

Chivers, Jennifer

From: Pam Gilby [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 August 2015 12:53
To: Chivers, Jennifer
Subject: Planning application 2015/3882/P

Dear Ms Chivers

The link for comments on this application seems to have disappeared so I will make my comments simply by email. My first comment is that though it cannot be proved, I believe that the first notice concerning an application for a basement, was removed - a number of us do not recall ever seeing it. The second notice regarding an amendment to the first application has had the date of the notice obliterated on the outside.

1. The party walls are not substantial - beams driven into them extending only as far as the half of the wall relevant to no 73 will not be secure enough to carry the weight required. To penetrate any further into the party wall may well damage the party wall on the side of the neighbouring house.
2. The amendments suggest that the party wall will be appropriated to carry work on no 73 prejudicing no 75.
3. There do not appear to be support pillars so the whole weight will be dependent on the beams driven into the party walls. The party walls of these houses are not thick enough to carry this weight.
4. The structure of the rear light well creates loss of privacy to no 75's rear garden - the new boundary wall appears to be higher than the present one causing loss of light to no 75.
5. The removal of the front boundary wall is totally out of keeping with all the other front walls in this conservation area.
6. A huge amount of earth will be excavated in this construction the removal of which will create disruption at street level.
7. There will be loss of parking spaces for which residents pay and which are already at a premium at busy times - these is bound to be disruption to traffic flow.
8. Due to the neighbouring properties all being terraced the noise of excavation will be disturbing - many local residents are either retired or work from home and this plan will cause considerable interference.
9. Due to the neighbouring properties being terraced any weakening of walls will most likely impact on them - this is not the environment suitable for basement developments.
1. We pay extra on house insurance because these houses are liable to subsidence - such a development as this will impact on this possibility.

It seems to me that this whole application is flawed - neighbours have not had the opportunity to comment fully and I cannot understand how the first application was given the go-ahead.

With thanks

Pam Gilby
79 Constantine Road
London NW3 2LP

[REDACTED]