a huge disruption cant be a socially responsible thing.</p> <p>Basement developments in London have become a blight to local residents in certain boroughs. This application in Flask Walk, if approved will without doubt case harm to the local amenity. For these and many more reasons i respectfully ask that Camden Planning refuse this application.</p>
2015/3753/P	Elisabeth Bauer-tholen	23 Flask Walk Hampstead London NW3 1HH	22/08/2015 11:03:42	OBJ	<p>I object as this will cause major disruption for an extended period of time with no or very limited access to my home by car. There will no doubt be severe noise pollution as well. This is a single track road, not suitable for large vehicles and this will impact severely on the access for emergency and utility vehicles during the works. I have lived here for 23 years and feel this is the worst application to date and I expect Camden not to allow it.</p>
2015/3753/P	Elisabeth Bauer-tholen	23 Flask Walk Hampstead London NW3 1HH	22/08/2015 11:03:43	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3753/P	Frank Trentmann	1 Boades Mews NW3 1DB	24/08/2015 12:45:55	COMMNT	Dear Planning Committee,

I would like to raise several objections and observations about the planning permission for a basement for 36 Flask Walk. I live at the bottom of Flask Walk, on 1 Boades Mews.

Given the very narrow width of the one-way street outside the house, the machinery, lorries and crane needed for the basement excavation as laid out in the plans would create a serious obstacle for fire-engines, ambulances, and presumably also for the waste removal. Anyone familiar with that portion of Flask Walk should be aware of the impossibility of any traffic getting around the works/machinery. Since the work cannot possibly be carried out without physically taking up space in the road, this objection concerns the flawed planning documents submitted – and is not a separate issue about a possible, later traffic plan. A site visit should make clear to councillors the physical impossibility of some of the works/machinery contemplated.

My second observation concerns the place of this particular planning permission within the larger planning process, esp. the other permissions recently granted by the Council. Is the Council reviewing this application in the light of previous decisions and with regard to the CUMULATIVE effect on transport, noise, disruption and risks to public health and safety? Surely it must, because the feasibility of this particular basement plan rests on an assumption of being able to transport equipment and cement and remove earth via New End and Flask Walk. But how will this be possible, given that the Council has already given green light to a major, on-going flow of lorries for other large building projects? Since this area has several elementary schools and small children coming and going, the public health and safety aspect cannot be assessed on a one-to-one basis: the lorries and risks caused add up. In brief, I think the Council needs to take a step back and take an all-round view of planning applications and the planning review process to assess the aggregate and cumulative effect on neighbours and communities.

Third, proportionality: the proposed gain in square footage is tiny and out of proportion with the disruption caused to the neighbours and the community at large. I understand that the same applicant has already requested and been granted permission to add a floor on top. Should this not be done first, before proposing any further disruption. That work in itself should prove just how tight the road is at this point for works of this kind.

Fourth, Camden should (and is probably required to) prioritise new housing stock. But this proposal, like other recent ones, are luxury developments or investment in existing property.

Finally, Camden should take its environmental obligations seriously – as UK governments have signed up to targets to reduce CO2 emissions. Basement extensions cause enormous environmental damage, with heavy material use, esp. cement. I do not see this taken into consideration in the proposal at all.

As Councillors will be aware, various London councils have taken steps stopping basement extensions of terrace houses – and for plenty of good reasons. Camden should urgently review its current process.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					Best wishes Frank Trentmann 1 Boades Mews London NW3 1DB
