



Dear Mr Tulloch,

re: 2015/4373/P 13 Kemplay Road

I am sending this objection personally, quite separate to my other (second) comment as Tree Officer to the Heath & Hampstead Society, invited by you recently due to the tree-related documents added on-line on 11th March.

This application would seem to be of no merit. It intends to

- ruin the treescape of this part of Kemplay Road - specifically mentioned in the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement - by felling but not replacing one tree, reducing the canopies of others to allow the work and future off-street parking, and placing hard standing over their roots and current main source of oxygen;
- encroach significantly on the rear view of the Rosslyn Chapel;
- reduce a good sized garden to almost nothing;
- build a basement on a 5 degree slope in an area with many ground water courses with insufficient borcholes for triangulation of groundwater movement and assessment of water-lubricated slip on clay, and inaccurate designation of 'Head' as 'Made Ground' hence inadequate evaluation of its water carrying properties;
- include an indiscrete lightwell in the front 'garden' that sets an unwelcome precedent for Kemplay Road;
- increase hard standing considerably, thus allowing more rainwater run-off that will go directly to South End Green, one of the worst areas for flooding in the region;
- expects Camden to allow a new cross-over for car parking to occur on site for the first time.

All this for an uninteresting building (others have commented further on this), where a speculative developer purely seeks to maximise profit on a house taken from the public estate by callously exploiting both the Council House Exchange and the Right to Buy schemes.

This is as nothing though for this developer, who must know the horrifying level of damage, noise and vibration that occurs when cutting a house in half, particularly a house built in the 1960s with public money. Reinforced concrete beams and slabs, chimney breasts and fireplace hearth slabs will be shared with the integrally attached neighbour, but the pair will undergo a brutal separation. This builder knows that what he is planning to inflicting on the neighbours is tantamount to torture, as well as serious and wanton damage to their main asset.

Camden Planning Department will probably be unaware of such consequences. I am aware of a horrifying case where this has occurred recently, where the neighbours were too frightened to be in the house during the whole procedure since it violently shook, visibly moved and cracked so much. They were so terrorised and threatened by the developers who were knowingly prepared to inflict this on them that they were too afraid to say anything to the authorities. This was despite having their main asset made unsellable. People living next door to such developments can rarely afford to fight this in the courts, and the developers know this and take advantage of it.

Since the developer pays for the neighbour's Party Wall surveyor 'he who pays the piper calls the tune'. Our experience of Party Wall Agreements in situations similar to this includes mysterious disappearance of evidence of the pre-demolition state and resignation of the neighbour's party wall surveyor at a critical time. This mean they are not worth the paper they are written on.

Please refuse.

Vicki Harding

--

***Dr Vicki Harding
Garden Flat
19 Frognal Lane
London NW3 7DB***



