

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Karyn Ray [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 August 2015 16:40  
**To:** Mutasa, Tendai  
**Subject:** Planning Application for 36 Flask Walk

Dear Tendai,

I am writing to lodge an official objection to the planning application above.

New End Primary School will be directly affected and yet the school was not officially informed of this application. I note from the planning application notes that the application was lodged after the school broke for the summer holiday period. As the school is closed due to building works for staff, we have not received mail since we broke up on Friday, 17th July. I can only assume that Camden's notification about the application will be received on our return next week.

In the meantime, please would you confirm whether the school can add a further objection to the application.

Best wishes

Karyn Ray  
Headteacher

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Mark Chapman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 August 2015 18:15  
**To:** Mutasa, Tendai  
**Cc:** Penny Fitzpatrick  
**Subject:** Planning App. Ref 15/3753/P 36 Flask Walk, NW3 1HE

Dear Mr Mutasa

I write with regard to the above planning application.

My wife, Penny Fitzpatrick and I are the owners of 27 Flask Walk, which is the house obliquely opposite number 36. Having examined this planning application in some detail, we feel we have to object to the owner's plan to excavate a basement.

In our opinion, the works would be enormously extensive for such a relatively small the gain in living space, and would cause considerable disruption to the area. As you are aware, Flask Walk is a very narrow street, although it is nominally two way at this point. Congestion in the area is common enough, but with the kind of work they will need to do, and for time it will take, the inconvenience to local residents, and to passing traffic will be disproportionately high.

In addition, the owners have already gained permission to add another storey to their house, and this we feel extends what is by design, a small property, in a sensible way. Especially given the height of the adjacent houses.

My wife and I are not people who object to proposed building and development work on a point of principle, as some people in Hampstead seem to do. Indeed we have not objected to any of the works carried out around our house over the past few years. We try to look carefully at what is being proposed, the way it will impact on the area from a design point of view and the inevitable inconvenience caused by construction. We then try to make a fair judgement as to whether we feel an objection is reasonable. In this case, although we fully acknowledge there will be no discernible visual change to the house once the work is completed, we genuinely feel that the scale of the excavation and massive disruption it will cause, will adversely affect both the area and local people in a way that is unfair.

Of course we would be more than happy to discuss our objection in more detail, but wanted for the moment just to log our concerns with you.

With kind regards

Yours sincerely

Mark Chapman (and Penny Fitzpatrick)

\*\*\*\*\* TIGER ASPECT PRODUCTIONS \*\*\*\*\*

MR BEAN THE ANIMATED SERIES: Weekdays 09.25 & 16.15 on CITV

RIPPER STREET SERIES 3: Fridays 21:00 on BBC One

The preceding e-mail message (including any attachments) contains information that may be confidential, may be protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privileges, or may constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated

recipient(s) named above. If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete all copies of it from your computer system. Any use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

**Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries**  
**Comments on a current Planning Application - Ref. 10213119**

---

**Planning Application Details**

Year 2015  
Number 3753  
Letter P  
Planning application address 36 Flask Walk

Title Dr.  
Your First Name Christopher  
Initial C  
Last Name Eve  
Organisation  
Comment Type Object

Postcode NW3 1HH  
Address line 1 49 Flask Walk  
Address line 2 LONDON  
Address line 3

Postcode NW3 1HH  
E-mail   
Confirm e-mail   
Contact number 

Your comments on the planning application

We object very strongly to the proposal to excavate a basement under no. 36 Flask Walk because of the disruption and damage to the local environment its construction will cause, which will be far in excess of that claimed in the application documents.  
We do not object in principle to extensions or home improvements and although we would not like to live in a space aflooded withâ so very little natural light, we do not object to the plans themselves (and made no objection to the recent proposal for a Mansard Roof extension at the same address).

## Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries Comments on a current Planning Application - Ref. 10213119

---

### Planning Application Details

We object only to the impossibility of executing them without very severely disrupting the lives of so many people who live in or who use the neighbourhood.  
[PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT]

If you wish to upload a file containing your comments then use the link below

[Objection to 36 basement](#)

### About this form

Issued by	Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 9JE
Form reference	10213119

## **Objection to Planning Application 2015/3753/P (excavation of a basement at 36 Flask Walk) by the residents of 49 Flask Walk**

We object very strongly to the proposal to excavate a basement under no. 36 Flask Walk because of the disruption and damage to the local environment its construction will cause, which will be far in excess of that claimed in the application documents.

We do not object in principle to extensions or home improvements and although we would not like to live in a space "flooded with" so very little natural light, we do not object to the plans themselves (and made no objection to the recent proposal for a Mansard Roof extension at the same address).

We object only to the impossibility of executing them without very severely disrupting the lives of so many people who live in or who use the neighbourhood.

### The Neighbourhood

The neighbourhood includes private and social housing in about equal proportions, and is characterised by very narrow streets and sharp corners. Flask Walk itself has a width restriction of 6 ft.

Flask Walk is used intensively by families bringing their children to and from school, and is also the main pedestrian thoroughfare for those from all over London walking between public transport in the High Street and Hampstead Heath. Commuters also use the route at rush hour.

### Our Household

We are a family consisting of my mother, my wife and myself, and our son. We moved here in 1967 and our son is now the only third generation resident in the street.

My mother, Betty, is 89 years old, bedridden and disabled, and lives in a specially adapted room fronting onto the street a few yards below the proposed building site. She cannot move into a back room as all the back rooms are much too small to be adaptable to her needs.

Betty will have to put up with the noise and dust of drilling through the concrete raft that we believe the proposer has not yet discovered or is keeping quiet about; of the excavations; and of the many hundreds of lorries that will block the road for, the building engineers in our Neighbourhood Association estimate, a year or more.

It will be especially trying for Betty, because it will bring back such bad memories of the time when our next door neighbour site-managed the complete demolition and rebuilding of her house so incompetently over 3 years that the site made a full page article in the national press.

### The Proposal

The proposal is what one might expect from one who worked for Lehmann Brothers.

It appears professionally incompetent, but by a strange coincidence all of the errors in it tend to underestimate the disruption and chaos it will cause. Some of the errors to consider:

1. The amount of soil to be used in "landscaping" is given as 5%; but (a) this is subsoil that could never be used for landscaping, and (b) there is nowhere to landscape in any case.
2. The 5% "bulking" figure given is completely unrealistic. 30% is generally accepted as normal.
3. Access. This is the biggest problem. It says that lorries will stop at the "entrance", but in fact they will have to stop in the street, completely blocking it. The width of the road from the kerb to the edge of the parking bay is only 6 ft, so even if the whole bay is reserved there will not be room for cars to pass.
4. The Access Route. The proposed route through New End is unworkable for lorries. The whole length is narrow, the entrance would need a parking bay permanently suspended, and turn into Flask Walk is much too sharp for lorries. Using New End and would endanger children going to the very large Primary School sited off Flask Walk.
5. The proposal that lorries will reverse to let cars past is ridiculous. They would have to reverse a long way down the very narrow road while the queue of cars would also have to reverse to let them past.

#### Concluding Plea

We hope that the Planning Committee will not take the lackadaisical approach of approving the alterations subject to a satisfactory traffic management plan, since the whole problem of the proposal is that there is no possibility of an acceptable Traffic Management Plan.

The Proposal can only be executed at the expense of huge disruption over a long period to the whole neighbourhood and the many tens of thousands of people who use it.

Dr C Eve, Dr E Eve, Mrs B Eve, Mr TL Eve