Application No:	Consultees Nome	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment	Printed on: 10/03/2016 09:05:18
Application No: 2015/7079/P	Consultees Name: patrick Williams	Consultees Addr: Archway house 21 Clapham Common NorthsideCommon Nside London SW4 0RQ	Received: 09/03/2016 16:16:29	Comment: COMMNT	Response: Dear Mr Tulloch It is with mounting despair that I have to write once again asking that the 51 responses forwarded to your office on March 1st be made accessible. As I already wrote, the preceding 59 can be downloaded, as can the other 400 objections. A group of 5 responses made on March 9th were similarly blocked, but now are available to view. Of those 5, one was my letter of 26th February: as I could see no evidence of that particular letter, I forwarded another which your IT department has managed to post twice, along with a correction 'I forwarded this week. I also notice that, for some reason, several other submissions have been duplicated. I came in person to Camden today to seek the corrections due. You were not in your office, and I was helped on the reception telephone by Chantal who told me that she had emailed my request. The 5 comments of 9th March can be viewed, but those 51 of the 1st March are still not possible to download. I might not be surprised to see a 4th copy of my (3rd) objection among the 51, were Camden IT to manage their accessibility. yours sincerely, Patrick Williams
2015/7079/P	patrick Williams	Archway house 21 Clapham Common NorthsideCommon Nside London SW4 0RQ	09/03/2016 16:16:29	COMMNT	
2015/7079/P	patrick Williams	Archway house 21 Clapham Common NorthsideCommon Nside London SW4 0RQ	09/03/2016 16:16:28	COMMNT	
2015/7079/P	patrick Williams	Archway house 21 Clapham Common NorthsideCommon Nside London SW4 0RQ	09/03/2016 16:16:27	COMMNT	

					Printed on: 10/03/2016 09:05:18
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
Application No: 2015/7079/P	consultees Name: patrick Williams	Archway house 21 Clapham Common NorthsideCommon Nside London SW4 0RQ	09/03/2016 16:16:28		Dear Mr Tulloch It is with mounting despair that I have to write once again asking that the 51 responses forwarded to your office on March 1st be made accessible. As I already wrote, the preceding 59 can be downloaded, as can the other 400 objections. A group of 5 responses made on March 9th were similarly blocked, but now are available to view. Of those 5, one was my letter of 26th February: as I could see no evidence of that particular letter, I forwarded another which your IT department has managed to post twice, along with a correction 'I forwarded this week. I also notice that, for some reason, several other submissions have been duplicated. I came in person to Camden today to seek the corrections due. You were not in your office, and I was helped on the reception telephone by Chantal who told me that she had emailed my request. The 5
					comments of 9th March can be viewed, but those 51 of the 1st March are still not possible to download. I might not be surprised to see a 4th copy of my (3rd) objection among the 51, were Camden IT to manage their accessibility. yours sincerely, Patrick Williams
2015/7079/P	patrick Williams	Archway house 21 Clapham Common NorthsideCommon Nside London SW4 0RQ	09/03/2016 16:16:06	COMMNT	

					Printed on: 10/03/2016 09:
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/7079/P	Valerie Harris	29 St Dunstan's Close Canterbury Kent CT2 8LP	10/03/2016 01:23:53	OBJNOT	 Air Studios (Lyndhurst Hall) planning application 2015/7079/P 11, Rosslyn Hill, London NW3 5UL I am submitting a second letter of objection as the planning application was re-registered on 15th February 2016. Confusingly the Application Form and Design and Access Statement remain unchanged to include the above ground elements and two Historic Buildings Reports dated March and July 2015 cover both eventualities. It seems the application is now for the excavation of the three substantial basements while omitting the previously proposed dining room and pitched roofed pavilion. The removal of the proposed dining room is welcome as it will avoid damage to a substantial area of root protection zone for the large and visually significant trees. However the retention of the flat roofed studio wastes the opportunity to enhance the conservation area as the flat roof will remain visible from the main road through the gap between 7 and 9 Rosslyn Hill; and coupled with the retention of the timber garden sheds means there will be no improvements to the setting of both listed buildings -11 Rosslyn Hill and Lyndhurst Hall. Therefore the applicant's justification for the basement extensions on enhancing the heritage setting and the character of the conservation area is severely diminished. With Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings, underground development must complying with Camden's Basement and Lightwells Policy to preserve the historic fabric, structural integrity, layout, interrelationships and architectural hierarchy of spaces. This is not being respected in this proposal. 11 Rosslyn Hill is a rare surviving remnant of 18th century Belsize. It is one of only two houses in the Belsize area to survive from the Georgian period and has largely intact elevations, plan form and staircase. Pre-application advice concerning the basements was that, 'the overall scale (almost twice the original locotprint of the building) is excessive and creates dominant spaces which overpower the original loc
					Basement proposals need to demonstrate that damage will not be caused to neighbouring properties, their amenity and the wider conservation area. The applicant's Basement Impact Assessments (BIAs) show regard for the five garages in the rear garage court of 9-9d Rosslyn Hill by setting the piles to the pool basement back from the boundary wall. The basements are specifically set away from the Georgian building to protect it, with underpinning shown for the two corners where the basements will break through into the lower ground floor. The vaulted cellar is to be supported during construction. However there is scant regard for the special structural nature of the Grade 2 Listed Lyndhurst Hall/Air Studios. This is the former Lyndhurst Congregational Church which is a tall, architecturally striking building with a vast hexagonal main space providing one of the largest recording rooms in the world. It would be expected that the protection of Lyndhurst Hall would be a priority. However it is difficult to find and requires much searching through details in the applicant's BIAs by Alan Baxter & Associates for how close the run of piles of the cinema basement will be to the flank wall of Lyndhurst Hall. Air Studios' own Structural Engineers, Corbett & Tasker, correctly and clearly highlight the striking construction problems including the clash of foundations, in figures 2, 3 and 4 of their report. This

gives grave concern for the structural safety of Lyndhurst Hall.

The excavations are mostly into stiff grev London Clay which is as little as 1m from ground surface and continues to an undetermined depth. Piles are planned to go to a depth of 31 metres. London clay is notorious for shrinkage, heave and loading pressure. There are many risks and uncertainties. The British Geological Survey indicates the underlying London Clay has high volume change potential. The applicant's say there will be no perched water flow as Lyndhurst Hall's foundations are protectively set into the clay but all five of their foundation trial inspection pits filled with water and a pump was required to keep them dry to enable excavation to the required depth. Also their report states with piles, in clay soils additional movement can potentially be developed by the bore causing a relaxation of horizontal stress. The applicant's BIAs acknowledge that large local ground movements can be expected where construction problems are encountered. They identify the need for and have yet to seek the advice of a specialist piling contractor who needs to undertake final design of the piles. Their case study concerning buildings with party walls involving excavation and piling is not directly relevant, as above ground bracing was possible between those buildings and the excavation was into river gravels. It is concerning that the applicant's second BIA has refined and reduced their assessment of ground movement and structural damage on the Burland scale from damage category 2 (acceptable damage) to damage category 0 (negligible) without any amendments to the proposals. Emphasis of their past schemes is no substitute to demonstrating adequately that in this instance the scheme has been specifically designed to avoid damage to Lyndhurst Hall – a landmark building that contributes greatly to the street scene and public realm at a busy road junction in the Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a strong driver for sustainable development. Air Studios' conversion of the former Lyndhurst Congregational Church into a world renowned recording studio in 1991, demonstrates an outstandingly sustainable re-use of a redundant heritage building which brings social benefits and economic vitality to shops and businesses locally and throughout London. Whereas the basement proposals for 11 Rosslyn Hill reduces the number of dwellings from two to one, omits the pitched roofed pavilion with photovoltaic slates and is unclear whether the proposed ground source heat pump will be implemented as the Low and Zero Carbon Technology Study by Price & Myers states this is not a feasible technology for the site.

Both 11 Rosslyn Hill and Lyndhurst Hall are individually special and significant buildings. They are irreplaceable heritage assets which the (NPPF) requires to be treasured and conserved for future generations. While 11 Rosslyn Hill is barely visible to the street scene, it is a locally rare example of a largely intact Georgian house and the basements will adversely affect its heritage character. The basements also pose a high risk to both the structural fabric and integrity of Lyndhurst Hall and to the sustainable commercial Air Recording Studios. With the recent death of Sir George Martin, producer of the Beatles, who transformed Lyndhurst Hall into the recording studios in 1991, his legacy in the development of studio recording will be even more precious. Air Studios will be a permanent international draw for musicians and visitors alike. It is unthinkable that all this should be risked by a poorly considered proposal for basement excavations next door which will damage historic buildings, have no public benefit and which lacks sustainability credentials.

		~		~	Printed on: 10/03/2016 09:05:18
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/7079/P	Patrick Ardagh-Walter	12 Highfield Road Sandridge St Albans	09/03/2016 09:29:33	OBJEMAIL	I work in the UK film-music industry as a musician and as such am one of many, many people depending on Air Studios for a living.
		Herts AL4 9BU			While the long-term possible damage from these proposed excavations remains an unknown, what is clear is that the noise of the work will render this vital lynchpin of our national film industry completely unusable. Once the work has gone abroad, no amount of financial compensation is going to bring it back any time soon.
					I am very concerned at the way our architectural heritage is being eroded and distorted, with such grotesque extensions and underground additions that are utterly out of proportion with the intended nature of the dwelling and of its role in the neighbourhood or community. Surely there must be a cut-off point in terms of the volumes being added and of integrity with the original building?
					For the sake of Air Studios and all of us who work there, I implore you to reject this application. It is the wrong place for this kind of project.