

Attention: Raymond Yeung
Application Number: 2016/2896/P
Site Address 1A Glastonbury Street London NW6 1QJ

Development Proposal: Redevelopment of the site to provide a 3 storey 2 bedroom dwellinghouse with basement (following the demolition of commercial garage premises) with associated cycle storage and amenity space.

We write to OBJECT to this proposal.

Summary:

The Ravenshaw Street residents were not informed at the time the plot originally went to auction and we have felt somewhat on the back foot ever since. Our view stands that the height, bulk and massing is still unacceptable based on the proximity of the plot to our house (our back garden measures only 6 metres in length). The proposed dwelling would be overbearing in nature and severely detrimental to our outlook. We object to a 1st floor and a pitched roof. We remain concerned regarding the construction of a basement and the daylight/sunlight/overshadowing impact. There is a lack of crucial detail (expected duration of works, access needed etc) and some unacceptable oversights (incorrect assumed room usage, actual footprint of house etc). We do appreciate their desire to make use of what is an awkward plot but our concerns very much stand. It is highly likely there was a reason this plot wasn't suitable as a residential dwelling at the time Ravenshaw Street was developed and we fail to see what has changed! Detail below:

1/ Inappropriate height, bulk and massing. We object to the plans for a 1st floor and an empty pitched roof

(Appendix A, drawing number GLAST-S201) which further adds to the overall height of the build. The architect informed us at our February meeting that the council had 'insisted' on the pitched roof. Is the reason the developer wants the empty pitched roof to make this into an additional bedroom if/when the build goes ahead? We question their true intentions.

2/ Height and proximity of proposed build to Number 40, in particular, results in **harmful loss of outlook** (contrary to policies CS5 and DP26). The lack of a traditional buffer of two gardens that typical London terraced houses enjoy, means that the **overbearing mass of wall** is at an unacceptable proximity to number 40 and would create a feeling of extreme enclosure. Appendix A, drawing number GLAST-L201 demonstrates that although narrower, the solid wall still exists covering the length of the garden of number 40. Also see Malcolm Hollis Drawing number 50049_CTXT_04.

3/ Daylight, Sunlight & Overshadowing.

We suggest even a small impact on our daylight/sunlight is unacceptable. We have been fortunate enough to enjoy the beautiful and intense reflection of the sun from the school into rooms [with a strong 'requirement for light'] including our Living Room, our master bedroom, our daughters' bedroom and our office and a huge wall would severely hinder this in our view. Supposed 'adequate' day/sunlight levels are extremely subjective, but a deterioration is unacceptable. We refer to CPG1, Policies CS6 and CS14 in this context of Scale, Bulk, Massing and Height objection.

4/ Basement. A thorough Basement Impact Assessment appears to have been carried out this time. Although we aren't opposed to a basement per se but **the proximity of the proposed build (only 6m from the back of our house!) means we remain concerned about subsidence, ground movement, structural damage to our homes & shrinkage and swelling of London Clay** (highlighted repeatedly in Ashton Bennett's report). I quote "The results indicate the clays are clays of very high plasticity and very likely to shrink and swell under varying moisture conditions in the ground": 12.3.3 in the report. We note recommendations to use L shaped underpins to party walls and high stiffness supports which is vaguely reassuring. However, section 14.5 highlights the risk of 'excessive horizontal ground movements' and 14.7 indicates that foundations need to be lower in the ground to cope with bearing pressure. 14.8 discusses investigating depth of foundations of adjacent properties and their structural conditions. The Aleck Construction Method statement concludes (11.0) that the "proposed works... will not pose any significant threat to the structural stability of adjoining properties". We are not sure they can really claim this with such certainty! It hardly sounds like a risk free project.

5/ Proposed Street Front Elevation: Appendix A, drawing number GLAST-E201 shows the outline of the current wall and proposed lower fence height. The current wall provides security for the houses on Ravenshaw Street and privacy for our neighbours. We feel strongly that the wall should exist at its current height and in keeping with the current style/materials in existence. We would expect to be consulted further regarding materials used.

6/ Change of use. The Planning, Design and Access Statement by Drawing and Planning Ltd mentions the 'National Planning Policy Framework' and encourages approval of the application 'where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose' ie employment use. A number of residents on Ravenshaw Street tried to contact the agents regarding renting the site and their calls in the majority of instances went unanswered or were not returned. Daniella Blanchard was told by the agent in no uncertain terms that the developer had no interest in renting the site out! We question their true intentions and behaviour.

7/ Lack of key detail & Inaccuracy: Drawing number 50049_WR_02 inaccurately demonstrates the rear of number 40 (which has an extension) and the incorrect assumption that the rear 1st floor windows are bedrooms had been pointed out by us and ignored by the developer and team. One of the rooms is in fact an office. The Rab Flood Risk Assessment mentions a 4 storey dwelling in the conclusion - this is incorrect. Even if (in a nightmare scenario) this project were to get approval we have concerns over lack of detail: The Aleck Construction Method Statement mentions underpinning in 1 metre lengths (4.3) but no indication of the implication that has for the neighbours. They say the site would be accessed from Glastonbury Street. They should have detailed the assumed day to day impact on the residents: any access needed from Ravenshaw Street, estimated duration, proportion of our gardens out of action, how long the project would take etc. We appreciate the addition of a living wall but are concerned as to the maintenance. We were told it was 'self-maintaining' but we do not see any assurances as to who would pay should there be a problem. . Although not a planning concern, we feel the handling of certain subjects (supposed attempts at finding a tenant for the site etc) has been somewhat calculated and this is not appreciated.

8/ Other points: Policy DP26 focuses on the quality of life for the occupiers of neighbouring properties. This application if approved in its current form would in no uncertain terms be detrimental to those living at Number 40 and the surrounding houses. In Figure 3.67 there is an unfounded statement that the basement 'would not result in an adverse impact on the adjoining properties nor compromise the structural integrity of the upper floors'. This is not a statement that can be assured. Section 5.9 comments that 'the western and southern elevations are screened by mature trees and a 'garden wall', which would not result in a loss of visual amenity for the residents' that is just completely untrue. **The visual impact and harm to the amenity of the surrounding properties is extremely clear.**

9/ Our tenants. We currently have a wonderful family (parents with 2 young children) residing at 40 Ravenshaw and we are very concerned on their behalf. The level of disruption would be unacceptable for them and as per our concerns above we object to the application in its current form. On a personal note we are worried about the potential loss of rent should the tenants leave and we understand there are insurance policies available to developers to cover landlords for loss of rent which would need in place should the project go ahead in some (scaled back) form.

Many thanks for your time and patience.

Bianca Alfano