

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/5351/P	Stephen Connelly	52 Shirlock Rd	08/11/2015 20:57:09	OBJ	<p>I write as the owner of the ground floor flat at 52 Shirlock Rd - the direct neighbour of the land subject to the planning application 2015/5351/P (the "Application").</p> <p>I have read the Basement Impact Assessment prepared by Ashton Bennett (the "BIA") and will refer to its findings as appropriate.</p> <p>I object to the application because it will cause harm to the built and natural environment and local amenity, including to the local water environment, ground conditions and biodiversity.</p> <p>My reasons for this are as follows:</p> <p>1) Land stability: the land in the immediate are is very soft London Clay as the BIA notes. The London Clay has already caused subsidence at 52 Shirlock Rd. Indeed, we estimate that No.52 has tilted towards no.54 by some 10-15cm. We fear that any further excavation at no.54 will at least exacerbate this tilt if not cause the most serious structural damage.</p> <p>We note the BIA admits that damage to adjacent properties as a result of excavation is "likely" (p.34). This admission is made even on the basis of what the BIA admits is the most superficial assessment of the land at No.54. Given this finding, I cannot see how allowing the application would do otherwise than cause severe (category 3 or higher) damage to neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>2) Local hydrology: part of the reason for the softness of the clay is Shirlock Rd's proximity to the course of the River Fleet and related runoff from the Heath. We feel that any excavation will adversely affect the hydrology of the area.</p> <p>The BIA's assessment of the hydrology of the site is flawed. For example, the map on p.14 purporting to show aquifers and related water flows suggests nothing of interest in the Gospel Oak area, and specifically along Fleet Road and down Mansfield Rd, despite these being the course of the Fleet River. Indeed a pipe carrying this water off the Heath is visible crossing the railway cutting just south of Roderick Rd. This and repeated assertions that there are no notable concerns with regard to water in the BIA are highly dubious and call into question the reliability of the BIA. It is submitted that the BIA seriously underestimates the impact of the excavation with regard to water in the area.</p> <p>3) Groundwater: 52 Shirlock Rd sits downhill from no.54. The effects of sealing the excavation at no.54 from the inevitable infiltration of water from the local water courses will be to distort the natural dispersal of groundwater at all levels and pass this problem on to the land at no.52. In a sense we will be forced to pay to remedy the effects of no.54's excavation.</p> <p>In addition, the BIA admits that there is "potential for higher water runoff" (p.33) as a result of building over a significant part of the garden at no.54. Furthermore, it acknowledges this harm cannot be remedied.</p> <p>Again, given the BIA's dubious claims as to the hydrology of the area, you are kindly requested to</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

regard the BIA as seriously underestimating the impact of excavation on groundwater runoff.

4) Empirical evidence: no.52 like all houses on Shirlock Rd has a "basement" which is in fact nothing more than an old coal cellar. This is a tiny corridor from house front to the kitchen designed only for the passage of coal. It is narrow and of little utility. No.54 in all likelihood has this coal cellar, not a basement.

Apart from the change of use, as a matter of fact the coal cellar at no.52 is extremely damp (damp which does not rise out of the cellar because of damp-proofing). This dampness is a function of the hydrology of the area and would probably have been obvious to anyone inspecting the coal cellar at no.54. By excavating and waterproofing at No.54 (if effective), one can in all reasonableness expect an adverse effect on all coal cellars in the immediate vicinity, including a significant increase in damp if not flooding of coal cellars.

5) Previous works and effect of works on neighbours: Between 2005-07 the owner of no.54 renovated the house. Unfortunately it was felt that the garden party wall was not adequate. Without notice and while I was at work, the builders at no.54 kicked over the wall causing damage to a recently made up garden, and then proceeded to build a new wall. The clear aim was to achieve a fait accompli. After a complaint the owner of no.54 apologised in writing (though did not offer compensation), but I fear that this attitude will return during the proposed very serious works and the harm will not be so easily brushed aside.

6) Related applications: I note that several other neighbours have notified their objections to the Application. In particular I refer to the letter of objection of Mr D Kossoff at no.49 Shirlock Rd and, without prejudice to the above statements, support the claims made their. I also note the objections made or to be made by Mr A Burkart of the 1st floor flat of 52 Shirlock Rd.

In conclusion and for the reasons stated above, including the admitted likelihood of severe damage to neighbouring properties, I submit that it would be unreasonable to let the Application proceed. I therefore humbly request that you reject the Application.

---