

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2534/P	Barrie Tankel	43a Lancaster Grove London NW3 4HB	11/10/2016 16:36:10	OBJ	<p>1. Background & Planning History I live at 43a Lancaster Grove, immediately adjacent to the ground floor flat at 45a Lancaster Grove. I am a Chartered Surveyor with 50 years experience in the Development of buildings. I have previously objected to this application and that the contents of objection still apply. This is supplemental information concerning the amendments that were made on 29 September 2016.</p> <p>2. Current Planning Application 2015/2534/P Proposal: Retention of a Basement extension to rear and erection of rear ground floor level extension and reinstatement of rear ground floor bay. The ground floor extension is 60.00m² plus basement. The built extension is 85.00m² so the proposal is still 70% of that size.</p> <p>3. Our Objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Size of the proposal 2) The Length of the Extension & its impact on No 47 LG 3) The Width of the extension and the Junction with the Bay window 4) The Geotechnical Report 5) The Design & Access statement <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Size of the proposal <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Camden's reason No 1 for refusing the retrospective application (2012/1510/P) was ... The proposed rear extension at ground floor level, by virtue of its height, bulk, mass, detailed design and materials would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding Belsize Park conservation area. The proposal would thereby be contrary to Policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the Core Strategy and Policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Heritage) of the Development Policies of the Camden Local Development Framework. ii. The original demolished extension was 2.4 m high. iii. The 2008 approved scheme was 2.6 m high. The height can be measured on the section 933/15 and it is also referred to in the Officers Delegated report. (Appendix A) iv. Whilst the proposed height is now shown as 2.6 m from ground level to top of roof, it is measured from a raised level on the left hand side of the extension, which raises the roof line above the previously approved extension. The applicants dimension is therefore misleading if meant to relate to the original height. v. The correct base point is 0.220 m below the point used by the applicant as measured on the right hand side of the extension, so in reality the proposed extension is 2.82 m high. This represents an increase of 460 mm on the demolished extension. vi. This roofline proposed by the owner, will seriously diminish sunlight to the garden of No 47. vii. Since Camden refused the 2012 scheme because of its height, this application should also be refused because of its similar height. 2) The Length of the Extension & its impact on No 47 LG

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

Comment: **Response:**

The Planning Portal states “A Single-storey rear extension must not extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by more than four metres if a detached house.” I am repeating this point because of its importance.

A straight comparison of the proposed wall facing No 47, versus the demolished wall, will establish the harm done to 47.

- i. The ONLY source of sunlight to this garden is the afternoon sun from the West.
- ii. The projection of the original extension beyond the rear wall of No 47, (scaled from the Existing Ground Floor plan LG.10.01A (Hartleys Projects Ltd)), was 4.00 m long for a height of 2.4 m.
- iii. It then extended as storage space for a further 1.25 m but at a lower height of 2.00 m. The lower extension should not be classified as habitable space and there are no grounds for a raising this part of the extension especially to the detriment of No 47. Anything above this 2.00 m height will damage No 47 through a loss of sky visibility, further loss of sunlight and an increase in the sense of enclosure
- iv. It is gross overdevelopment and creates a sense of enclosure to No 47. It will seriously diminish
- v. Any additional width of the extension should not extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by more than four metres.

3) The Geotechnical report

The applicant has applied to retain the unauthorised rear basement extension. The planning application 2012/1510/P was for a shallower basement than was built and the inadequate geotechnical report that was submitted was in respect of that shallower basement. The applicant has not submitted all information required to substantiate their structural design for the built basement. My comments on the report submitted by Geo-Environmental to Planning & Party Wall Specialists Ltd are repeated due to their importance.

- i. The report states in Item 4. Fieldwork, “The scope of works was agreed with the Client...” It then lists 4 items of work covered by the report however it does not state that it provides all information required by Camden for new application that include a deep basement.
- ii. The intrusive investigation was carried out on the 15th December 2014
- iii. A subsequent visit made on the 7th January 2015, recorded the standpipe as dry.
- iv. Historic weather conditions for the period have been obtained from AccuWeather web site. These records show that on the previous 15 days

- Zero rain fell on 7 days;
- 1mm rain fell on 6 days
- 4mm on 1 day
- 9mm on 1 day

In the following 23 days to 7th Jan 15

- Zero rain fell on 9 days
- 1mm fell on 5 days
- 3mm fell on 1 day
- 5mm fell on 1 day
- 11mm fell on one day

Hence it is not surprising that the standpipe was dry and it suggests that the results are of no use whatsoever.

- v. Camden’s requirements

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Para 56 of PI's decision. "Accordingly I conclude that it has not been shown the scheme would not adversely affect underground drainage or the structure of adjacent buildings, and so is in conflict with CDP Policy DP27 and CPG4." This information to satisfy this requirement has still not been submitted. <p>vi. Campbell Reith report</p> <p>There are several items that CR state is required to complete their report. In particular following items require further information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Section 3, 18 items stated. (Basement Impact Audit Check list)• Item 4.6 and Items 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 <p>5) The Design & Access Statement</p> <p>The applicant has not submitted a revised Design and Access statement that reflects the latest design proposals. Our previous comments still apply.</p> <p>4. Objection</p> <p>I object to the planning application. The proposal does not meet Camden's standards and should be refused. The enforcement notice should be implemented, since no progress has been made in achieving a planning permission for an appropriate scheme. The High Court appeal was rejected in August 2014 and over 2 years later an acceptable solution has not been achieved</p> <p>Barrie Tankel FRICS 11th October 2016</p>
