

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2017/2671/P | John Saynor | 27 Kylemore Road London NW6 2PS | 23/06/2017 17:44:36 | OBJNOT | <p>This is an application for a basement extension which will have a deleterious effect on the appearance of the property and the street. The plans submitted lack detail (an photographs) and make no reference to what is proposed for the rest of the house.</p> <p>Kylemore Road is a small and attractive street of terraced Victorian houses (built about 1890) and each house has a front garden measuring about 4m x 5m. Most of the gardens have mature shrubs (incl no 28) and some (incl no 28) have a thin layer of concrete covering part of the garden. Some neighbours look after their gardens better than others, but the overall effect is of pleasant greenery. The application describes the front garden of no 28 as "hard standing", which is misleading. There is a small area of (neglected) flower bed and some crazy paving, together with mature shrubs. I will attempt to upload a photograph of the property.</p> <p>There have been four recent basement conversions in Kylemore Road (nos 3, 5, 21 and 23) and these have resulted in the whole of the street-level frontage of the house being made up of concrete, paving and metal railings. If this trend is allowed to continue, the green and pleasant aspect of the street will be lost.</p> <p>A feature of all four of these basement conversions is that they were unnecessary. The houses in this street (in their unaltered condition) are substantial four bedroom properties, with space for extension at the rear, the side or into the loft space. The houses have quite extensive cellars across the depth of the house, which are valuable for storage, but which cannot be converted to habitable space without a massive basement dig.</p> <p>The property at No 28 is converted into two flats (possibly rented?) It is not clear what the applicant intends for the upper flat, or indeed even whether the occupants of the flats have been consulted. The entire house would need to be vacated for the two years or so that would be needed for the basement conversion. It would appear that this application is somewhat half-baked, and that the applicant is deliberately remaining silent about his overall plans for the property.</p> <p>I live on the opposite side of the street at no 27, about 3 doors along from no 28. I would therefore not be much affected by the building work. However I know from the experience of my neighbours that there will be a huge impact, with risk of property damage, to the adjoining properties at nos 26 and 30. When the basement conversion at no 23 was done a couple of years ago, the builders greatly underestimated the size of the job and the amount of spoil that would need to be removed to achieve the required ceiling height in the basement. A large (and unsafe) hole in the front garden remained for some months and the nearly 2 year duration of the project caused great distress to my elderly neighbours at no 25.</p> <p>Therefore, while I appreciate that disruption caused by the basement extension may not be a ground for objection , I would urge the Council to take this into account.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2017/2671/P | John Saynor | 27 Kylemore Road London NW6 2PS | 23/06/2017 18:18:47 | OBJNOT | <p>I can find no other comments from neighbours to this proposal, which suggests that the applicant has not spoken to his neighbours about his plans, and it may well be that they have failed to see the street notice.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>This is a supplement to the comments that I have just submitted. I have just read the BIA Statement (apologies for not doing so before) and I would query some points in this document.</p> <p>Ref 10) "Is the site within an aquifer? If so, will the proposed basement extend beneath the water table such that dewatering may be required during construction?"</p> <p>The answer given is No, but I would dispute this. The houses in this street are only just above the water table. When digging test holes at my property in winter, the hole did not have to be very deep before it filled with water. The water table here seems to rise and fall between summer and winter. I note that the report is dated April 2017, which was at the end of a long dry spell. This may explain the statement in the text of the report "no water was encountered in the boreholes."</p> <p>Ref 13) " Will the proposed basement significantly increase the differential depth of foundations relative to neighbouring properties?" "No" "The properties either side have existing basements similar to that under No. 28. It is proposed that the foundations will be underpinned in order to allow the existing basement floor to be lowered by a maximum of 0.33m"</p> <p>I believe that this is a ludicrous estimate. If the basement of this property is similar to my house, 0.33m would be inadequate just to obtain enough ceiling height. But to build adequate foundations for the new basement and to meeting building regulations for ceiling depth etc, I would guess that a dig down of at least 1 to 1.5 m would be needed. This is what I observed was required when the basement at no 23 was built.</p> <p>Therefore I would dispute the statement "As the properties either side have similar basements the proposed basement floor lowering will not require a significant increase in the differential depth of foundations relative to the neighbouring property"</p> <p>I would also disoute the statement; "The property and adjoining properties appear to be in a good state of repair ..." No 26 is certainly in good external condition, but no 28 has peeling exterior paintwork and does not give the impression of being in a good state of repair.</p> |