

1A OAKHILL AVENUE LONDON NW3 7RD

28 June 2017

Development Management Team
Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

Attention: Tania Skelli-Yaoz

Dear Sirs,

**OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION NO 2017/2614/P at 2
OAKHILL AVENUE NW3 7RE IN RESPECT OF BASEMENT
EXCAVATION AND EXTENSIONS TO FORM 3 THREE BEDROOM
FLATS**

It is understood that the Applicant has lodged a revised planning application under number **2017/2614/P**. No notice was sent to me but I have seen the one (only) notice placed outside 2 Oakhill Avenue.

I wish to make a formal **OBJECTION** to the above proposed planning application.

In support of my grounds for objection I would be grateful if you could note the following:-

1. I enclose, for ease of reference, a copy of my letter of 25 November 2014. The works involve basement excavation which is most damaging to the neighbouring properties and environment. It is presumed that you are aware that basement excavation in the neighbouring road, Redington Road, caused the road to collapse. I am surprised that the council saw fit to approve the initial application which was apparently motivated by no more than opportunist and excessive greed by the owner.
2. The property is over the River Fleet and digging down will cause great damage to the water table.
3. It is understood that the Eyre Estate has taken into account the substantial damage both to the fabric of houses and gardens entirely due to basement excavations, and no longer issues licenses for such works to be carried out. If this development is permitted, then Camden Council will of course be liable in

damages should any similar damage occur, either to the highways and/or neighbouring and/or adjacent properties.

4. The amount of noise and disruption which will be occasioned by the carrying out of these works (which of necessity will be over a long period of time) is detrimental to the quiet enjoyment of the home owners in Oakhill Avenue and other properties in the vicinity. This new application purports to "reduce vibration noise". This is of course nonsense. What professional opinions has Camden demanded to see to ensure that this can be achieved? It is merely a vague statement which cannot be justified or accepted by the council.
5. The new application also purports to "reduce differential settlement between adjacent buildings". Again what professional opinions has Camden demanded to see to justify how such settlement between adjacent buildings can be reduced? This statement alone cannot be accepted by Camden.
6. The new application also purports to "simplify structural design". This means nothing.
7. This proposed development is clearly detrimental to the character of this Conservation Area and unacceptable in terms of a number of Camden's policies.
8. Camden Council has a statutory duty to protect the character and appearance of the Redington/Froggnal Conservation area. The proposed works appear to be in breach of the requirements of the policies as set out in Camden's Unitary Development Plan 2000.

Camden Council has recently been under scrutiny and subject to enormous criticism in respect of its oversight role in respect of tower blocks. I would expect Camden Council to be rigorous in respect of this mini block which has no place in this road. It is over development on a large scale on a small site. There will be at least 6 parking spaces required, and will be overcrowded with at least 18+ people living there (and possibly many more)

I urge the council to **REJECT** the proposal.


Dr Roger Coudren

4. The amount of noise and disruption which will be occasioned by the carrying out of these works (which of necessity will be over a long period of time) is detrimental to the quiet enjoyment of the home owners in Oakhill Avenue and other properties in the vicinity.
5. This proposed development is clearly detrimental to the character of this Conservation Area and unacceptable in terms of a number of Camden's policies.
6. Camden Council has a statutory duty to protect the character and appearance of the Redington/Frognaal Conservation area. The proposed works appear to be in breach of the requirements of the policies as set out in Camden's Unitary Development Plan 2000.

I urge the council to **REJECT** the proposal.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Roger Goulden