

Gentet, Matthias

From: Smithson, Annette
Sent: 11 December 2015 08:55
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application Ref. 2015/4547/P. 13 A Langland Gardens, NW3

FYI

Regards

Annette Smithson
CSO
Culture and Customers
Culture and Environment
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 1630
Web: camden.gov.uk
1st Floor
Roy Shaw Centre
3-5 Cressy Road
London NW3 2ND

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Linda Chung [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: 10 December 2015 20:59
To: Gracie, Ian; Planning and Public protection
Subject: Planning application Ref. 2015/4547/P. 13 A Langland Gardens, NW3

Dear Mr Gracie

I write as a resident in the house adjoining no 13A, to object as follows:

1. The loss of some privacy to my neighbours in the garden flat of no 15, in particular the addition of extra doors and windows to the side elevation facing hers. The current private passageway would become a thoroughfare for residents in the proposed new basement flat.
There is no need for a side entrance as it could be accessed from the front door as is, and could be designed as such.
2. Our area has notorious soil foundations of Hampstead clay and Bagshot sands which means it is prone to subsidence and damp problems. Most houses in the road show signs of cracks and warping in various rooms. The external pathways and walls have shown signs of movement. My neighbour's flat already suffers considerable damp which has been a continuing and expensive problem.

The BIA has not acknowledged or shown the potential damage to adjoining buildings, which may not manifest themselves immediately, caused by the excavation work.

3. There is no CMP to accompany the application.
4. Though the proposal is described as "excavation of existing basement", there is still considerable excavation in order to create the two-bedroom basement flat as a completely new floor addition and residence to the house.

5. In particular I object to the extra extensive excavation to the front of the house. The applicant told me that he had not wanted or needed the larger lightwell, it was something the architect had suggested, I understand he thinks the current lightwell is adequate, and he had not wanted or needed it to be so extensive.

I would have less objection to the application if it was amended not to include the excavation to the front of the house.

This would lessen the considerable impact of the construction work, and the potential subsidence problems caused to adjoining houses.

Please keep me informed regarding this application.

Kind regards

Linda Chung