

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2534/P	Barrie Tankel	43a Lancaster Grove London NW3 4HB	17/12/2016 17:04:57	OBJ	<p>Whilst the extension has been reduced in length this submission is still incomplete and does not address other concerns raised in the Planning Inspectors Decision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The basement still requires planning permission. Drawings must be provided to show the Basement design following the reduction in the size of the extension above, as a reduced extension above alters the enclosed basement area.2. A revised Design and Access Statement is required to reflect the current proposal.3. My concerns about the geotechnical report remain unanswered. There is no credibility in the results of the bore holes since there had been no rain for several weeks prior to the tests.4. My basement now leaks following construction of the basement at No 45. This is currently being investigated by specialists.5. A construction management plan has not been provided. How will the removal and reconstruction impact neighbours? How will Demolition and rebuilding be managed?6. The basement must mitigate potential problems due to slope stability and hydrology...how was this done if at all?7. The West side of the extension harms the Bay Window. The Inspector stated "The rear of the property and its adjoining neighbours make a positive contribution to the conservation area." Camden officers stated in their delegated report "the Bay window to the rear...is an attractive historic feature that should be retained". CPG1 states "Any rear extension should respect and preserve existing architectural features such as projecting Bays." None of these are respected in the current application.
