

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/7022/P	Simon Legg	10b Eldon Grove London NW3 5PT	22/01/2016 18:20:27	OBJLETTE R	<p>We are the owners of 10b Eldon Grove, the house directly abutting the applicant's house at 10/10a Eldon Grove.</p> <p>Meetings have been had with our neighbours at numbers 10c and 10d and we have subsequently met with the applicants at 10 to discuss our objections.</p> <p>We strongly object to this planning application for the reasons set out below :-</p> <p>Our principal objection is to the basement aspect of this development and its impact on the stability of the surrounding ground and buildings both during and post construction.</p> <p>1. Not in-keeping: Number 10/10a lies in a conservation area and as such new developments are required to be sympathetic to existing buildings. We have concerns that the new designs for the extension at the location of 10a are not in keeping with the style of the traditional Victorian houses along Eldon Grove and may not meet this requirement of local Planning Policy - LDF DP24.</p> <p>2. The landscaping to the front as proposed seems bland and lacking in a retention of the 'green' look of the current front garden.</p> <p>3. Impact of Similar Local Developments: Planning consent has been granted for a nearby property at 30a Thurlow Road to demolish and rebuild the house with a basement - (Application 2013/1613/P). The owner of this property has submitted a further application (2015/5409/P) with revised plans increasing the size of the basement considerably. In addition, a planning application is well-advanced for a large basement development extending into and under the garden of 39 Rosslyn Hill (application 2014/5285/P).</p> <p>In this application, no documented consideration has been given to the potential combined impact of these three neighbouring works should they all proceed around the same time. Together they involve the excavation of over 1400 Tonnes of soil and clay which may threaten the structure of the area of land sloping from Eldon Grove to Rosslyn Hill. Furthermore if construction commences on all three sites at the same time, there will be major disruption and misery caused to local residents caused by the construction traffic convening on the junctions of Eldon Grove/Thurlow Rd and Rosslyn Hill.</p> <p>4. Threat to Structural Stability of Ground and Buildings: This new proposed development at 10/10a Eldon Grove, notably the basement, will pose a significant threat to the structure of not only the applicant's property but also that of mine 10b plus 10c and 10d due to us sharing the same 'raft foundation'.</p> <p>a. The stability of a deep excavation close to 10b Eldon Grove and its method of reinforcement have not been sufficiently assessed. The BIA assumes a basement excavation of 3 metres depth whereas the drawings of the proposed works (section 6) show the base of the excavations being some 6 metres below the ground level at the neighbouring wall of 10b and less than 1 metre horizontally from it. Such a high differential in foundation depths calls for high strength reinforcement to prevent ground movement. The BIA section 7 describing construction methods shows a retaining wall being formed by 'Hit and Miss' underpinning along some 11 metres of subterranean wall running parallel with the end wall of 10b. However, the BIA analyses the predicted strength of this retaining wall, the results of which strongly suggest it may not be fit for purpose.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

b. Section 8 of the BIA remarks that the design of the basement retaining wall will be very important in ensuring the basement is robust and threats to the neighbouring wall at 10b are minimised. Appendix F contains the strength calculations for the retaining wall. The results of this analysis show clear references to 'warning' and 'fail' with no further comment or qualification in the body of the BIA report.

c. The opposite subterranean vertical wall of the basement is to be formed by similarly underpinning a main supporting wall of the applicant's house at 10 Eldon Grove. This is shown in BIA section 7 setting out the temporary works and construction. It shows a two stage process forming a wall to a total depth of 4 metres below the existing house. This will require the removal of the original main supporting foundations over a length of 10 metres. These 'corbels' have been supporting this main wall in an undisturbed state for over 120 years. The analysis in the BIA does not sufficiently discuss the potential risks to the applicant's property of this particular method. It is well known that these Victorian houses are very prone to movement and there are nearby specific examples where relatively minor works, apparently undertaken with all due care, have led to subsidence and cracking not only to the main residence but adjoining properties too. It is concerning to see that the same retaining wall structure, referred to in 3.b., is also being proposed to underpin this section of wall.

d. As mentioned in section 2 above, the BIA report does not comment on the combined potential ground structural or hydrogeological effects should the two other nearby local basement constructions also proceed according to the plans submitted.

5. Inadequate Ground Reinforcement Method: The proposed basement development at 30a Thurlow Road, application 2015/5409/P, has a similar design profile. This involves an excavation of similar proportion, again at close proximity to a Victorian house (30 Thurlow Road). This application has been the subject of detailed engineering reviews and assessed in an independent BIA audit on behalf of Camden Planning. The conclusion was that underpinning and open excavation of exposed foundations is not reliable. It recommends the appropriate method for ground support and structural reinforcement is Contiguous Flight Auger (CFA) piling. This is the same conclusion drawn for the basement proposal at 39 Rossllyn Hill and the same technique used in recent the basement construction at 9 Downshire Hill. If the basement aspect of the development at 10 Eldon Grove is to proceed, on this analysis, the construction method should adopt a suitable system of steel reinforced piling with piles extending to at least 1.5 times the depth of the ground to be supported. We note that piling is indeed considered in the applicant's BIA report undertaken by GEA but not proposed in the construction methods statement.

6. Inconvenience to local residents and traffic: The construction of the extension and basement will create an unacceptable level of disruption in Eldon Grove and to the local residents in adjacent roads. According to the Construction Traffic Management Report (CTMP, TPHS), the construction phase will last 14 months, assuming all goes to plan. During this time some 600 m³ of building waste and spoil will be removed during the demolition phase and over 600 tonnes of concrete will be used in construction, the latter requiring delivery of up to 40 concrete mixer loads. The basement build will occupy a substantial part of the overall timeline taking up to 18 weeks involving around 3 HGV

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

Comment: **Response:**

deliveries every working day during this phase; an estimated 80 vehicle loads just to remove excavated material. The CTMP also shows the proposed flow of this construction traffic around Rosslyn Hill, Thurlow Road and Eldon Grove.

Our deep concern is that if the planning applications at 30a Thurlow Road and 39 Rosslyn Hill are granted and construction at these sites proceeds at a similar time, this could lead to three times the levels of traffic, noise and environmental impact.

7. Party Wall Agreement: We, together with our immediate neighbours at 10c and 10d Eldon Grove, put the parties concerned on notice that we would, if required, make full use of the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 to ensure the protection of our property which will apply as this application proposes to:

“...excavate, or excavate for and construct foundations for a new building or structure, within 6 metres of any part of a neighbouring owner"s building or structure, where any part of that work will meet a line drawn downwards at 45° in the direction of the excavation from the bottom of the neighbour"s foundations....you must inform the Adjoining Owner or owners by serving a notice”.

And as our Adjoining Owners" rights are described within the Act. They include the right to:

- appoint a surveyor to resolve any dispute (at the Building Owner’s expense);
- require reasonably necessary measures to be taken to protect their property from foreseeable damage and for their security;
- not to be caused any unnecessary inconvenience;
- be compensated for any loss or damage caused by relevant works;
- ask for security for expenses before you start work under the Act so as to guard against the risk of being left in difficulties if you stop work at an inconvenient stage.

8. The Site History Report is incorrect as it assumes that no changes have been made to the surrounding areas to number 10 since 1895 other than the 50’s built extension that forms the core of application. In fact houses 10b/c/d were built on the site of old garaging in 1978.

9. There is an assumption made within the BIA that the foundations of 10b/c/d are ‘at least the same depth as those of the lower ground floor for number 10’. They are not as a proper Survey of the foundations of 10b/c/d will show. The 1978 built foundations are significantly shallower.

We therefore hope that you will refuse Planning on this project in its current form pending further investigations that address all the areas we have asked to be considered as it would seem irresponsible to do otherwise.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/7022/P	ainger	9 Downshire Hill Hampstead London London NW3 1NR	23/01/2016 17:42:38	COMNOT	<p>Camden Planning mmApplication 2015/7022/P</p> <p>Dear Mr Whittingham</p> <p>From my experience as the owner of 8 Downshire Hill which is adjacent to 9 Downshire Hill where some years ago permission was granted at appeal for a 40 foot deep tripe basement 1 inch away from my regency gothic home I strongly object to the basement aspects of the above planning application on the following grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of the 20 foot deep basement will inevitably do damage to neighbouring homes which are very close to the site and the public benefit of the development is insufficient to outweigh the damage to neighbouring homes and the loss of amenity. 2) The level of damage will be made worse by the fact that the cost of proper piling and pre stressed beams which would be necessary to minimise damage to negligible on the Burland scale will not be commercially viable leading to too much damage to neighbours. Indeed a much cheaper solution is proposed which will lead to "slight" damage with cracks up to 0.5cms The BIA section 7 describing construction methods shows a retaining wall being formed by 'Hit and Miss' underpinning along some 11 metres of subterranean wall running parallel with the end wall of 10b. However, the BIA looking at the strength of this retaining wall suggest it may not be fit for purpose. The BIA goes on in Section 8 to say that the design of the basement retaining wall will be very important in ensuring the basement is robust and threats to the neighbouring wall at 10b are minimised. Appendix F contains the strength calculations for the retaining wall. The results of this analysis show clear references to 'warning' and 'fail' with no further comment or qualification in the body of the BIA report. 3) This could be mitigated by including the structural construction method statement of a contiguous piled wall with press stressed beams be included in any planning consent but since this is not Camdens' policy the application should be refused. We were fortunate in having such method statement included in a s106 with 9 Downshire Hill and it is only down to this that damage was minimised. Damage however was still substantial. As proposed damage would at best be "slight" with a high chance of significant damage 4) In addition, the development will not make a positive contribution to the area as the new designs for the extension at the location of 10a are not in keeping with the style of the traditional Victorian houses along Eldon Grove and may not meet this requirement of local Planning Policy - LDF DP24.The garden as planned is also not a positive contribution 5) Planning consent has aslo been granted for a nearby property at 30a Thurlow Road to demolish and rebuild the house with a basement - (Application 2013/1613/P). The owner of this property has submitted a further application (2015/5409/P) with revised plans increasing the size of the basement considerably. In addition, a planning application is well-advanced for a large basement development extending into and under the garden of 39 Rosslyn Hill (application 2014/5285/P). Together these will significantly detract from the amenity of numerous neighbours.

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

Unless a method statement is included in the planning consent with the criteria that damage should be restricted to “negligible” on the Burland scale. I urge you to refuse Planning on this project in its current form. If this is consented it is a licence to do significant damage to neighbours’ homes for no public benefit.

As stated above this could be avoided if damage was restricted to “negligible” on the Burland and an appropriate method statement ensuring this happened was included in any consent.

Without such a proviso the application should be rejected.

S D Ainger
