

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2017/4684/P | Mr Onn Tammuz | 121 Broadhurst Gardens London NW6 3BJ | 27/09/2017 17:34:30 | OBJ | <p>The applicant's property is semi-detached with 121 Broadhurst Gdns. I am the Director and Chairman of '121 Broadhurst Gdns. Management Company Ltd.' and the owner of the Lower Ground Floor at this address. I believe that the plan to lower the existing level of the Lower Ground Floor of 123 Broadhurst Gdns, will adversely affect my property and, for this matter, also the whole structure of 121 Broadhurst Gdns. I therefore strongly object to the proposed plan/application. My reasons are twofold;</p> |

1. Structural risk/damage.
2. Water damage.

There is an additional reason for my objection to the submitted plans; part of the current Ground Floor plan has been changed i.e. it is different to the consented plan for this level, different in a way that will adversely affects my property. No application for these changes has been submitted. You will find more details towards the end of this letter.

Structural Risk – In order to achieve the final level of the proposed new basement, it is necessary to reduce the existing level of the Lower Ground Floor by 2.0 meters (see Paddock Geo Engineering 'Ground Investigation Report' clause 7.3). By PGE own admission, this will create a "significant differential depth of foundation relative to neighbouring properties" (i.e. my property) "which may result in structural damage" (PGE 'Basement Impact Assessment', page 13, clause 3.3, sub clause 13 and also page 14, clause 4.1 sub clause 13). Furthermore, the proposed massive excavation necessitates the underpinning of the full length (~16 meters) of the Party Wall between the applicant's and my own property. According to Sinclair & Johnston, the structural engineers for this project, this is a highly specialized task where, even with a most experience contractor, an applicable damage is to be expected (Sinclair & Johnston 'Structural Design' doc, page 9 clause 8.7). PGE report also states; "Each of the walls for 121 Broadhurst Gardens are also considered to have an applicable damage ... "due to the magnitude of strains resulting from horizontal and vertical displacement" ("Ground Investigation' doc. Page 34, second paragraph from the bottom).

Water Damage – There is plenty of evidence to the presence of various groundwater levels on site (perched water, PGE 'Ground Investigation' doc. Page 19, clause 5.6.3 first paragraph and page 22, clause 6.1 last paragraph. Also Sinclair & Johnston 'Structural Design' report, page 3 clause 3.5, page 4 clause 5.6 and page 9 clause 8.4). Four boreholes were dug on site (see relevant plan) and perched water seepages were encountered in all of them. In the past, my own property suffered from rising water level during periods of heavy rain and I have spent considerable amounts of money in an attempt to prevent this from happening again.

The proposed, significant lowering of the existing ground level will, no doubt, result in underground water being attracted to the site i.e. to the area under the whole building. Indeed, the use of sump pumps was strongly recommended to the applicant by both PGE and Sinclair & Johnston. I, on the other hand, do not have sump pumps installed and am, therefore, likely to suffer from the expected waterlogged soil under my floors and walls. It is worthwhile mentioning that the proposed lowering of the Lower Ground Floor level

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

applies not only to the full length of the Party Wall and complete footprint of the building but it also extends further into the front and rear gardens (~7 meters longer than the building, an addition of more than 40% to the dug area!). This massive digging, as experienced with similar projects all over London shows, will increase significantly the problem of water penetration into our property.

Considering the engineers' reports and the expected potential damage to our property, I would have expected the applicant to achieve the necessary headroom in his basement by raising his ground floor level, as we have done when we built our basement flat. Instead, he chose to dig deep into the ground, all in order to have a very high ceiling basement (over 340 cm net, the highest floor in the building!), showing little consideration for the risks involved.

My last point relates to the fact that the currently submitted plan for the Ground Floor is different to the consented plan for the same level. The consented Ground Floor plan included a built in planter as part of the external balcony. This planter, ~ 60 cm wide and as deep as the whole balcony and stairs, was included in the consented plan as a result of discussions between the project's architects and me. It serves as a buffer that prevents the users of the proposed balcony from being able to look directly into my Living Room (see drawing of the South Elevation). In the new, currently submitted plan, the built in planter was removed and access to the very edge of the balcony is now provided. No application for this change which results in my total loss of privacy has been submitted. I urge the Council to insist on the construction of this planter as it appears on the consented plan. And since no measurements were provided in the initial application for the depth of the proposed balcony (i.e. how far it extends into the rear garden), I also urge the Council to insist on keeping this depth as small as possible, again, in order to protect my privacy (see South Elevation).

Considering all the above mentioned reasons, I urge the committee to decline this planning application.

Thank you.

Onn Tammuz
Architect and Town Planner, Tech. IL
