

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3753/P	Hugh Long	41 Flask Walk NW3 1HH NW3 1HH NW3 1HH	25/08/2015 11:01:40	INT	<p>Planning application 2015/375/P</p> <p>I ask the council to take into account the following in addition to the points already made in other submissions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. This application shows in the operational plan that the road width is able to accommodate both the parked cars and the construction trucks. This is not correct given the width of the trucks shown in the application. In view of this error I request that the application be checked very carefully. Although the application appears to be most detailed, other discrepancies may be found; possibly also of a nature favourable to the application's success.2. The construction includes a 2.3m deep lightwell with the outer wall at the boundary with the public pavement which is approximately 1m from the carriageway. If this buttressing wall deflects or is inadequately supported at the party walls each side there will be damage both to neighbouring property and to public property. There would not appear to be any weight restriction in Flask Walk. I suggest that the council should seek assurance that the risk of failure and damage to public and private property is low and require the provision of adequate long- term indemnity in the event.3. In general, the terrain and the age and character of the buildings and their foundations is such that the independent excavation of basements is inherently risky, to set a precedent is to encourage further applications without any apparent consideration of any adverse consequences. If serious failures result what will be the impact on the residents affected and who will be responsible restitution?4. For the reasons stated by earlier respondents and these concerns I believe that the application should be refused.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3753/P	John Cook	63 Flask Walk	25/08/2015 14:13:27	OBJEMAIL	<p>I am writing in connection with Planning Application Ref 2015/3753/P which proposes adding a basement to the existing terraced house, 36 Flask Walk.</p> <p>I am objecting to the development on several grounds.</p> <p>Flask Walk is one of the most pleasant and popular streets in Hampstead, leafy and charming, containing many building of note. Its unique character, maintained by its Conservation Area status is no doubt the reason why it is on the itinerary of many tourist walking guidebooks.</p> <p>Firstly, I am concerned that adding a basement to a property that also has planning to extend at roof level amounts to overdevelopment of this site, to the detriment of the existing character of the area.</p> <p>Additionally, the works would create a new light well at the front of the house which completely removes the existing small garden and planting that, again, erodes the unique character of the street. I believe in this respect, the plans do not conform to paras 23-26 of Camden's guidance on Basement Developments.</p> <p>However, my main objection is the inevitable chaos and disruption the development will cause to both residents and visitors for a long period of time – even assuming all goes according to plan – and the precedent that will be set.</p> <p>From a noise and dust point of view, the site is towards the narrowest part of Flask Walk, with tall buildings either side of the road. Unfortunately, any noise will be amplified by the surroundings and dust will be funneled along the street. This is something that all residents have already recently had to suffer and experience due to closure of the road by sewerage system upgrade works taking place recently. It is one thing to have to accept this due to infrastructure improvements, but not for a discretionary development.</p> <p>Both the Construction Management and Traffic Management Plans are defective in places, contrary to Camden guidance para 40-42 (as above). It is worrying that if attention to detail cannot be relied on in these initial stages, how rigorously will any plans agreed now be adhered to in their execution? References to Garbage Chutes as a solution to a basement development waste don't seem relevant and plans for storage ignore the complete lack of space on site or in the surrounding area.</p> <p>The Traffic survey provided in the Traffic Management Plan is not one that I recognise as a 25 year resident in the street. 3 cars in a one-hour period? I cannot explain how these numbers are at such a variance with any experience of someone living here, but I am sure that Camden itself has its own independent traffic surveys of the area, produced when changes were made to the Flask Walk/Willow Road junction, which will show how inaccurate they are.</p> <p>The fact is that Flask Walk is a busy pedestrian and traffic thoroughfare at many times of the day – notably during the School Run with the population of New End School (a primary school with 14 Classes of up to 30 pupils in each class, situated in the middle of site) going to and fro and during the</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

rush hour, together with the many commuter cars and vans using us as a rat run behind the High Street.

Likewise, on any sunny day, Flask Walk is the main pedestrian route for the numerous visitors, domestic and foreign, to get access to the Heath from Hampstead Tube station.

The Survey paints a completely inaccurate picture of the traffic environment.

The historic and well documented problems with access, lorries getting stuck, etc, have caused Camden to wisely put 6 foot restrictions on the entrance to Flask Walk. I do not understand how lorries of up to 3m wide and over 8m long mentioned in the Traffic Management plan are physically going to enter Flask Walk from New End (a very tight 85 degree bend) navigate up to the site, (completely blocking the road) and then negotiate the even narrower upper part of Flask Walk, the 90 degree turn into Back Lane and the 180 degree turn from Back Lane onto the Southbound Heath St (Back Lane having a 'no right turn' restriction). Because it's impossible.

Practically, they'd have to reverse back out of Flask Walk, something residents are familiar with watching when the occasional misguided HGV driver attempt to drive through.

The Traffic Management Plan also assumes that if a lorry is parked outside the site, traffic will be able to pass with only the suspension of a single bay. Practically that seems very unlikely, not least because the double yellow lines there are often in use by Disabled Drivers (as it gives easy access to Hampstead High Street on foot).

Additionally, problems will arise with the inevitable blocking of the entrance to Lakis Close by site traffic and/or displaced cars and the disruption for those residents and the pedestrian flow down Flask Walk (added to by the closure of the pavement on the other side of the road outside the site).

Overall, this proposal is misguided in concept and fatally flawed in its proposed execution. I ask that the matter be considered by Committee so the community can be heard in person and the strength of feeling against the development be properly gauged.

Lastly, I appreciate that any objections to development may be read through the filter of NIMBY-ism. I would point out that I recently supported a local application that included basement development.

But it simply does not make sense for this property in this location and is, I believe, contrary to Planning Guidance – so should be refused outright, in that the many problems outlined cannot be cured by a fresh Plan or by giving conditional consent.