

APPLICATION REFERENCE: 2015/3753/P

ADDRESS: 36 Flask Walk, London NW3 1HE

PROPOSAL: Creation of a new basement floor with front lightwell and alterations on rear grounds floor fenestration

FURTHER OBJECTION: David and Francine Altaras, 46-48 Flask Walk, London NW3 1HE.

Further Objection

The developers have submitted further documents to Camden. We address them in this document, which should be read in conjunction with our original objection.

For the reasons set out in our original objection, we continue to object to this application which is yet another basement excavation proposed or undertaken in Camden and in particular in the vicinity of Flask Walk. Like many of our neighbours, we view this application as totally unnecessary and unneighbourly. Although we find the revised CMP more acceptable than the original version, it does not obviate the various problems that we originally identified. The development, if permitted, will inevitably cause disruption and loss of amenity through noise, dust and highway disturbance both by itself and in conjunction with the other basement developments (for example, New End) recently granted permission.

An extraordinary number of vehicular movements is still estimated to occur along this unusually narrow street, bringing with it the problems of highway disruption and loss of residential amenity identified in our original objection. Thus, according to the CMP (rev 2), the average number of Transit Vans moving or delivering general builders' materials from/to the site is estimated as 3 vans a week when the job first starts for a period of 3 weeks then declining to 2 a week or even 2 every 1-2 weeks. However, it is estimated in the same

document that 145m³ of spoil in total would be removed from site which would require 7-10 van loads per week for a period of 18 weeks (4.5 months).¹

Moreover, we note that there is further exploratory work to be undertaken with respect to potential historical slope movement: see item 5 of the developer's response to Campbell Reith. We suggest that the issue of historic slope movement is fundamental to the acceptability of this application. We invite Camden to reject the suggestion that the exploratory work be postponed until after permission is granted. It is unclear how postponement would assist the developers. If problems were revealed, the work in any event could not commence. If no problems were revealed, the developers would be in no worse position than they are in now.

Finally, there is a suggestion in the CMP (rev 2) that work might continue between the hours of 18.00 – 8.00 Mon to Fri when there would be a noise level of 55 dbA and “at all other times” (which must include Sundays) when there would be a noise level of 50 dbA. Any working after 18.00 on weekdays, after 13.00 on Saturdays or on Sundays is totally unacceptable.

Conditions/Section 106 agreement

If, contrary to our objections, Camden are minded to grant this application, then, we make the following submissions:

1. Community liaison: Community liaison should be with three members of the Flask Walk Residents Association. They would form the Construction Working Group, who would pass complaints from residents to the contractors and with whom the contractors should meet at regular intervals to discuss any revision to their plans and associated matters and/or to deal with any such complaints. We suggest that

¹ It is suggested that vans carrying materials to the site could be used to transport materials from the site. While that might occur on the odd occasions, it certainly could not be guaranteed in the majority of cases.

an appropriate model for inclusion in a s106 would be clause 4.2 of the s106 agreement between Karawana Holdings and Camden (the 29 New End Development). The suggestion in the CMP (rev 2) under the rubric “Community Liaison” “Construction Working Group” is unacceptable.

2. No work must commence on site until Camden has approved a final CMP. That prohibition should be a requirement of either a planning condition or of a s106 agreement.
3. The final CMP must reflect the CMP (rev 2) so far as concerns the following:
 - The method of bringing plant and material to site and removing spoil.
 - The types and size of the vehicles to be used in those operations.
 - The storage of materials.
 - The removal of spoil.
 - The way in which the substructure excavation works will be undertaken. (We make no comment on the construction sequence or method, but whatever method is finally chosen, the excavation works should be undertaken as suggested in the revised CMP – in other words hand held power tools etc.)
 - The suspension of residents’ parking bays.
4. Under no circumstances should the matters contained in the original CMP be brought forward to the final CMP.
5. The final CMP should not be approved until such time as the Construction Working Group have had sight of it and provided comments to the case officer. The case officer should take all such comments into account when deciding whether or not to approve the final CMP.
6. No work should commence until Camden has approved the contractor selected by the developers, who must have proven experience of undertaking basement excavations in a residential area.

7. No work should commence until Camden has approved a suitably qualified Chartered Engineer with membership of an appropriate professional body appointed to inspect, approve and monitor the permanent and temporary basement construction works throughout their duration.