

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3593/P	J Durdin	27 Denning Road Hampstead NW3 1ST	28/02/2016 17:23:51	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to this application.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There has already been much disturbance to residents of Denning Road while work has taken place on this house, and it is unreasonable for us to put up with any more. Disturbance includes noise and dust and dirt, and concerns about residents cars while skips and building materials are delivered and removed. Parking space is lost (often to vehicles that appear to have no permit) and the road has been blocked.2. Hampstead is well known for underground water, so it is not safe to dig down, especially to create a basement the significant size of the full footprint of the extended house. The applicant has failed to demonstrate, as required, that the work will not destabilise the surrounding area. In an area of tall terraced houses, this is just too risky.3. There is no adequate Construction Management Plan.4. There is no indication of how a cinema room would be properly accoustically insulated.5. A cinema room is in no way a necessary living space, so there is no good reason to create upheaval and risk to neighbours.6. The application is for a basement cinema the size of the footprint of the extended house. This is enormous for domestic use and raises concerns about the real use of the room.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3593/P	oliver froment	10 PILGRIM'S LANE	28/02/2016 16:41:39	COMMNT	<p>1- I am not sure why this apparently new application is filed now and includes a letter addressed to the Camden Planning department dated 17th June 2015 whilst there is a BIA Audit instruction dated: 28/01/2016 for consultation ended 16/02/2016?. If it was the case that the previous BIA was deemed improper by Camden, then the application should have been refused and a new one filed in. This is all the more curious that in section C of the audit I noticed that the applicant has paid a fee of £ 997.50 to Camden on 28/01/2016</p> <p>2- I notice that for example on question 6 of the BIA it is stated that “Denning road is not mapped as being at risk from surface water flooding”. That seems totally incorrect according to the URS report commissioned by Camden. This is all the more curious that in question 1 CET, the author of the BIA makes reference to this very report.</p> <p>3- Please also note that on April it did not rain either. So both boreholes measurements were executed on days without rain fall not only on the day but also on the prior day. This is an unreliable and incorrect way to measure the conductivity of the soil re: water/ain flow. You should have days of heavy rain at the time and immediately prior at least in one serie.</p> <p>4- Among other dubious professional standards, I found in appendix C, page 27 of the BIA paragraph 3 monitoring of excess movements “every 2 weeks and the reading provided to the Engineer within 3 days of the reading” and variation in excess of 3mm a joke. This monitoring should be ongoing and certainly on at least a daily basis. I hear that some systems exist whereby the site manager and/or the engineer are alerted real time if movements exceeding a predetermined level occur.</p> <p>If you have a crack in excess of 3mm occurs on day 1 and you are given a two week lead time to read it, chances are that avoidable severe damage may already have happened to your property two weeks later.</p> <p>5- I also note that there are so many faulty information in the BIA as per the analysis of both Mr Eldred and de Freitas that this application should be rejected outright.</p> <p>The amount and substance of faulty information and the predicted damage are such that this application should be fully rejected at once.</p> <p>No section 106 should be considered under the current application either in view of the amount and substance of faulty and missing information.</p> <p>Oliver Froment, CRAAC Camden Resident Association Action Committee</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3593/P	phyllis turvill	9 denning rd london NW3 1ST	27/02/2016 10:49:39	COMMEMP ER	1 Potentially destabilising.&poor precedent for terraced houses on slope2 BIA inadequate & inconsistent. 3 Previous breaches of existing planning permission at that site, so why trust the owners to comply?4 disruption to neighbours by traffic & noise problems5 no evidence noise insulation from proposed cinema
2015/3593/P	P J Solomon	27a Denning Road London NW3 1ST	28/02/2016 20:32:55	COMMNT	<p>I wish to protest in the strongest possible way to this proposal for a double basement at 26 Denning Road. i own the basement flat opposite at 27a Denning Road and my flat will be seriouslycompromised by the digging of this basement.</p> <p>There is nothing in the application to prove conclusively that the digging of a basement will not endanger neighbouring properties. The application is inadequate and it is incapable of demonstrating that my flat will not be undermined by the proximity of this digging.</p> <p>The plans in the application consist inadequate drawings (not by a registered architect) which could have been done by a child; there is also lacking a satisfactory Construction management plan and no Design and Access Statement; there is an inconsistent and inaccurate Basement Impact Assessment; and lack of assurance that the construction will not damage neighbouring properties or lead to ground instability/flooding. It is all highly unsatisfactory and inadequate. My flat is downhill from this property therefore is likely to suffer considerable damage if this basement is permitted. I see that the space is to be used for a cinema. There are four cinemas within a comfortable distance from the property (the furthest being 2k distant) and this use is therefore not deemed significant and certainly unworthy of the potential disruption it will cause. There is plenty of evidence of underground streams and rivers in this area, and knowledge of sandy and gravel soils in Hampstead to provide enough reasons to refuse this basement extension.</p> <p>I therefore urge you to refuse it.</p>