

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3753/P	S.Pentol	19 Spencer Walk London NW3 1QZ	27/08/2015 23:53:56	OBJ	<p>OBJECTION TO PLANNING PERMISSION BASEMENT 36 FLASK WALK</p> <p>We live at 19 Spencer Walk so that the rear of our house is directly overlooked by the rear of 36 Flask Walk in circumstances where due to the undulating landscape, the basement area of 36 Flask Walk is on the same level of the ground floor of our property. We have a tiny rear garden the boundary wall (not terribly well built) to which directly adjoins the rear of 36 Flask Walk as in effect, a party wall. Due to the proximity of our house / tiny garden to the area of the proposed works, we strongly oppose the basement development on the following Grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are concerned over the scale of this proposed development and in particular the excavation aspect to it as there is a high probability of such development causing structural damage to our rear adjoining garden wall and in turn, the very foundations of our house; 2. In particular, we insist that any excavation or extension of the basement to 36 Flask Walk should not be lower than the floor level of the existing communal garages as this will have a direct adverse impact on subsidence; 3. In an area that already suffers from subsidence and is in close proximity to the underground lines, any further disturbance caused by a basement extension creates a genuine possibility of both damage to our property and flooding to our garden; 4. In circumstances where the rear wall to our tiny garden directly adjoins these proposed works, we have a genuine fear that any potential 'movement' could lead to structural damage to our rear wall, garden, pipework and house itself; 5. These types of damage not only occur during the development stage but also can continue or remain latent and thereafter come to the fore many months and years thereafter; 6. We are therefore concerned about the depth of the excavation and disturbance to existing drain lines, water courses and subsidence; 7. It is well known that in projects of this type, there are many major unforeseen consequences that extend beyond a comparable above-ground extension; 8. We will suffer a loss of amenity during basement development works which are often aggravated by the extended duration of such works; 9. We anticipate suffering from disruption and disturbance that go well beyond that associated with usual renovation works and include (but are not limited to) initial boring and other tests, noise and vibration from excavation and piling, demolition, delivery and installation of concrete construction and all the associated traffic and nearby vehicular movement; 10. Environmental damage is self-evident; 11. Flask Walk is a narrow thoroughfare totally unsuited to the presence of diggers, rigs and rubbish skips; 12. The properties in Flask Walk were never intended for subterranean expansion especially where change of use to will lead to further vehicular congestion in an area already overly congested by vehicles competing for limited road use; 13. Character – we have concerns that the proposed renovations are not in keeping with the character of the of other properties in the neighbourhood; 14. Given the proximity of the our two properties and the nature of the excavation, we anticipate

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>endless noise, dust and disruption;</p> <p>15. The living room on the ground floor and rear bedrooms on the first and second floors of our house directly overlook/about the proposed development in an already congested living space so that the normal level of disruption brought about by a project of this nature will be exacerbated during the lengthy building stage and the prospect of having to endure ground vibrations, the sounds and tremors from a piling rig (or similar apparatus) etc will become tortuous;</p> <p>16. For all these reasons, we consider that the proposed development violates our Article 8 Human Rights Act (HRA) 1988 entitlement to private and family life and home;</p> <p>17. Moreover, the proposed development contravenes our right to peaceful enjoyment enshrined within Article 1 of the First Protocol.</p> <p>For all the above reasons we strongly object to the plans in connection with this application that contain nothing to assuage the concerns we have set out.</p> <p>I am happy to speak further on this matter to any representative of Camden Council or the owner of the relevant property.</p>
2015/3753/P	Anabelle Rodrigues	41 New Court cottage Lutton terrace	27/08/2015 12:35:24	OBJ	we believe that the works will have detrimental effect on the satiability of the other properties and that as a result the application is in breach of the Camden planning policy DP27.

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

2015/3753/P	Simon & Anna Marshall	73 Flask Walk Hampstead London NW3 1ET	27/08/2015 16:13:18	INT	
-------------	--------------------------	---	---------------------	-----	--

Dear Sirs

We wish to object to this planning application.

Some recent local applications have been approved even though the construction plan was problematic – the idea being to look at that aspect later. In this case the construction plan is almost certainly a physical impossibility and I believe that the planning application should be rejected now for that reason. Construction would cause untold chaos in Flask Walk for a long period of time. With several cubic metres of soil to remove, than several cubic metres of concrete to bring in there is simply no space for the truck movements, loading equipment and storage that would be required. Flask Walk has a 6ft width restriction and entry and egress of constructor's trucks would be highly difficult and would pose a significant safety risk, especially during the school run. 36 itself is located at one of the narrowest parts of Flask Walk. The suggested idea of constructors' vehicles moving each time to allow vehicles though is palpable nonsense.

The submitted traffic estimate (7.5 cars an hour?) should be regarded as unreliable. I have lived in Flask Walk for 30 years and the high traffic volume has always been an issue, raised regularly with the council by the Flask Walk Neighbourhood Association, of which I (Simon) am Treasurer. The twice-daily school run causes chaos and (occasionally) conflict. Flask walk is also used as a "rat run" by evening commuter traffic. In recognition of this and in order to attempt to rectify it Camden Council introduced a "No right turn" at the top of Back Lane into Heath St. This did not achieve the desired result and there is a queue of cars from the Heath Street exit as far back as Gardnor Road (ie most of the length of Flask Walk) most evenings. There is also a regular flow of delivery vans (supermarkets and online retailers).

The plan also entails removal of the front garden in order to create a light well. I believe that such removal contravenes Camden's guidelines.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3753/P	Richard Bauer	23 Flask Walk Hampstead London NW3 1HH	27/08/2015 12:17:20	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to the proposed basement excavation at 36 Flask Walk.</p> <p>The excavation project will cause considerable inconvenience to many residents of Flask Walk, made worse by the location being at the narrowest section of the road. Although the road is two cars wide, half of it is used to park cars leaving a single lane for traffic to pass through. As you are probably aware, this single traffic lane is so narrow that large trucks regularly get stuck - often damaging the parked cars. The road signs at the entrance to Flask Walk now advise that the maximum permitted width for vehicles is just 6 feet (183 cm). The proposed excavation will require many truck movements to remove the cuttings, and these are likely to require very large trucks, wider than 183cm. In addition, the location of 36 Flask Walk is opposite the entrance to Lakis Close, a community with several cars than require access to Flask Walk.</p> <p>Although sandwiched against a parking basement under 34 Flask Walk, there are considerable risks with excavating in this street. Many of the houses at the upper end of Flask Walk are Victorian, or earlier, and are built on clay banks with shallow foundations. Many of these do not have basements, and some have suffered from excavation projects (remember number 51?)</p> <p>Although 36 Flask Walk is an insignificant small house, it forms part of a terrace on the even numbered side of the road. Any attempt to retrofit a basement will cause an unnecessary noisy, dirty and generally unpleasant intervention to the currently peaceful area. The noise and vibration from the excavation process will be heard by residents for at least 100m in all directions. Many of the neighbours are resident during the daytime, some with children, others working from home. Their lives will be blighted by this selfish, unnecessary, noisy project.</p> <p>In my opinion, it appears to be just an attempt to increase the potential value of the property. If anyone seriously requires a house with a basement, there are already many available to buy in Hampstead, as any good estate agent would tell you. There is absolutely no justification for attempting to excavate a basement under this existing small terraced house. The inconvenience and disturbance to the existing neighbours, local residents and users of Flask Walk will be considerably greater than any potential benefit that the basement development could obtain. This ludicrous plan must be rejected.</p>
2015/3753/P	Cindy Galvim	3 Streatley Flats Streatley Place London NW3 1HR	26/08/2015 15:14:31	OBJEMPER	I am extremely concerned that this application has been submitted without requisite documentation showing that due and careful investigations were made into the impact the proposed construction would have on neighbouring properties. An independent engineer's report is being produced now and will be submitted shortly to highlight flaws in the application. The report underscores the concerns this proposal has caused among residents.
2015/3753/P	Daniel E. Smith	2 Lakis Close London NW3 1JX	26/08/2015 11:56:01	OBJLETTE R	Objection letter sent via email to planning officer Mr. Tendai Metusa.