

Comments on planning ref 2015/3049/P Umiak Mahoupe 49 Calthorpe Street.

1) 51 Calthorpe Street is a 'positive contributor' to the conservation area.*

It looks good, and is harmonious with the listed terrace beside it. Future developments nearby could mean that these areas of historic interest become rarer and rarer. The high roof proposed will look out of place, as well as the light-wells for the six underground flats.

(*Page 150 of the Bloomsbury CA statement)

2) Threat to listed buildings.

The proposed basement excavation- a basement under the existing basement will endanger the listed building adjoining 51 and the whole listed terrace.

3) The 'made ground' .

The engineers who dug a hole this year at 51 were called AF Howland.

They dug down 15 metres and still found no clay.

The ground was all soft and moving. You could see the gravel and wet mud. Other engineers reports have mentioned the 'made ground' and the 'mound of shale'.

4) Basements extensions now 'on hold' in Kensington.

Since the out-break of court-cases in Kensington, Camden now have a draft plan to ban digging basements under basements in this borough. The draft plan has not yet been adopted. However it is indicative of the new trend to limit underground developments, due to the many problems cases in London.

I attach a 'Ham and High article of march this year.

If the draft plan goes through, the new basement for 51 will be banned anyway.

I attach the relevant section of the Camden Draft Local Plan 2015.

4) Basement Impact Assessments

I quote from the draft local plan:

Basement Impact Assessments must contain a non-technical summary of the evidence that applicants have gathered against each stage of the assessment. This should be presented in a format which can be fully understood by those with no specialist technical knowledge in these matters.

5) The Basement Impact Assessment for 51

This document is three volumes and 140 pages long. It is hard for anyone to decipher what it means.

6) River Fleet

In the B I A vol 1 there is a table on page 12 and page 14. It is claimed that the site is NOT within 100 metres of a watercourse. It mentions the Fleet as being 'culverted'. Now the engineers reports of 1985, where measurements were made from 51 down to 45, showed the ground getting wetter and wetter towards 45. These engineers (sent by Camden), said that there was slippage towards the wet ground in the garden of 45, and they recommended underpinning the whole terrace, which was not done.

If you cross the road and look at the terrace, you can see this tendency. 45 lists down to the West and 49 list down to the East.

7) 1990's

It was in the 1990's, when the Holiday Inn was built that no 51 slipped to the East and all its window arches broke. My house no 49 slipped at that time also; and its top wall (adjoining 51) became bowed. The crookedness is visible.

8) More about the Basement Impact Assessment

Vol 1 page 23 of the new BIA shows an Assessment of Impacts Table.

Boxes 3,7,13 all show that movement could affect the neighbouring building.

9) Further danger to curtilage structures.

My old victorian brick underground vault is under my garden, and it is joined to the garden wall of 49/51. Any digging down will certainly have a deleterious effect.

10) All or nothing

The only way to stabilise 51, 49, 47, and 45 would be to underpin all four buildings together. I own 49, Camden Council owns 47, and Camden is the freeholder of 45. Jonathan Avis (Leaseholder of lower flat at 45) might well agree to co-operate with underpinning the whole row, if that is necessary.

11) The two story metal roof at the rear.

This very high two floor roof will be visible from the street from Pakenham Street. And from the gardens of 4,5,6,7 and more of Pakenham St. It is high, zinc covered (steel? one or the other). It is over-sized, and not in character.

12) Sub-standard lower flats

51 is to contain 17 flats, of which the top one is to be a luxury pent-house (for the owner I hear) Of the remaining sixteen, six of them are below ground, in what is described as a 'water-tight concrete box'.

These flats have no windows as we know them. This accommodation would be sub-standard.

13) Misleading language

Mr Firth (owner of 51) describes his basement as a lower-ground floor. It is 1.3 metres lower than mine, and mine is a real basement. He is wanting to build a basement below an existing deep basement

14) Misleading drawings.

The drawings of the rear elevations all show the level of my garden much lower than it really is. It makes the hole he is digging look less deep.