

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	Christos Malialis	11 Wavel Mews NW6 3AB N2 8DT	06/12/2016 11:13:21	INT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The new structure proposed is wider and taller than the existing house. This would mean loss of light &amp; view for neighbouring properties as well as loss of privacy.</li><li>2. Permitting this development will change the character of the street which at the moment is like a small village.</li><li>3. The street is in a conservation area, therefore no major changes to the appearance and size of the building should be allowed.</li><li>4. Digging down two stories will disturb the natural rain water drainage. Already the back gardens of properties behind 10A are so wet during the rainy season that you cannot walk in them. This proposed development, can potentially create a flood and subsidence problem for 10A and neighbouring properties.</li><li>5. Parking in the street is already a problem. Building a bigger property with potentially more occupants with cars, will worsen the problem.</li><li>6. The street is very narrow and cannot accommodate big trucks delivering building materials to the side. The street will have to be virtually closed for the duration of the works which can be as much as one year.</li><li>7. The building works will seriously disturb the peace in the street and the surrounding area for a long period.</li><li>8. The new owners of the property are developers who are not proposing to rebuild a bigger property for the use of their family but for profit.</li></ol>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	Nicoline Sajjadi	12 Wavel Mews	06/12/2016 10:56:47	OBJ	<p>Date: 5 December 2016</p> <p>RE: Objection to the planning application for a 2 surface storey and 2 basement storey building in place of 10B Wavel Mews, NW6 3AB, ref 2016/5492/P</p> <p>I am writing to express my objection to the planned changes as presented by application reference 2016/5492/P. I base my objections on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy to no. 12 Wavel Mews, but also adjacent dwellings</li> <li>2. Loss of character to the Mews and wider (conservation) area</li> <li>3. Loss of value to 12 Wavel Mews</li> <li>4. Precedence</li> <li>5. Impact from noise and disturbance to residents from excessive building work required</li> <li>6. Impact from traffic nuisance</li> <li>7. Impact on wildlife from excessive building work and changes to existing nature</li> <li>8. Miscellaneous observations and comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Misleading presentation within the application</li> <li>? Drawing</li> <li>? Unrealistic traffic management predictions</li> <li>? Unrealistic timing of the project</li> <li>o character of applicant and impact on future prospect of 'community spirit' within the Mews</li> </ul> </li> <li>9. Effect on Conservation Area, national Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies, and guidelines and Camden Council Conservation Area policies</li> </ol> <p>Detailed comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy to no. 12 Wavel Mews (and other adjacent dwellings)</li> </ol> <p>The proposed height of the roof structure will lead to an immediate assault on our privacy; our bedrooms are diagonally facing number 10B, no matter what material is placed on top, as it would never be as high as an average person. The proposed roof height and terrace are unreasonable and I would legally challenge the impact on our right to privacy.</p> <p>A roof terrace would also be completely out of character with the surrounding houses.</p> <p>Furthermore, as owners of 12 Wavel Mews, we have made our own applications in the past to have a dormer placed in our attic. These plans were rejected due to privacy concerns from our neighbours and we would consider it completely inconsistent and unjust for other</p>
2016/5492/P	Bob Hampton & Philippa O'Keefe	The Lodge 17 Acol Road NW6 3AD NW6 3AD	06/12/2016 14:39:24	OBJ	<p>We would like to register our strong objection to the proposed redevelopment of 10B Wavel Mews. Excavating and building a 2 storey basement on this site where the soil is clay and and very unstable is likely to cause major structural problems for nearby properties. Our house has already suffered major subsidence a lot of due to the nature of the soil</p> <p>.As well as the excavating down the proposed design consisting of a high terrace on top, is totally out of character with the area. Mature trees would also be lost.</p> <p>The road and area is totally unsuitable for the heavy building machinery that will be necessary for such a building and will cause extreme disruption to all residents for many months.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2016/5492/P	Bob Hampton & Philippa O'Keefe	The Lodge 17 Acol Road NW6 3AD NW6 3AD	06/12/2016 14:39:42	OBJ	<p>We would like to register our strong objection to the proposed redevelopment of 10B Wavel Mews. Excavating and building a 2 storey basement on this site where the soil is clay and and very unstable is likely to cause major structural problems for nearby properties. Our house has already suffered major subsidence a lot of due to the nature of the soil</p> <p>.As well as the excavating down the proposed design consisting of a high terrace on top, is totally out of character with the area. Mature trees would also be lost.</p> <p>The road and area is totally unsuitable for the heavy building machinery that will be necessary for such a building and will cause extreme disruption to all residents for many months.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	Peter Symonds	48 Canfield Gardens London NW6 3EB	05/12/2016 15:16:48	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms Smith</p> <p>Planning Application 2016/5492/P – 10B Wavel Mews NW6 3AB</p> <p>This association objects in the strongest possible terms to the above application and has grave reservations about the developer’s plans, as submitted.</p> <p>The two-storey house which currently exists on this small plot has managed to harmonise sympathetically with the design of mews properties which were already in existence when it was built in the sixties, and has rightfully been categorized as providing a positive contribution to the charm and character of Wavel Mews, as well the South Hampstead Conservation Area as a whole. By comparison, the current application is, in our view, a gross over-development which will dominate and overbear the site and destroy that character to the detriment of the South Hampstead Conservation Area as a whole. Most particularly our objection is centred on the proposed double-depth basement. CRASH was under the impression that Camden’s latest revision of CPG4 now restricts basement development to just one level and that to within the footprint of a property. In this particular case, the overall excavations proposed are to the disproportionate depth of nearly seven metres, and require the garden to be dug out as far as the rear boundary wall between it and the garden of 11 Acol Road, thus seriously destabilising, if allowed, the neighbouring adjoined property at 10a Wavel Mews. Even discounting the damage which is sure to be inflicted on that property by the differential depth of the proposed basement foundations relative to neighbouring properties, the shallow concrete strips which form the somewhat basic foundations of the existing adjoined semi-detached houses, 10A and 10B – foundations which would not, in the sixties, have been subject to the rigorous building regulations required today – means that it is highly unlikely 10A can possibly remain undamaged once the other half, of what was built as a single construction, is demolished.</p> <p>Even the applicant’s BIA admits that the depth of the party wall foundations at 10A are unclear and need clarification and that underpinning and controls will be necessary to minimise structural effects yet, incredibly, it goes on to claim that “ground movement analysis indicates negligible or very slight impacts on neighbouring properties”. In addition, the fabric of 10 and 11 Wavel Mews, to say nothing of the structural integrity of the properties at 15, 13 and 11 Acol Road, which back on to this site, is likely to be seriously disturbed and compromised by the serious vertical and horizontal movement which the developer’s own Basement Impact Assessment predicts. It is therefore hard to reconcile these assessments of damage with the BIA’s statement that end of construction and post construction damage can be estimated, on the Burland Scale, at ‘very slight’ for 10A Wavel Mews and ‘negligible’ for the other above-mentioned properties.</p> <p>This application proposes an out-of-scale project designed merely to maximise profit by enlarging the property in every possible direction - to the side, over the adjoining garage and along the whole of the north wall of the building, above the rear garden extension, by the addition of a cantilevered front which juts out over the footpath, (an out-of-keeping architectural feature found nowhere else in the Mews!) as well as the creation of a large roof terrace. These features would see the building dominate the entire mews by pushing its increased mass ‘into the face’ of neighbours only a few metres away, particularly in the adjacent properties at 15 and 13 Acol Road, thereby resulting in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the flats on every floor, by allowing a direct view into living rooms, bedrooms, bathrooms and kitchens. In addition, the increased height, mass and bulk of the building will rob those properties – in particular the residents of the garden flats at 15 and 13 Acol Road - of access to already seriously compromised sunlight. The proposal which, in our view, has little or no architectural merit, would</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

render it the most dominating building locally, thus altering the character of the entire mews and setting a precedent which could result in the destruction of the location's very character.

The Basement Impact Assessment states that the proposal has been assessed as "being unlikely to have negligible impact on groundwater levels and flows so should have little effect on neighbouring properties". That statement runs absolutely counter to the considerable body of evidence CRASH has accumulated from the fifty or more basement developments we have monitored in our area over the last few years. In a very large number of cases, properties which neighbour basement works have subsequently flooded or suffered serious damp problems, none of which were evident before the works were undertaken. Additionally, this association has become increasingly concerned about rising water levels in the neighbourhood. Residents of several houses in the immediate area report that their gardens now frequently flood after heavy rain, even in summer, with water often taking days to drain away. The owner of the garden flat at No 11 Acol Road reports that surface water in his lawn drains away only in the driest of summers and is usually so prevalent for the rest of the year that it can suck the wellington boots off his children's feet if they attempt to walk on the waterlogged grass.

CRASH fears that what was once termed the 'lost underground river Westbourne', along with its tributaries, may have begun to flow again as a result of the displacement of groundwater due to the number of concrete basement foundations that have been allowed in the area. The proposal, in this application, to create a sunken, paved external rear garden will do little to mitigate the problem of water run-off which has been exacerbated by the concreting over of so many gardens in the area and which is now a serious concern in South Hampstead as a whole. This Basement Impact Assessment actually acknowledges the existence of perched water on the site, indicating that a clay or rock layer has formed a barrier preventing water penetration to the groundwater level. While 'tanking out' may successfully prevent water ingress to the proposed basement, it will do little to protect neighbouring properties and is, we contend, far more likely to displace and re-route existing perched and groundwater into nearby houses and gardens.

There has been a distressing increase in the number of trees lost to basement developments and building extensions over the last few years. This proposal attempts to downplay the effects of felling a couple of 'small trees or large shrubs' and the very likely damage to a large 'semi-mature' Lime tree at the rear of 15 Acol Road. Wavel Mews is part of what is affectionately known in South Hampstead as the 'gardens area' and CRASH goes to considerable lengths to ensure the protection of local trees.

When we give in to a demand to fell any tree that does not have an existing tree preservation order, we endanger the very life-blood of our neighbourhood. The loss of any species of tree or shrub in South Hampstead, small or large, is a matter of enormous concern. If we go on mindlessly uprooting, felling or damaging the trees and greenery which help this area breathe, simply because they are inconveniently placed and obstruct a developer's construction plan, then it is but a short step to turning South Hampstead into an urban desert!

While we recognise that it has no actual bearing on the merits or otherwise of this particular application, CRASH feels it necessary to point out that this property has, even from before the recent sale was completed, been rented out as an Airbnb property. It is not the current application to grossly overdevelop what is currently a two-bedroomed property into a five bedroom, four-bathroom house alone which concerns CRASH. It has come to our notice that the installation of five separate utilities meters have recently been requested, suggesting, at the very least, that this applicant is being disingenuous in claiming that the redevelopment is to be constructed as a family home.

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

The planning history of this site shows that permission was granted in 2009 for a basement at 10A Wavel Mews. This, of course, was before Camden's basement planning regulations were anywhere near as stringent as they are today. What was proposed then was not on anything like the outlandish scale of this current proposal. In 2009, however, that applicant, acknowledging that her plans would cause considerable distress and inconvenience, as well as a great deal of damage to her neighbours and their property, decided against going ahead and the basement was never built.

We would hope that this developer might be persuaded to show the same neighbourly consideration in this instance although, thus far, he has shown little sign of caring about his neighbours' welfare. It says a great deal that although Camden's Construction Management Plan recommends that developers engage in a neighbourhood consultation process before their application is lodged with council this developer, to date, has evinced little or no willingness to do so.

CRASH respectfully asks you to refuse the application.

Yours truly,

Peter Symonds

Chair

The Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead

---