

Glen and Barbara Scarcliffe,  
24 Denning Road,  
London NW3 1SU

March 3<sup>rd</sup> 2016

Camden Council Planning Department,  
London Borough of Camden  
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square  
c/o Town Hall, Judd Street  
London WC1H 9JE

For the attention of: Jonathan McClue, Senior Planning Officer

Dear Mr. McClue,

Re: Objection to 26 Denning Road/Basement Proposal  
Planning Application 2015/3593/P

We object to the proposed basement at 26 Denning Road. We believe that to grant planning permission in this case would be entirely wrong and against Camden's stated planning policies.

The application and the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) is inadequate and fails to comply with Camden's requirements, as shown by the reports of Dr Michael de Freitas, hydrogeologist, and Michael Eldred, geotechnical and structural engineer. These two reports, commissioned by us and other neighbours, have been submitted to Camden in connection with our objections; the full reports should be considered in their entirety, as part of our objection. The reports are highly critical of the application and the BIA, as shown by these brief excerpts:

Dr Michael de Freitas states in his report: "The [BIA] ... fails in a number of significant ways to satisfy the requirements set by Camden and could be quite misleading to a contractor engaged to undertake the work." ... "There are many simple errors of interpretation within the BIA which suggest that the authors have not involved a Chartered Geologist in their assessment of ground conditions as required to do so by CPG4. **On that basis alone the BIA should be rejected.**"

Mr Eldred in his report states: "I find that the drawings submitted in support of the application contain technical errors, are self-conflicting as well as conflicting one with another, and postulate impractical situations which it is difficult to interpret as anything other than contrivances designed to give false assurance about the application. They fail a fundamental requirement of any planning application; that of providing a clear accurate and consistent description of the applicant's intention". The application shows a "haphazard and careless if not incompetent approach...".

We note also that the BIA also answers incorrectly Question 12 (page 9): "Is the site within 5m of a highway or pedestrian right of way?" The BIA says no, but in fact the front of the house is less than 5m from the pedestrian pavement.

Based on these experts' reports, and our own review, we believe the application fails to demonstrate (as the applicant is required to do by Camden's policies CPG4) that the proposed excavation will "maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties" and "avoid adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment".

The proposed works would involve an unacceptable level of disruption, noise & traffic problems (especially considering that building works have been on-going at No 26 since September 2014).

The 'Specification of Works' and 'Method Statement' submitted with the application are sketchy and do not constitute a proper construction management plan. The proposed laser monitoring arrangement, with readings taken only every two weeks, seems inadequate when excavation will be ongoing and the site needs to be monitored continuously for movement.

The proposed basement is excessive in scale and inappropriate for Victorian terraced houses in this conservation area.

Furthermore, we note the following: Since September 2014, No 24 has been undergoing extensive above-ground renovation, involving multiple planning applications and party wall agreements with both adjoining owners. Building work is still on-going. There have been issues concerning breaches of existing planning permission, and unauthorized tree felling in the garden. We have been informed by Camden that regarding dormer windows and a balcony, No 26 has in fact exceeded its planning permission, even though the breaches may not be excessive enough to warrant enforcement action. The owner of No 26 has submitted two previous applications to dig out a basement (January 2015 and August 2015) both of which were effectively rejected for inadequate documentation. Where the developer (as in this case) has a history of not quite complying with existing planning rules, and a history of submitting inadequate basement BIA's, and then proposes to excavate a large basement (including directly under a newly-built extension), all while building work is still on-going – we believe in these circumstances Camden should reject a fresh basement application, especially one submitted, yet again, with an inadequate BIA.

For all of the reasons above, we urge Camden to reject this application.

Yours sincerely,

  
Glen and Barbara Scarcliffe

25A Denning Road  
LONDON NW3 1ST  
[REDACTED]

1 March 2016

**Planning Application 2015/3593/26 Denning Road**

I am writing about the above application for a building excavation at the above address.

Our basement flat is in the house opposite, so clearly our first concern is with the grave and constant disruption we will suffer while the work is being carried out. That goes without saying but cannot be an overriding factor in our objection to the application.

We are mainly concerned about the technical flaws in the application which carry risks it would be wrong, indeed dangerous, to overlook. These have been thoroughly documented and there is no need to specify them in detail here. In summary there are serious doubts about:

Insufficient attention to the dangers of subterranean water flow, and the absence of any full and thorough hydrological analysis

Ground instability, specifically the effect on the foundations of neighbouring properties

The danger of erosion by seepage.

It seems clear to me, from my experience of some years in public service, that the risks involved in this venture are far too great and too uncertain to allow the application to go forward. These risks and doubts have been well documented and we hope will be found to be conclusive in reaching your decision

Yours sincerely  
[REDACTED]

Charles Chadwick CBE

Mr. Jonathan McClue,  
The Planning Officer,  
Camden Council,  
London &  
The Councillors,  
The Borough of Camden,  
London.

47 Denning Road  
Hampstead  
London NW3 1<sup>ST</sup>

Ref: app.no. 2015/3593/P,  
Add. of propty: 26 Denning Road, Hampstead  
London NW3.

Dear Sirs & Madams,

02 03 2016

1. The technical inadequacies of the above planning application have been well documented & have been presented to you by all the concerned residents in this area.
2. The irreparable damages it will cause to the adjacent terraced properties ( if the plan has 'your BLESSINGS'), has been well pointed to you as well.
3. Repetition is a bad practice & is unnecessary in this matter.
4. Boldly, we put the following points to you:
  - a) when multiple evidence is put forward regarding a damaging, ill-conceived plan, it is expected that person & persons in responsible positions will act responsibly & intelligently.
  - b) As residents we have certain responsibilities to our council, the Council also bears enormous burdens of welfare for its residents. In critical situations the Council must not shirk away from those responsibilities. This is one of those situations & our expectations for our Council & our elected Councillors to act intelligently to reject the above Plan is justifiably appropriate.
  - c) For different hidden reasons, rich people with their whimsical idiotic ideas propose some plans which cause untold miseries to others living in the vicinities. These Pied Pipers play the Tune & some people even in responsible positions Dance along with the Tune. PITY.
  - d) We, the residents of this Borough, expect our Planning officers & our elected Councillors to be astute, positive & bold to reject the plan which is bound to cause structural damages to the adjacent properties & woeful physical & psychological problems to the responsible residents around.

Thank You.

Yours sincerely,  
Datta family.