

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0859/P	VERONICA WAKEFIELD	FLAT 1 30 CANFIELD GARDENS LONDON NW6 3LA	13/04/2017 13:44:56	OBJ	<p>Dear Anna Roe</p> <p>Re: Flat 1, Basement & Ground floor, 28 Canfield Gardens, London NW6 3LA Application No. 2017/0859/P</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Application.</p> <p>I am a member of CRASH, and a committee member of the Fairhazel Co-operative who owns properties in the neighbourhood, including two adjoining buildings to No.28, ie: 26 and 30 Canfield Gardens of which I am a resident in the half basement & ground floor flat. I am, therefore, familiar with the local area, Co-op owned buildings, and especially 30 Canfield.</p> <p>I am writing to express my concern and objection to the Application for numerous reasons.</p> <p>First of all, it is perplexing that the Application Notice itself was never sent to the neighbouring properties as per previous routine practice but was discovered by chance, rather close to the commenting deadline, flapping on a post in the pavement outside 28 Canfield Gardens. This seems irregular.</p> <p>The Application and its details seem to be inconsistent, inaccurate and misleading.</p> <p>There is no similar conversion of enlarged basement/ground floor flats between 14 and 38 Canfield. The similarly converted flats the Applicant mentions are no where near this stretch of Canfield Gardens.</p> <p>The Application indicates that the purpose of the proposed enlargement is for a growing family. 28 Canfield Gardens is divided into 7 flats including a minute loft conversion unsuitable for anyone over 5 feet in height. Cedar Estates, the Applicant on behalf of Kolyma Investments limited, is the management agent who rents these flats out to a very transient population: tenants who move in and out within a couple of years. What growing family?</p> <p>There are no light wells to the rear and to the front of 24, 26, 30, 32 and 34 Canfield Gardens. In the case of 30 Canfield, There is a bedroom occupying half the space of the half-basement, with a window above ground to the rear only. It is accessible from the interior of Flat 1 (basement and ground floor) 30 Canfield. The other half of the half-basement, adjoining the basement room but not inter-accessible, is a storage cellar for the three flats at No.30. It has no light-well or window, and accessible from the exterior of the property.</p> <p>The proposed works does not confine only to the enlargement of an existing half basement, but also involves alteration to the ground floor flat. Extension on the ground floor level will cause light and air obstruction to the front and rear of Flat 1, 30 Canfield Gardens.</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

The proposed enlargement requires excavation under ground level deep into the current foundation. The floor of the excavated area will be lower than the floors of the existing half basement at 28 as well as the adjoining half basements at Nos. 26 and 30.

Subsidence

Despite favourable reporting and assessment re local soil, 30 Canfield Gardens has had a serious issue with subsidence in 2007 and 2008, due to ground movement and soil erosion. It was addressed in 2008 by felling trees in the front; building fabrics were repaired -- enormous cracks in the lavatory, bed room, kitchen, living room, hallway and ceilings on the ground floor (as well as floors above) were filled. Underpinning was recommended by the surveyor but it was never carried out due to lack of Co-op funding and refusal by our insurers who deemed it too expensive for them, and stated that underpinning was "not essential at that stage"!

Currently busses and lorries run down Canfield Gardens. At times, when a heavy lorry runs pass, the whole building shakes. Excavation in the basement of 28 Canfield will endanger the foundation and structure of 26, 28 and 30 Canfield Gardens.

Flooding

The application mentions drainage for bathrooms and lavatories.

A 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 at 28, and will have a lower floor level than the adjoining half basement at No.30. The risk of this bathroom and lavatory causing flooding in No. 30 has not been sufficiently considered.

Despite favourable reporting and assessment re water, let me alert you to the history of flooding in the basement of 30 Canfield Gardens since I became a resident in 1977.

- 1 Summer 1978, due to rising level of subterranean water.
- 2 June, August and September 2009: surface water, due to heavy rainfall.
- 3 May 2010 - a high water table flooding, as in 1978. Water seeped through the floor and approximately 3 inches before it eventually subsided. An automatic pump was installed to monitor and address future flooding.

rose

I am particularly concerned that possible risks such as ground movement and flooding are only assessed as the work progresses and not carried out in detail before work commences, as they should be. Contractors are allowed to monitor their own works. No.28 as a building is in a poor state of repair due to neglect. It does not therefore impart confidence that the proposed works will be carried out to a decent standard, nor that it will be monitored properly.

The proposed development will adversely impact on the adjoining properties at No. 26 and 30, and that this risk has not been given adequate consideration.

The Application, its reports and assessments are not only inconsistent, inaccurate and misleading, they seem to be glossed over to facilitate a speed planning approval without sufficient consideration to the

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

health and safety aspects of the property itself and its tenants. It is certainly without consideration, in particular, to the adjoining properties: 26 and 30 Canfield Gardens and their neighbouring buildings. I therefore lodge my objection to this Planning Application herewith and request that Permission be refused.

Yours sincerely
Veronica Wakefield

13 April 2017

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0859/P	Shahram Vaziri-Tabar	Flat 2 23 Compayne Gardens NW6 3DE NW6 3DE	14/04/2017 20:06:58	OBJ	<p>Flat 1, Basement and Ground Floor 28 Canfield Gardens, London, NW6 3LA Application Ref: 2017/0859/P</p> <p>I am writing in my capacity as a member of Fairhazel Co-operative Ltd, owner of the adjoining properties at 26 and 30 Canfield Gardens. I would like to lodge my objection on the following grounds.</p> <p>1 - Number 28 Canfield Gardens is towards the bottom of a slope running from Finchley Road along Canfield Gardens in a terrace of double-fronted houses. Drainage and ground water runoff are therefore serious issues of grave concern in this area. Excavation, enlarging the basement area and creating a light well can only increase the risk of flooding and will jeopardise the safety of the adjoining properties.</p> <p>2 – Reported on 14th August 1975 basements of adjacent properties to 28 Canfield Gardens suffered substantial flood damage. We are also advised there is an underground tributary of the ‘lost rivers’ River Westbourne near 28 Canfield Gardens, running through clay that could pose potential flooding if it alters its course. Clay movement in this area has in the past caused structural damage.</p> <p>3 - Claims were made in 2005 at 30 Canfield Gardens, and in 2008/9 at 26 Canfield Gardens regarding subsidence (both are adjoining properties to 28 Canfield). All was monitored, the properties eventually stabilised and the internal cracks settled hence no underpinning was necessary, but significant damage was caused.</p> <p>4 - The Design and Access Statement appears to contain incorrect information concerning basements in the terrace of houses. 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 some basements (former coal cellars), which are the same as the existing basement at number 28 Canfield.</p> <p>5 - To the best of my knowledge, there are no basements of the proposed depth with or without light wells in similar properties along this section of Canfield Gardens.</p> <p>6 - I am advised that careful reading of all of the documentation shows that the proposal will require significant downward excavation of the current basement. It will also extend the basement beyond the current footprint of the house.</p> <p>7 - Structural works to lower the foundations at 28 Canfield Gardens poses a potential risk of further subsidence occurring at our properties, i.e. 26 and 30 Canfield Gardens.</p> <p>8 – I am also advised basements being dug out in one of a line of terrace houses can be problematic. I do not actually know of any others that have been done in our stretch of Canfield Gardens.</p> <p>9 - I have grave concern and request that risks such as ground movement and flooding be assessed in detail before planning permission is even considered. I also have serious concerns over the "safety" of undertaking the works that is proposed for the building as a whole.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>10 - The impact assessment in the planning application suggests that there could be trouble due to the basement being lower than the water table.</p> <p>I request that the application, as it stands, be refused.</p>
2017/0859/P	Antonia Pantazatou	Flat 4 28 Canfield Gardens	14/04/2017 17:01:01	OBJ	<p>I have been living at 28 Canfield Gardens for the last 5 years. I love this area as it is so quiet, and I feel that if the extension happens that won't be the case anymore. I have only now renewed my contract for one more year until March 2018, and no one has informed me regarding this extension. I believe my and my neighbours' quality of living will be greatly reduced. I work a lot from home, so I will be affected even more by the enlargement process and work.</p>
2017/0859/P	Mark Newman	Flat 3 22 Canfield Gardens	17/04/2017 18:08:32	OBJEMPER	<p>I write to object to the planning application at 28 Canfield Gardens.</p> <p>My concerns are two-fold. Firstly, that the plans for basement enlargement are disingenuous - for there is currently not a basement flat at this property. Nor are there other basement properties on this section of the street (there are garden flats, and some buildings do have old storage spaces, but no basements that I am aware of). The scale of the works will severely impact both the front and rear of the property, significantly alternating its appearance and therefore the appearance of adjoining properties that make up this conservation area. The plans indicate the new basement and associated lightwells would take up considerable space in the front of the building, very close to the pavement, thus severely impacting the appearance of the building, and damaging the existing appearance of the street.</p> <p>Secondly, I am concerned that the significant structural changes the plan implies could result in the risk of subsidence and other related issues being much greater, both to this building and to the neighbouring buildings. The area is built close by underground streams and going deeper down into the ground may result in damage caused to the structural integrity of the foundations, which could potentially cost significant sums for the owners of the adjoining properties to correct, should they be affected.</p> <p>On these grounds I wish to object to this planning application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0859/P	Fairhazel Co-operative Ltd.,	Fairhazel Co-operative Ltd Basement Office 23 Compayne Gardens London NW6 3DE	13/04/2017 11:03:07	OBJ	<p>Flat 1, Basement and Ground Floor 28 Canfield Gardens, London, NW6 3LA</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on application 2017/0859/P.</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Fairhazel Co-operative Ltd, owner of the adjoining properties at 26 and 30 Canfield Gardens, who would like to object to such an application on the following grounds. For your information Fairhazel Co-operative comprises 128 residential properties in 26 buildings mostly surrounding the Triangle Green which 28 Canfield Gardens backs onto.</p> <p>1 - 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. In fact Number 28 Canfield Gardens is towards the bottom of a slope along Canfield Gardens. Drainage and ground water runoff are therefore serious concerns. Enlarging the basement area, excavation and creating a light well at a lower level can only increase the risk of flooding.</p> <p>2 - We are advised that if either the groundwater level or sewer level is above the basement floor, natural forces of physics will try to move that water into the basement. The sanitary sewer lateral under normal conditions allows water to flow from a property to the sewer, there is the potential for water to move from the sewer into the basement / proposed bedroom area; especially if filled beyond capacity due to extreme heavy rainfalls. History shows that on 14th August 1975 basements of adjacent properties to 28 Canfield Gardens suffered substantial flood damage due to storm flooding. In addition there is an underground tributary of the 'lost rivers' River Westbourne near 28 Canfield Gardens, running through clay that could pose potential flooding if it alters its course. Clay movement in this area has caused structural damage. There is no apparent drainage under the security grille hiding the light well which may also cause flooding.</p> <p>3 - Also claims were made in 2005 at 30 Canfield Gardens and in 2008/9 at 26 Canfield Gardens regarding subsidence. The properties eventually stabilized and the internal cracks settled hence no underpinning was necessary but significant damage was caused.</p> <p>4 - Structural works to lower the foundations at 28 Canfield Gardens poses a potential risk of further subsidence occurring at these properties, especially as the proposal is to create a basement area in number 28 that will adjoin 30 Canfield Gardens.</p> <p>5 - 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.</p> <p>6 - In fact, to the best of our knowledge, there are no basements of the proposed depth with or without light wells in similar properties along this section of Canfield Gardens. There are "basement flats" on</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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 some basements (former coal cellars), which are the same as the existing basement at number 28 Canfield (it is these which are marked on the photograph).</p> <p>7 - The Design and Access Statement is written to suggest – incorrectly - that the proposed works will merely be “enlarging the existing basement level” (p2). We are advised that careful reading of all of the documentation shows that the proposal will require significant downward excavation of the current basement. It will also extend the basement beyond the current footprint of the house.</p> <p>8 - We understand basements being dug out in one of a line of terrace houses may be particularly problematic. We do not actually know of any others that have been done in our stretch of Canfield Gardens.</p> <p>9 - We are deeply concerned that such possible risks as ground movement and flooding may only be assessed as the work progresses and not carried out in detail before work commences, as they should be. We have serious concerns over the "safety" of undertaking the work that is proposed for the building as a whole.</p> <p>10 - 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.</p> <p>11 - We are 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.</p> <p>12 - We would like to object to the proposed enlargement of the existing half basement, as its proposed floor will be lower than the floor of its existing half basement. It is unclear exactly how deep the excavations will go since the drawings provide conflicting information.</p> <p>13 - The impact assessment in the planning application suggests that there could be trouble due to the basement being lower than the water table.</p> <p>14 – Finally the tree in the front garden space of 28 Canfield Gardens is protected by virtue of being in a Conservation area. In addition such excavation works may have an impact on the roots of protected trees of adjoining properties.</p> <p>We request that the application, as it stands, be refused.</p>