

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2885/P	Lea Steps and Upfleet Ltd	Lea Steps (Registered Office) Vale of Health London NW3 1AN	20/06/2017 14:30:26	OBJLETTE R	<p>THE GARDEN HOUSE, VALE OF HEALTH, LONDON NW3 1AN LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN APPLICATIONS 2017/2885/P</p> <p>Objections of the Freeholders of Lea Steps and Upfleet Limited, Vale of Health, NW31AN</p> <p>OUR INTEREST</p> <p>1. The building of Upfleet and Lea Steps is immediately adjacent to the proposed development site. As Freeholders of the building known as Upfleet and Lea Steps we own the narrow passage through which all foot and proposed vehicular transport currently passes and will have to pass during construction. All rear windows of the property, comprising one maisonette and three flats, overlook the proposed development site and its garden. The Garden House accesses mains drainage via the drainage system of Upfleet and Lea Steps.</p> <p>OBJECTIONS TO 2017/2885/P</p> <p>2. Disproportionate Addition. The proposed site lies in the Hampstead Conservation Area and is both designated as Metropolitan Open Land and protected under Camden Council's LDF citing the London Plan policy 3D.10 . With an estimated increase of just under eighty three percent, the multiple applications relating to development of the Garden House already appear to constitute a clear breach of permitted extension to the original building. The current application further extends the disproportionate addition to the original dwelling.</p> <p>3. Water Management. We submit that without full and satisfactory consideration in the proposed review of Camden Council's external engineering consultants (Campbell – Reith) of the long, medium and short term issues below planning permission should not be granted.</p> <p>a. Long Term: It is not possible to disassociate the PD basement excavation from the lightwell excavation. If the combined effect of the two is unsatisfactory, then the present application with respect to the lightwell aspect of the proposal should be dismissed. The basement and lightwell excavation will be carried out below groundwater level. As yet we see little evidence that the spring water and ground water flows, and their fluctuations, have been taken into account in the BIA. Recent heavy rains (29.05.17) and historic flooding in our and the adjacent property makes this an important consideration for the proposed Campbell – Reith review. A further long term consideration for this review should be the changes to groundwater recharge, surface water infiltration and runoff that will result from the proposed development.</p> <p>b. Medium Term. The CPM indicates that a temporary earth bund formed of site strip topsoil and turf will be installed to ensure that surface water runoff does not enter the adjacent Vale of Health pond. We can find no calculations or discussions in the BIA of the dimensions of the bund or to its structural integrity. Of particular concern is the potential flooding of the pond and seepage of soil which is known to have high lead content into the pond.</p> <p>c. Short Term. There is insufficient detail in the CPM relating to management of the water pumped from the site during construction. Current drainage, running through our property, has</p>

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

proved unable to deal with extant seasonal conditions and cannot be used for discharge of site water into the mains water system.

4. Land/Ground Management. The BIA indicates a requirement for ground investigations and related calculations to ascertain the likelihood and real level of structural damage to our and adjacent properties. We submit that planning permission should not be granted until such time as that work and those calculations have been undertaken and an addendum report submitted.

5. Impact upon Neighbourhood Amenity during Construction. The effect on local amenity and the highway network from construction and demolition is a material planning consideration. In this respect, we draw attention to the following policies: namely policy CS5 at paragraph (e) (Managing the impact of growth and development); policies DP26 and DP27; policy A5 of the draft Local Plan; and Paragraph 4.1 of CPG 4 "Basements and Lightwells" in relation to the following objections.

a. Traffic Congestion and Services Access. The only access to the Application Site is via the small arched entrance that forms part of the Freehold of Upfleet and Lea Steps. This is accessed from the narrow residential street of the Vale of Health. The passage proportions are insufficient to permit the access of most construction vehicles to the proposed development site. The Vale of Health itself is a narrow single-lane dead-end street surrounded by Hampstead Heath, with very limited parking. It is currently subject to frequent traffic movement problems during peak usage times and during deliveries to households. It is inherently unsuitable for large vehicles. The impact on traffic congestion of large works vehicles and the three suspended parking bays would be considerable and would pose a safety risk by unacceptably restricting access for emergency services, as well as causing difficulties for neighbours, particularly those who are disabled or have young children. The Garden House is one of the first houses in the street and difficulties caused by large vehicles would have a knock-on effect on all properties further along - some 70 dwellings and well over a hundred people for whom there is no other means of access to their properties. Because of the restricted access, the work is likely to be extremely disruptive to neighbours and have an unacceptable impact upon neighbouring amenity for all Vale residents.

b. Working Group. The CMP indicates that the project is not of sufficient scale to warrant setting up a working group. Given the nature of the site and the impact of the proposed development on a large number of people over an extended time period it is very apparent that a working group is essential and the CMP should not be approved until this is in place.

c. Incorrect Statements. (1) The answer to Question 16 is wrong. Hillview has been granted planning permission and it is expected that work there will soon commence. The cumulative effect of work on the two sites, were they to proceed simultaneously, would be to cause an intolerable impact upon residential amenity. (2) the Design and Access Statement notes that the building was constructed in the 1960s. This is incorrect. It was constructed in the 1950s.

6. Impact on the Structure and Amenity of Upfleet and Lea Steps.

The arched entrance and passage noted in 5. above is located over the cellars and below one

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

of the flats of Upfleet and Lea Steps. The walls of the passage are also in the ownership of the Freehold of our property. Our objection related to this concerns the absolutely inadequate consideration within the CMP of the impact of construction traffic, goods and people through this restricted access. In particular:

(a) The CMP indicates that Light Goods Vehicles will be used for deliveries to site. It is also stated that all materials "could" be manually handled on and off the site to/from the road. It is entirely likely that this may be necessary as the width of the passage and access adjacent to the pavement on the land immediately before the gateway is considerably reduced from a maximum of 2200 mms to around 1600 mm by piers and pillars. This is documented on the original land grant for the Garden House site and its accompanying plan dated 31st Decemeber 1952. The CMP should not be approved until the height and width restrictions of the extant structure allow for a definitive decision on the use of vehicular transportation of materials and/or plant.

(b) As yet there has been no structural survey of our property to ascertain the capacity of the passage way in any of its structural aspects (walls, ceiling, floor, piers) to support the weight and repeated vibrations of construction vehicles, plant and materials. Without this survey planning permission should not be granted.

(c) The draft CMPs estimate of a total of 1146 vehicular movements over a construction period of up to 61 weeks is a likely underestimate and does not take into account the physical requirement of using very small machinery to remove site spoil. Without a review of the amount of spoil (currently estimated at 1200-1500t) and a realistic calculation number of the number of journeys with vehicles appropriately sized to the passage, this planning permission should not be granted.

(d) The limited access will also restrict the size of the piling rig to be used on site. As it is doubtful that such a rig would be able to form the secant wall to the sizes and depths required the CMP should specify the piling plant to be used.

(e) The CMP should also consider the size of the steelwork required for the secant piled wall propping. The section sizes needed for that operation could be long (over 5m), heavy and therefore difficult to handle without lifting equipment. That issue is not currently addressed.

As Freeholders of Upfleet and Lea Steps we submit that permission should not be granted until all concerns have been fully addressed to the satisfaction of all concerned parties.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2885/P	James Hinchcliffe	Flat B Upfleet Vale of Health NE31AN	20/06/2017 14:08:08	OBJLETTE R	<p>THE GARDEN HOUSE, VALE OF HEALTH, LONDON NW3 1AN LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN APPLICATION 2017/2885/P</p> <p>OBJECTIONS OF JAMES HINCHLIFFE LEASAEHOLDER OF FLAT B, UPFLEET, VALE OF HEALTH, NW3 1AN</p> <p>I raise the following objections to the application 2017/2885/P</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Illegality of additional square meterage. The sequential and piecemeal applications from the Garden House haVE increased the square meterage of the house to well above the NPPF, the MOL rules and Camden's own Policy CS15. The Planning Consultant for the Garden House states that the lightwell should not be considered as an extension to existing plans. This is incorrect as the various proposals cannot be considered independently. Including the lightwell, the size of the multiple submissions for extension almost double the square meterage of the original building. 2. Inadequacy of the BIA and the CMP. The current drafts do not sufficiently address: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The disruption to the current groundwater flows and capacity or the current spring water regimes. Without detailed investigation this may result in worsening the existing risk of flooding of both Upfleet & Lea Steps as well as neighbouring properties. The potential effect of ground water changes on the foundations of these properties has not been discussed. b. Management of the excess water to be pumped off site during construction is not addressed. Current drains are unable to cope with heavy rains so are certainly unable to deal with any additional load from the construction site c. Disruption caused by pumping is not discussed in the CMP. There are two issues which need to be addressed: the location of the physical pipes and pumps; and, the noise generated during pumping operations. Given the proximity to other dwellings the last cannot be sustained outside of normal working hours. d. Potential pollution and long term damage to the ecology of the pond is given scant attention. The bund proposed during construction has not been detailed and, until its structure and capacity is clear, the management plan has to be considered inadequate. 3. Unacceptable impact upon Neighbouring Amenity during Construction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Camden's planning policies make it clear that the effect on local amenity and the highway network from construction and demolition is a material planning consideration. In this respect, the objectors draw attention to the following policies: namely policy CS5 at paragraph (e) (Managing the impact of growth and development); policies DP26 and DP27; policy A5 of the draft Local Plan; and Paragraph 4.1 of CPG 4 "Basements and Lightwells". The proposals are at odds with most of the mitigation measures suggested in the guidelines b. The only access to the Application Site is via the small arched entrance that forms part of the Freehold of Upfleet and Lea Steps. This is accessed from the narrow residential street of the Vale of Health. The passage proportions are insufficient to permit the access of most construction vehicles to the proposed development site. The Vale of Health itself is a narrow

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>single-lane dead-end street surrounded by Hampstead Heath, with very limited parking. It is currently subject to frequent traffic movement problems during peak usage times and during deliveries to households. It is inherently unsuitable for large vehicles. The noise and impact on traffic congestion of large works vehicles and the three suspended parking bays would be considerable. It would also pose a safety risk by unacceptably restricting access for emergency services, as well as causing difficulties for neighbours, particularly those who are disabled or have young children. The Garden House is one of the first houses in the street and difficulties caused by large vehicles would have a knock-on effect on all properties further along - some 70 dwellings and well over a hundred people for whom there is no other means of access to their properties. Because of the restricted access, the work is likely to be extremely disruptive to neighbours and have an unacceptable impact upon neighbouring amenity for all Vale residents.</p> <p>4. Negative Impact on the Structure and Amenity of Upfleet</p> <p>The arched entrance and passage noted in 5. above is located over the cellars, below one of the flats of Upfleet and Lea Steps. The walls of the passage are also in the ownership of the Freehold of this property. This objection concerns the almost total lack of consideration within the CMP of the impact of construction traffic, goods and people through this restricted access. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Noise, vibration and dust levels resulting from construction traffic and activities on the road, through the passage and on the construction site have not been adequately addressed. All of these will have considerable negative impact on the residents of Flats B and C.b. Potential damage to the structure of the building, in particular the wall adjoining the pavement as well as the walls, ceiling and floor of the passage through our property and under Flat Cc. Visual intrusion of construction activities, materials and vehicles during constructiond. Potential breach of a clear view to the ponds for all residents of Upfleet and Lea steps. This view is protected by covenant and covers all obstructions including trees, building and other objects such as vehicles
