

Application No: Consultees Name: Comment:

Received: Response:

Consultees Addr:

V Joel OBJ

2016/4511/P 02/10/2016 17:52:37 Basement Applications are ever more problematic. In this case the work is admirably restrained and in

keeping with the delightful building.

I object to the application as follows.

1) The building is very close to its neighbours in particular 13A which appears adjacent. Work to 13 will endanger 13A.

2) The repeated statements of a one storey basement is potentially misleading as the existing house has

a lower ground floor that is already partly below the "ground level". The proposed basement will

therefore be at more than a "one level" depth and could be considered almost a 2 storey basement. This

could be outside the LBC guidelines.

3) The reference to "seasonal movements" is admitted in Section 7.3 of the applicants expert report.

The area is noted for subsidence and movement - the pavement outside is evidence of this.

The previous large development on this road at number 9 had huge re-enforcement of the basement which was feasible as the house was built from scratch. Re-enforcement measures are not stressed in

number 13.

4) The report admits that there is groundwater present. There is reference to groundwater strikes (9.5)

Their own boreholes found this and the applicants expert further recommends (section 10) full water

proofing to imply it is a major issue. The usual references to the BGS are qualified (6.10) in that there

is in effect insufficient information.

5) The access statement appears rather general and inadequate in saying how the site will work as their

is no access other than through the house.

6) There is reference to a tree being damaged in another garden but again without detail (that I could

find in this large volume of documentation!)

If LBC is obliged to recommend approval despite objections may I please make a request?

That a condition is imposed for the applicant to pay for a qualified independent expert - the trades of

civil and hydrological engineers are needed - to oversee the work and ensure all the promised works and protections are installed.

Reasons:

A) Relying on the applicant's own experts alone is potentially unsafe as they are in effect "paid trades"

and, without suggesting any impropriety, are subject to influence by the applicant and even termination

and replacement if needed.

In other words, the parties that need protection need a fair voice to ensure they are protected after approval.

B) We know of problems in basement sites all over London where the approved works were badly carried out with consequences, sometimes serious to the neighbours.

C) The reporting by the independent expert should be open and available to all interested parties online.

D) The applicant should be subject to sanctions if he breaches this requirement before the work is completed. Withholding of Building control approval is one option. A legal charge is another.