

From:
Sent: 24 September 2015 10:36
To: English, Rachel
Cc: Watson, Ed (C&E directorate); Planning; Jones, Phil (Councillor);
Currie, Tom (Councillor); Cooper,
Oliver (Councillor);
Oliver (Blueyonder)
Subject: ref 2015/4157/P
Attachments: exisiting depths of basement.pdf; existing basement depths plan
999-so2.pdf

Dear Rachel,

Subsequent to my email of last night and in order to further illustrate one of the points I made, I enclose the following 2 attachments that have been sourced from the existing plan 99-SO2 filed by the applicant.

One can clearly see, in the first attachment, that the existing depths of the basements are not uniform. In some areas it is 80.10 (I have indicated this in red frames)and in some areas it is 79.94.

Please also note that one measurement next to the veranda is shown erroneously at a depth of 79.92 (I have marked in a blue frame) whereas in reality a site visit will show that it is also at a depth of 80.1

You mention in your email that the applicant proposes actually to excavate uniformly at a depth of 79.72 and tells you that there will be no lowering of the internal basement. This is not the case has the existing plans show.

The proposed lowering of the depth will be in some areas 38 cm (80.1-79.72) + thickness of the slab + excavation so in reality the total excavation will need to be at depths ap 50 cm excavation.

I would be much obliged if you made the committee immediately aware of the entireties of this email.

I would like this email and the other emails to be displayed in the Camden Planning Portal today.

I look forward to your reply

Thank you

Best Regards

Oliver and family

From: Oliver Froment [[ma](#)]
Sent: 23 September 2015 23:36
To: 'English, Rachel'
Cc: 'Watson, Ed (C&E directorate)'; planning@camden.gov.uk; 'Jones, Phil (Councillor)'; 'Stark, Stephen (Councillor)'; 'Currie, Tom (Councillor)'; 'Cooper, Oliver (Councillor)'; 'Owens Tim'; 'Nusrat';

Oliver R. Froment (oliver@oliverfroment.co.uk)
Subject: VERY URGENT: ref 2015/4157/P
Importance: High

Application 2015/4157/P des not fall under Permitted Development

Dear Rachel,

Thank you for your email. I would like to bring your attention that on the drawing “existing basement 999/SO2 of 2010”, referred to in your email below, there are numerous areas within the footprint of the house that are currently shown at a floor depth of 80.10. The applicant clearly proposes in its drawing “proposed basement plan 999-AP4-03CL1” of September 2015 that at all the basement floor be levelled uniformly at a depth of 79.72.

Therefore and contrary to what is written in you email and what the applicant's agent tells you, **there will be a lowering of the internal basement floor and furthermore this will take place in many areas in the applicant's proposal**. The lowering will be of 18 cm (i.e.80.1 minus 79.72) not counting the thickness of the new proposed floor slab and the necessary ground excavation. In effect this will mean that the total depth of the excavations will be circa 30 cm.

The basement excavation areas of the internal area are very significant and they are marked in red cross-hatched patterns in the above enclosure “proposed basement excavation at proximity to...”.

Furthermore it is very clear from the above enclosure that the proposed excavation will be at very close proximity to the critically sensitive column which solely supports 10 Pilgrim's Lane flying freehold hence with possible very serious destabilising effect on my house. The structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties are at risk of being compromised contrary to DP 27. A few centimetres of excavation at close proximity to the column are enough to potentially totally destabilize the column by weakening its support. Trial pit have shown that the foundation of this column is not very deep or large at its base.

It is obvious from the above that engineering proposal will have to be provided in order to calculate and attempt to demonstrate that an engineering solution is possible. This is at the chore of the inquiry due to take place on January 26th with the Inspectorate.

What is absolutely clear is that we are dealing with an engineering operation and that therefore this application does NOT fall under permitted development.

Please also note that the applicant, as also pointed in my previous emails, proposes to excavate at a depth of 70 cm (plus slab thickness and ground preparation) a patio at close distance to the column and at level close to the water level observed by technical expert, Mr Eldred, structural engineer, during dry weather conditions in July 2014. This further necessitates an engineering appraisal.

I would be much obliged if you made the committee immediately aware of the entireties of this email.

I would wish also that this email and my previous emails be posted today on Camden's planning portal.

I look forward to hearing promptly from you.

Best regards,

Oliver and family

From: English, Rachel [<mailto:oliver@oliverfroment.co.uk>]
Sent: 23 September 2015 12:22

To: Oliver Froment
Subject: RE: ref 2015/4157/P

Oliver,

I can confirm (and the applicant's agent has also confirmed) that there is no lowering of the floor internally. The floor level remains at 79.72 which is as the existing drawings. The other figures shown on the existing drawings refer to sill heights and ceiling heights as per the legend on the drawing 999/S02.

Regards

Rachel

Rachel English
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1343

From: Oliver Froment [[mailto](#)]
Sent: 23 September 2015 12:21
To: English, Rachel
Cc: Planning; Watson, Ed (C&E directorate); Cardno, Steve; Jones, Phil (Councillor); Currie, Tom (Councillor); 'Linda Chung'; 'Owens Tim'; 'Nusrat';
Subject: ref 2015/4157/P

ref 2015/4157/P: Depth of proposed basement: request for cross section. Missing information

Dear Rachel,

The applicant says that there will be no basement excavation. During our conversation of this morning, you mentioned that the applicant has just given you their assurance that there will not be any excavations except those limited to a garden patio. I am concerned that all the information online suggests the contrary and this not only for the external part of the proposed basement excavation.

In order to prove his assertion, the applicant should provide detailed cross sections of the current depths of the existing basement before any decision is made (both on the east side, next to the driveway, where the utility room is located and the west side where the other bedrooms are located, next to 6 Pilgrim's Lane) and a corresponding set of cross section plans showing the proposed depths of the various excavations and this should be also posted on line.

For example, currently there are floors with various depths in the basement (e.g. 79.92, 80.10,...) and it is not clear at all if the applicant intend to level the basement floors and have one uniform level of floor or not and at what depth is intended scheme.

Please also note that since application 2015/4179/P has just been approved last week, this added application would generate further traffic bottleneck and safety matters in this narrow one way passage and therefore a traffic management scheme should be provided as well for review.

Thank you

Best regards,

Oliver and family

10 Pilgrim's Lane

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e- mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.