Applica	tion No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Finited on.	14/10/2015	09.05.18
2015/468	84/P	Meir Elias	68 Elsworthy Road NW3 3BP	05/10/2015 20:19:11	OBJ	RE: Planning Application 2015/4684/P This planning application seeks to demolish and extend the existing hous taking the square footage of the property from under 9000 sq ft to almost			

I am objecting to this planning application on four grounds.

Firstly, the size of the basement is far in excess of Camden's planning guidelines.

"Larger basement developments, such as those of more than one storey in depth or which extend outside of the footprint of the building, can have a greater impact than smaller schemes. Larger basement developments require more extensive excavation resulting in longer construction periods and greater numbers of vehicle movements to remove the spoil. These extended constructions can have a significant impact on adjoining neighbours through noise, vibration, dust, and traffic and parking issues. Larger basements can have a greater impact on the water environment by reducing the area for water to run off and soak away. Basement development that extends below garden space can also rescue the ability of the garden to support trees and other vegetation leading to poorer quality trees and a loss in amenity and the character of the area. The councils preferred approach is therefore for basement development not to extend beyond the footprint of the original building...Proposals for basement development that take up the whole front and/or rear garden of a property are very unlikely to be acceptable." Camden planning guidance, basements and lightwells, July 2015, p.8-10.

 $D_{min} = \frac{14}{10} \frac{14}{2015}$ 

00.05.10

As noted in your own guidelines there are numerous valid reasons that a basement should not extend beyond the footprint of the house. Yet in this planning application the new basement will be 11,152 sqft. It covers most of the rear and front garden, and extends far, far beyond the footprint of the original home. In fact it is well over double the size of the footprint. This is a clear contravention of Camden's policy on basements detailed above.

My second objection relates to the depth of the proposed basement, which again is in direct contravention of Camden's planning guidelines. "The Council's preferred approach is for basement development to be...no deeper than one full storey below ground level (approximately 3 metres in depth)." Camden planning guidance, July 2015 p.8. The proposed basement development is over 5 metres in depth; the lift shaft is well over 6m deep. It comprises of two floors underground. The depth of the basement does not comply with Camden's guidelines.

My third objection is based on the noise, dust and air pollution that would be created by the demolition and building work.

"Some of the worst problems affecting amenity are experienced during the demolition and construction phases of development. Although this is temporary, it tends to create noise, vibration, dust, air and light pollution and can last for lengthy periods of time". Camden planning guidance, basements and lightwells, July 2015, p.34

I am 88 years old, I rarely leave my home. My favourite place to sit is by the window of my front room watching out over the calm and quiet street I have lived in for over 30 years. But if my neighbours are allowed to demolish their home and add 16,102 sq ft to their property this will require an extensive period of construction. During this time I will be subjected to noise, dust, vibrations, loss of air quality, traffic issues. The peace and quiet of my window seat will be entirely lost and there will be a detrimental effect to the quality of my life.

As you are aware, my home at 68 Elsworthy Road is within a conservation area. My fourth concern regards the extremely large and beautiful horse chestnut tree in my garden. This tree is mentioned on the tree report prepared by Arbol Euro Consulting as T4. This tree consultant has not visited my property and therefore the size of the root protection area for this tree as shown in Appendix 2 is based on a guess. I have had this tree measured and the root protection area is a radius of 12.6m from the centre of this tree. The radius of the RPA incorrectly shown in Appendix 2 is approximately half the full radius. The actual RPA overlaps significantly with the proposal development and therefore this proposal endangers this important tree. If permission for this proposal is granted then a historic tree may be lost forever.

I am not convinced that the location of this tree has been correctly placed on the plan. It may be closer to boundary wall with 70 Elsworthy than depicted on the plan. This could certainly impact the proposals, and it should be measured on site, and redrawn if necessary, before a decision is made regarding planning.

Furthermore, if this tree report is able to misjudge third party trees so significantly, I would urge you not to rely on the accuracy of this tree report with regard to the other third party trees.

I would like my daughter to have the opportunity to attend committee on my behalf. Kindly keep me updated of the details of this.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objections.

2015/4684/P	Francoise Findlay	1 Lower Merton	13/10/2015 12:15:50 OBJEMAIL	Elsworthy Residents Association has concerns with the extent of basement excavation in the
	Chairman	Rise		conservation area and has joined CRAAC in order to tighten the Camden policy. The proposed
	Elsworthy	NW33RA		basement far exceeds the size of any other in the area and stretches far beyond the footprint of the
	Residents			proposed new house. Despite the attached professional reports the amount of excavation necessitated
	Committee			on the site remains a huge concern. The proposed garden above the basement will be compromised for
				the future. Please refuse this application until it is reduced to below the footprint of the house.