

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0859/P	Jennifer Woolf	17 Canfield Gardens London NW6 3JP NW6 3JP	27/03/2017 21:28:01	COMMEM AIL	I live very near to this house and strongly object to the idea of a basement excavation. Canfield Gardens is a narrow road and bus route and its construction means that building noise reflects off surrounding buildings and causes considerable inconvenience. No 28 Canfield Gardens is an very poorly maintained house which is already converted to make it much more crowded than neighbouring properties and there can be no possible benefit for neighbours and indeed many disadvantages for us in allowing this application.Please inform me of the date of the DCC.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0859/P	Diarmuid O'Hegarty	CRASH First Floor Flat 48 Canfield Gardens London NW6 3EB	29/03/2017 16:55:34	COMNOT	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application. I am writing on behalf of CRASH, the Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead. This proposed development falls within the area represented by our membership. CRASH wishes to object to the proposed enlargement of the existing half basement. It should be noted that the floor of the proposed enlargement will be lower than the floor of the existing half basement.</p> <p>Number 28 Canfield Gardens is in a terrace of double-fronted houses which are divided into flats. Numbers 24 to 34 comprise six houses that follow the same design. They are part of a larger terrace that runs from the corner of Compayne Gardens to the junction with Fairhazel Gardens. The Design and Access Statement included in the application shows an aerial photograph of the rear of numbers 24 to 34 marked to indicate that each has a basement "with front and rear light-wells". This is not correct. Each of these houses was built with a half basement and with a window to the rear only. These original windows are not in light wells but are above the ground level at the back of the houses. The proposal is to create a light well at the front which will be completely below the ground level; and a light well at the back which will be 80% below the ground level.</p> <p>It is noticeable that each of the half basements in numbers 24 to 34 Canfield Gardens is separated by an area that is over half the width of each house that is not a basement. The proposal will create a basement area in number 28 that will adjoin the half basement in number 30 and will have a floor level that will be lower than the floor level of the existing half basement in number 28 and lower than the floor level of the adjoining half basement in number 30. The application states that number 30 has not been surveyed. The application discusses ground levels and drainage for bathrooms and lavatories. The current bathroom and lavatory at number 28 are against an outside wall, have a higher floor level than the proposed extended basement and do not adjoin the half basements in numbers 26 or 30. The new second bathroom and lavatory proposed for number 28 will not be against an outside wall, will adjoin the half basement in number 30 and will have a lower floor level than the adjoining half basement in number 30. The risk of this bathroom and lavatory causing flooding in number 30 has not been adequately considered. The Basement Impact Assessment contained in the application addresses the risk where properties are connected to the sewer system at a level below the hydraulic level of the sewage flow. It merely states that is no history of sewer flooding having occurred at number 28. It does not address the fact that the new bathroom and lavatory in the proposed extension of the basement will be at a lower level than the existing bathroom and lavatory in the current half basement. CRASH understands from the occupant of the existing half basement in number 30 that there is a history of it flooding. CRASH is concerned that the proposed development will adversely affect the existing half basement in number 30 and that this risk has not been given adequate consideration. Number 28 Canfield Gardens is in a part of the terrace that is at the bottom of a slope from Finchley Road. Drainage and ground water runoff are therefore serious concerns. Increasing the basement area and creating a light well at a lower level can only increase the risk of flooding.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the drawings of plans and elevations submitted with the application have a small drawing of the elevation of a house which is not that of number 28 Canfield Gardens. The small drawing is that of one of the houses on Canfield Gardens that are located on the other side of the junction with Fairhazel Gardens. This lack of attention to detail in the application is worrying and indicates a lack of familiarity with the area.</p> <p>We request that the application, as it stands, be refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0859/P	Katherine Woolf	Flat 3 30 Canfield Gardens NW6 3LA	29/03/2017 11:00:32	COMMEM AIL	<p>Dear Ms Roe,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on application 2017/0859/P.</p> <p>I would like to object to the application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The application incorrectly suggests that the proposed works will merely be “enlarging the existing basement level”. In fact it will extend the basement downwards and outwards beyond the current footprint of the house. The Basement Impact Assessment states “The proposed basement will significantly increase the differential depth of foundations relative to neighbouring properties” (p28). Documents 08, 11, and 12 show that the basement will be lowered and expanded outwards to accommodate lightwells. 2. It is unclear how deep excavations will go since the plans are conflicting. Document 08 gives the proposed bedroom 2 and 3 ceiling heights as 2400mm and 2700mm respectively, whereas in Documents 11 and 12 both are given as 2580mm. All are significantly higher than the 2035mm of the existing basement. 3. The lack of consistency between plans makes it difficult to ascertain how deep excavations will go, and demonstrates poor quality design work. 4. The Design and Access Statement shows a photo of Canfield Gardens with “existing basements” marked, stating “there are many basements along Canfield Garden [sic]”. The implication is the proposed works will result in a property in keeping with this Conservation Area. In fact there are no basements of this depth with or without lightwells in similar properties along this section of Canfield Gardens. There are basement flats on Canfield Gardens but they are garden flats, i.e. at ground level or even slightly raised at the back of the house. There are also basements (former coal cellars) similar to the existing basement at 28 Canfield. It is these which are marked on the photograph. By contrast, the proposed plans will result in new bedrooms below ground level, and below existing basements in this property and nearby properties. The much greater depth of the proposed bedrooms is clear from Document 14, where the windows in proposed bedroom 3 are nearly entirely below ground level and are considerably lower than the window in the existing basement. 5. The proposed works will result in a basement that extends beyond the footprint of the existing property, resulting in a loss back and front garden space where the lightwells will be. 6. For these reasons, the proposed plans are not in keeping with the character of the street or the Conservation area it is in.

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

7. In the Design and Access Statement it is stated “This application seeking to enlarge the exiting [sic] basement level, which will then provide sufficient space for the growing needs of a family.” This gives the impression that the owners live in the property and are seeking to enlarge it to accommodate extra members of their family.

In fact to my knowledge the owner is an investment company and the property is entirely tenanted.

8. Another error in the Design and Access Statement is the omission of planning application 2013/4572/P in which Camden granted the current owner a Certificate of Lawfulness (Existing) for use of the second and third floors of the property as 5 x self contained residential units (numbered as Flats 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7) (Class C3).

9. The errors in the application (the lack of consistency between plans and the incorrect and missing information) seriously undermine confidence in the applicant’s ability to ensure a high quality standard of work from contractors.

10. This is extremely significant since the Basement Impact Assessment states that “The magnitude of movement [of the earth as a result of the works] is almost entirely a function of the standard of the workmanship”; it also states that close monitoring of movement and groundwater is essential throughout the works to prevent flooding and serious damage to neighbouring properties.

11. The potential damage to my home (30 Canfield) from these works is particularly concerning since 30 had serious subsidence about 12 years ago, which required significant works.

I therefore recommend the application is refused.

In addition, I was disappointed not to receive a letter notifying me of the planning application despite living next door, and despite being a member of the Fairhazel Housing Co-operative, which owns both adjoining buildings at 26 and 30 Canfield.

Please notify me of the committee date.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Katherine Woolf
