

Dear Sirs,

Planning Application 2016/3719/P – 50 Rochester Place

Further to my telephone conversation with Mr Hope on 15.9.16, I make the following comments in respect of the application.

I object to the application on the following grounds:

1. **Ground instability.** The plans drawn by applicant:-
 - a. incorrectly draw the proposed wall of no.50 against the wall of no. 48a *as if that were* a party wall, which it is not. The Party Wall Act procedure therefore does not apply;
 - b. indicate proposed foundations which go underneath the wall of no.48. This is something for which I do not give permission. Further, this takes no account of piles which were inserted in the middle and back of the flank wall in the 1980s;
 - c. indicate a proposed first floor glass block which attaches to the 48a external flank wall, which itself is only one or two bricks wide;
 - d. in light of the above, I am concerned that the plans as drawn may adversely affect the foundations of 48a and 48. Indeed, the basement impact assessment produced by Croft Structural Engineers accepts that the proposed build gives rise to risk of movement to the neighbouring property, and that some cracking is anticipated. I do not consider that the mitigation measures proposed are in any way adequate to deal with these risks;
 - e. I would ask that these issues are specifically addressed by the independent audit;
 - f. further, I would ask for some opportunity to obtain my own expert advice regarding the potential affect of my foundations and mitigation measures in the event that the independent audit approves the plan.
2. **Loss of amenity.** The proposed digging will prevent me from working for home for the entirety of the works. Although not exclusively, I often work from home during office hours (9-6 Monday to Friday). I am a barrister, and I frequently conduct Court hearings by telephone, something which will obviously not be possible given the noise and vibration from the proposed plan.

Rory Holmes

48a Rochester Place