

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/3545/P	Lara Horne	Flat 2 121 Goldhurst Terrace London NW6 3EX	05/08/2016 11:50:54	OBJ	<p>Earlier this week, a letter was sent by Mr Nathaniel Caiden confirming that his objection was on behalf of a collective that included the owner and occupiers of Flats 1-2 121 Goldhurst Terrace (of which I am one) and Flats A-B 113 Goldhurst Terrace.</p> <p>In case this letter does not arrive, I confirm that this is the case and include the relevant parts</p> <p>"In summary there are two features of the proposed development design which lead to the majority of the below grounds for objecting namely i) the inclusion of a basement and ii) the need to extend along adjoining party walls.</p> <p>The grounds for objecting are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The excavation and building of the basement requires increase in foundations and underpinning within the boundary lines of the adjoining properties. Both the Basement Impact Assessment and Structural Engineer Report appear to acknowledge that this basement work will cause (with a high standard of workmanship) "very slight damage" to the adjoining properties. The occupants in these adjoining properties can take little comfort from such phrasing.</li> <li>2) It is suggested that the above ground for objecting is sufficient on its own for the design of the 'basement' to cause the application to be rejected, but this is compounded by there being insufficient acknowledgement in any supporting documents of existing movement to these properties after the past 100+ years (despite acknowledging that there has been history of subsidence and that the type of ground is prone to movement). Merely underpinning one side will not prevent movement to the other side's foundations which will cause stress on these over 100 or so year old brick terrace houses, so damage may even occur after the development work is completed. It is further noted that the development will require the property to be joined to 121 Goldhurst Terrace which for over 50 years was partly detached, and so this poses further risks to that property. Moreover, the Basement Impact Assessment states that the "foundation depths of adjacent properties are not known", which is also of little comfort to the occupants in the adjoining properties.</li> <li>3) There is a tree at 121 Goldhurst Terrace just by the boundary of the proposed development. The Abrocultural Impact Assessment seems to suggest that significant roots were found in the trial pit. Although it concludes that the tree (which has a Tree Preservation Order) can survive, the trial pit does not extend the entire scope of the new proposed foundations/party walls. In light of the tree being very near 121 Goldhurst Terrace, the increase in risk to it from the basement design of the development is of concern to the occupants.</li> <li>4) The proposed development (certainly on its current scale) will have significant Impact on traffic parking and road safety. During the building works there is a need for 12m of resident bays to be taken out of use and it requires sizable vehicles to be driving down a narrow road, and increase congestion in the area. After the completion of the works, the increase in occupancy (19 bedrooms, in contrast with the current 12 bedrooms) will increase the need for parking and traffic on a very narrow road (which already has scarce parking and is congested at times).</li> <li>5) In relation to noise from the development work, the supporting documents 'hope' that there is no need to use piles. However, the scale of the work means that there will be significant noise produced in any event. The Construction Management plan envisages some 36 weeks spent on the demolition, excavation and structural work. Much of the time on the work (and ensuing noise) is because the development is to include a basement.</li> </ol>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

6) Loss of light and privacy, the Daylight Sunlight report acknowledges there will be a loss of light, although states this will not be of an unacceptable level. However there is no need for there to be any loss of light / privacy.  
In conclusion the proposed development which design includes a basement is strongly objected to and it is hoped that if those seeking to pursue any development remove the basement from their design"

---