

10/11/15

Dear Sirs

I live at number 50B Shirlock Road and wish to lodge an objection to the planning application submitted by 54 Shirlock Road.

Shirlock Rd is in the Mansfield conservation area with Victorian terrace houses which are all in very close proximity to each other, number 54 has already had quite a few refurbishments before Mrs & Mrs Kay bought the property it was owned by a gentleman called Frances, who spent a whole year refurbishing it with major building works. Mr and Mrs Kay acquired the property and promptly started a new building project which also took a whole year with lots of noise and disruption, with builders starting working very early and also towards the end of the project working all day Saturday and Sunday.

Victorian houses are not designed for huge basements for sub terrain living. The properties in Shirlock Road are built on clay and digging out with a digger, industrial power tools etc. will make a horrendous amount of noise, and will cause damaged to the adjoining properties.

The original footprint of the house is quite large already with an existing extension at the back, the planning asked for is much larger and will cause greater disruption and as far as I am aware the Councils' policy is not to grant this. We at number 50 have already had trouble with subsidence and have steel elbows fitted to the front bay windows.

Number 54 is in a run of four houses all connected, number 56 is one whole family property while numbers 50 and 52 are all split into three flats with people who work from home and also families with young children and babies.

I also make reference for the reasons stated in Mr Kossoff's letter of objection dated 5<sup>th</sup> November object to the planning application.

Please think of the environmental impact and the stress on the neighbours when making your decision!

Thank you

Annie Scott-Horne and Gary Stephens

MRS DELORES MEERE  
56 SHIRLOCK ROAD  
HAMPSTEAD NW3 2HS

[REDACTED]

8-11-15

To London Borough of Camden

Town Hall Judd St

WC1H8ND

Attn. Jennifer Chivers

Dear Madam

**Re planning Application Ref 2015/5351/P**

In reply to your letter dated 21<sup>st</sup> October, I write to object to the proposed development on the following grounds :-

From the drawings which are not clear it appears that the development will obstruct and take light from my garden.

The rebuilding of the garden appears to be raising the levels and hence will be overlooking my garden.

The development is a complete contradiction of the "Mansfield conservation stated policy" and should not be granted as the proposed development will be the 1<sup>st</sup> and set a precedent for the rest of the conservation area.

A development of this size will have a project time of a minimum of a year the noise and disruption will be intolerable. If granted I will seriously need to consider moving out for the duration of the works.

There are serious contradiction within the assessment, the drawings show underpinning and piles this will require major mechanical plant to form the construction, while the assessment refers to the work in the basement will "generally need hand tools", clearly this will not be the case.

For the above reasons I strongly object to the proposed development

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Mrs D Meere

Daniel Kossoff 49 Shirlock Road London NW3 2HR

Date 5 November 2015  
Camden Planning Department  
Development Management Team  
Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London  
WC1H9JE  
Reference 2015/5351/P

Dear Sirs,

54 Shirlock Road London NW32HR- Reference 2015/5351/P

1. This letter refers to the above referenced planning application and is an objection to it. The objection is based on various grounds.
2. It is not possible from the plans to form a clear impression of what the appearance of the rear of the building will be after the development. However, what is clear is there will no longer be anything that looks remotely like a Victorian back addition. The Planning Design Statement prepared by Gundry & Ducker seeks to persuade the reader that the changes in the appearance of the rear of the building, which are on any objective basis significant departures from the original Victorian building resting in a conservation area, are not objectionable because modifications have already been made to the rear of the building. The existing rear is clearly a Victorian back addition in substance. The existing modifications are small. The Planning Design Statement puffs up the existing changes. The proposal effectively produces something nothing like the Victorian original. It should not be allowed in a conservation area. Having said that I would not be objecting to the back extension were it not coupled with the basement proposals. I recognise that there is precedent for similar back extensions.
3. As the authority will be aware the streets in the Mansfield Conservation area are unusually narrow. The terraced housing is also unusually narrow; indeed the writer has never observed an example of four story Victorian terraces, which are as narrow. In addition parking is, as is usually the case in Camden, very restricted. The author understands from that the owners of the subject property will not reside in the house for one year during the carrying

out of the works. Granting of this planning permission will, during that year, make the life of neighbors intolerable. This will particularly be the case for the adjacent neighbors. They will not be able to live normally in their properties for that year. They will suffer intolerable vibration and noise during the day including Saturdays. There will then be significant damage to their properties inflicted by the project that will be disruptive to their lives during repair. The Basement Impact Assessment takes no account, in its assessment of this disruption, of the extreme closeness of this terraced housing. The immediate neighbors are living within inches of the development and this is what makes this a special case. The Basement Impact Assessment makes much play of the proposition that, "while working in the basement the work generally requires hand tools to be used" (page 56 of the report). This statement appears helpful to a concerned neighbor, but is actually, on reflection, plainly a statement that can only give cosmetic assurance. A more helpful statement, which would enable assessment of the true level of disturbance and on which the Council should insist, would be one that specified the number of hours during which power tools will be used. My opinion is that power tools will be used significantly enough to be very disturbing.

4. Camden has issued some guidance on the topic of basement developments called "CPG4 Basements and lightwells" from which I quote below:

*"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 construction impacts can have a significant impact on adjoining neighbours through disturbance through noise, vibration, dust, and traffic and parking issues. Larger basements also can have a greater impact on the water environment by reducing the area for water to runoff and soak away. Basement development that extends below garden space can also reduce the ability of that garden to support trees and other vegetation leading to poorer quality gardens and a loss in amenity and the character of the area.*

*The Council's preferred approach is therefore for basement development to not extend beyond the footprint of the original building and be no deeper than one full storey below ground level (approximately 3 metres in depth). The internal environment should be fit for the intended purpose, and there should be no impact on any trees on or adjoining the site, or to the water environment or land stability. Larger schemes, including those consisting of more than one storey in depth or extending beyond the footprint of the above ground building, will be expected to provide appropriate evidence to demonstrate to the Council's satisfaction that the development does not harm the built and natural environment or local amenity."*

It is clear from the guidance that the Council prefers basements that do not extend beyond the original footprint. This one does at least at the rear. The reasons for the Council's preference are important. It is clear from CPG4 that one reason is that larger developments cause greater disruption. The Council has a policy, which clearly considers the issues raised by me in 3 above. This application should not be granted in violation of the Council's stated preference. The issue is particularly important for

this application given the points made in 3 above and the fact that, given narrowness of the road and the terraced housing itself, disruption will be unusually severe. Eye-balling the plan about a third of the proposed basement is beyond the original footprint so this is not an immaterial point. Every one per cent increase in the size of the basement, beyond the Council's preference, is a one per cent increase in the duration of the agony of neighbours and this is a ground requiring rejection of this application in accordance with the Council's stated policy. It is worth noting that the basement dig out at 28 Sherlock Road, which is the only one actually within Sherlock Road of which I am aware, was, from the planning application, only beneath the original house and not even the original back extension. Basement developments are controversial; what is the point of developing a policy to meet that controversy, to balance the interests of developers and neighbours, and then to apply the policy other than in a tough manner.

5. The document described as "CIL" forming part of the application is uncompleted and unsigned. If this is a required part of the application the incomplete form is a ground for the rejection of the application.

6. Finally I hope it can be taken as given that the pre planning discussions which have taken place have not fettered the discretion of the Council, either legally, but more importantly as a matter of objectivity of judgment, to consider the application after hearing objections.

Yours Faithfully

Daniel Kossoff



Dear Sirs

Re: Planning Application: 2015/5351/P

For the reasons stated in Mr Kosoff's letter of objection dated 5 November 2015 we, being a resident of 51 Shirlock Road, object to the above referenced planning application.

The houses in these roads are on clay and move during the year with cracks in walls opening and closing. We are worried that this kind of major change to the foundations will disrupt the buildings' natural movement which could result in serious damage. Please can Camden Planning Department advise us on who will be responsible for any repairs that might occur to adjacent houses post development should these plans go ahead.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully

Jonathan and Jane Gibbon  
51 Shirlock Road, NW3 2HR