

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5780/P	Oliver Froment	10 Pilgrim's Lane NW3 1SL	07/12/2017 22:59:12	COMMNT	<p>This application should be refused in its present form as it unnecessarily endangers Tree Preservation Order trees (TPO) that give substantial amenity to the whole community. The SUDS should be located further away from the tree protection area and south of the proposed location. These TPO's were issued several years ago as a result of petitions signed by over 100 local residents. It is perfectly feasible to have the SUDS built further away from the proposed location.</p> <p>It is also very regrettable that the owner of the house is now proposing this because the basement that they have built has produced water infiltration issues that have forced them at the last minute to come up with this proposal in order to evacuate through a pumping network, the underground water problems that they have caused in the first instance. We had previously warned the applicant that their scheme was deficient in that respect but the applicant refused to listen at the time. It is also very regrettable that the applicant did not consult with the local residents despite both the Hampstead Neighbouring Plan and the Camden Planning framework explicitly recommending for applicants to consult with residents. Please refuse this application in its present form. The applicant needs to redraft his application and have a location for the SUDS that is at least away from the TPO trees by 1.5 meter from its present proposed location. Please keep me informed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5780/P	Peter Goldsmith (as agent for Mrs Zoe Hersov)	7 Hurlingham Studios Ranelagh Gardens London SW6 3PA	07/12/2017 09:14:52	COMMNT	<p>2017/5780/P - Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The application is an abuse of planning process in that the materials supplied with it were supposed to be presented as a precondition of the works being commenced, but have flagrantly been supplied only now when very substantial work has been undertaken. It flouts the local authority's ability to manage planning properly and sets a precedent if simply permitted because 'something has arrived, eventually'. 2. The above is particularly the case as it is clear from the SUDS plan that a survey had been undertaken as long ago as 2014 and the bona fides of the applicant must therefore be queried in relation to the point made in 1 above. This emphasises the nature of this application, if simply consented to, as a precedent for any other who wishes to ride a coach and horses through the due planning process. We do not propose to here deal with the consequential issues of liability on the part of the planning authority in that case. 3. There is no demonstration in the materials supplied as to the full consideration of the issues normally attendant upon design of SUDS. There is no real insight into the facts and figures and thought process on the part of the developer and advisers as to how this solution has come to be presented. 4. There is some shorthand case presented for using a tank that will fill with and then slowly release the water of heavy rainfall, rather than surface features. This is provisionally accepted as a general means of resolving the SUDS for this development, but subject only as below and to the safeguards needed in view of the issues raised. 5. The ground in question slopes in two directions, first from back to (street) front and second from left to right viewed from the road. One has merely to walk on nearby Hampstead Heath, off the 'beaten tracks' to find one is treading through very heavily waterlogged ground. I believe the water table for the property lies at 1 to 2 meters below the ground, and the zero infiltration rates exhibited in the figures confirm that the whole is heavily waterlogged. 6. The principal consent, to which the instant application is subsidiary, was granted subject to conditions re SUDS and re tree management for very good reason – with a substantial basement excavation, the water displaced has to go somewhere, and the issue of what happens when more water penetrates the soil is of moment, whether this arrives from a storm directly onto the property or its effects on other property uphill of it. 7. No 4 is downhill of no 3, so any defect in SUDS will be detrimental to No 4 but also to other property further downhill in Downshire Hill itself and in other downhill property. We are aware of a substantial water issue downhill in Downshire Hill owing it would seem to insufficient attention to such details on a development. 8. Thus, there are two questions to be settled in considering the application: 1) is the location of the tank shown in the diagram appropriate? and 2) is the tank and overall 'plumbing arrangement' adequate for the task? 9. Dealing with the location, we believe it is not correctly sited. To deal with run off from 3 Downshire Hill the obvious place for a tank is not where shown on drawing 01 rev P01 of job ICS 2176. It is in the lower left hand ("south east") corner of the land owned by the developer where catchment is at its maximum, and thus to minimise or remove outflow from the land save at the reduced rate of the system. This is a case where the developer's benefit from location must take second place to neighbourhood benefit. That is the reason

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>for SUDS.</p> <p>10. We would also observe that there is no assurance that the trees presently so close to the proposed tank site will not be damaged by the excavation works necessary to site the tank and or cause problems for the security of the tank at a later stage due to roots etc. These trees are subject to tree preservation orders which were the subject, we believe, of substantial neighbourhood involvement at an earlier stage. 'Losing' them is not an option whether for appearance, drainage, soil retention or any other reason. It is thus imperative that the tank is resited so that it cannot conceivably result in issues either way with the trees.</p> <p>11. Dealing with capacity, there are further issues namely, first, is the tank of adequate size for the events envisaged given the ground conditions above mentioned. Here there is no computation to show that the combination of sewers, downflow from other land to no 3 and rainfall event impacting on the those as well as the land will lead to the size of the tank set proposed being adequate. We believe it would be inadequate, and a rough guesstimate based on the area considered by the computations, and say a 5" downpour, suggests that the tank would need to be about 4 times the size specified. It is for the applicant to demonstrate adequacy, and this we submit has not been done at all.</p> <p>12. Because of the failure referred to in point 10, there is also no way of knowing whether the proposed outflow rate would not still lead to unwarranted amounts of water exiting no 3 to trouble other properties downhill. How many other outflows will now or in future join this tank simultaneously in releasing 'slowly' their contents? Will not the event in question see an enormous quantity of water in the area which means the tank water cannot simply be released at the rates specified? We believe the rate of release needs to be very much reduced so that escaping water is not just a slightly reduced 'flood' but a tempered stream that does not cause water problems on this and thus on other property. The whole issue of how much water will affect no 3 in the event of the storm envisaged, how much of it can enter the tank, how it will get there, and at what rate it will leave having regard to onward capacity, is not adequately set out. We note that the solution in whole or part of a rain garden has not been considered at all.</p> <p>13. We believe a quick and easy fix for the developer as presented is not a fix suitable for anyone else downhill of no 3 nor a SUDS treatment that should be accepted by the planning authority. Any review of SUDS materials makes it clear that it is essential to deal with this as the first step, not the last. The developer has chosen to proceed now despite the drawing being available in 2016, and not to follow planning requirements, and cannot be dismayed or surprised if what was inadequate then remains so now and must be properly addressed. These comments are of course without prejudice to the need for any party wall award that may be required for the tank to be in place.</p> <p>14. We urge that this application be dismissed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5780/P	Oliver Froment	10 Pilgrim's Lane NW3 1SL	07/12/2017 22:50:37	COMMNT	<p>This application should be refused in its present form as it unnecessarily endanger Tree Preservation Order trees (TPO) that give substantial amenity to the whole community. The SUDS should be located further away from the tree protection area and south of the proposed location. These TPO's were issued several years ago as a result of petitions signed by over 100 local residents. It is perfectly feasible to have the SUDS built further away from the proposed location.</p> <p>It is also very regrettable that the owner of the house is now proposing this because the basement that they have built has produced water infiltration issues and that has forced them at the last minute to come up with this proposal in order to evacuate through a pumping network the undergroundwater problems that they have caused in the first instance. We had previously warned the applicant that their scheme was deficient in that respect but the applicant refused to listen at the time. It is also very regrettable that the applicant did not consult with the local residents despite both the Hampstead Neighbouring Plan and the Camden Planning framework explicitly recommending for applicants to consult with residents. Please refuse this application in its present form. The applicant needs to redraft his application and have a location for the SUDS that is at least away from the TPO trees by 1.5 meter from its present proposed location. Please keep me informed.</p>
2017/5780/P	Oliver Froment	10 Pilgrim's Lane NW3 1SL	07/12/2017 22:50:19	COMMNT	<p>This application should be refused in its present form as it unnecessarily endanger Tree Preservation Order trees (TPO) that give substantial amenity to the whole community. The SUDS should be located further away from the tree protection area and south of the proposed location. These TPO's were issued several years ago as a result of petitions signed by over 100 local residents. It is perfectly feasible to have the SUDS built further away from the proposed location.</p> <p>It is also very regrettable that the owner of the house is now proposing this because the basement that they have built has produced water infiltration issues and that has forced them at the last minute to come up with this proposal in order to evacuate through a pumping network the undergroundwater problems that they have caused in the first instance. We had previously warned the applicant that their scheme was deficient in that respect but the applicant refused to listen at the time. It is also very regrettable that the applicant did not consult with the local residents despite both the Hampstead Neighbouring Plan and the Camden Planning framework explicitly recommending for applicants to consult with residents. Please refuse this application in its present form. The applicant needs to redraft his application and have a location for the SUDS that is at least away from the TPO trees by 1.5 meter from its present proposed location. Please keep me informed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5780/P	Mrs E Goldsmith	4 Downshire Hill London NW3 1 NR NW3 1 NR NW3 1 NR NW3 1 NR	07/12/2017 22:02:45	COMMNT	<p>I heard about the application by chance as there was no formal notice.</p> <p>I urge this application be dismissed. I object to the position on Drawing 01 job KS 2176 of the proposed water tank and recomend it be placed in the car parking area of No 3 Downshire Hill so the water displaced from the tank flows towards the front garden of No 4 and not towards the basement flat and foundations of No 4. The present position of the tank will affect the roots of the Prunus (Cherry Tree) which is protected by a T.P.O. According to British Standard BS 5837 the tree protection zone is 12 times the diameter of the tree trunk at 1.5m. The digging and removal of soil could cut and damage the tree roots, causing compaction, waterlogging and endanger the stability of tree. Prunus trees do not respond well to waterlogged soil which could result as the tank releases water. Also the tree roots could grow into the tank damaging it and affect the drainage capacity, with disastrous consequences.</p>
2017/5780/P	s D Ainger	8 downshire hill hampstead london nw3 1nr	07/12/2017 16:00:58	AMEND	<p>As a resident of DH I would like to comment on the water storage proposed on the site.</p> <p>The issue we have in DH is everything is built on clay on a 10 degree slope. The clay lies at a couple of feet below the surface and all water flow is therefore restricted to this zone with very little soaking away in the clay.</p> <p>This means that when we have heavy rain, the run off from the hillside between the back of Downshire Hill building and the back of Pilgrims lane (about 120feet), because of the clay subsoil, can be substantial.</p> <p>Whilst there is no street flooding (so 100year flood guidelines are not applicable)' residents with basements have found they flood as the water from hill side run off can not escape fast enough as the buildings often occupy the full plot width on the hill side.</p> <p>With the building of the new basement water flow under the building will be nil. I am therefore unconvinced that the storage water proposed on site is sufficient. I am not an expert but it seems they have proposed 3.2cu meters of storage which over the garden would equate to a just over one inch rain fall in a cloud burst. I have not included run off from adjacent gardens here. We certainly have had more than this in 30 minutes, whilst I have lived here, in certain storms.</p> <p>Can the site engineer confirm that the storage proposed is sufficient given unique situation of Downshire Hill as I am sure the owner and neighbours do not want water overflowing and cascading down the garden retaining walls</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5780/P	s D Ainger	8 downshire hill hampstead london nw3 1nr	07/12/2017 16:00:49	AMEND	<p>As a resident of DH I would like to comment on the water storage proposed on the site.</p> <p>The issue we have in DH is everything is built on clay on a 10 degree slope. The clay lies at a couple of feet below the surface and all water flow is therefore restricted to this zone with very little soaking away in the clay.</p> <p>This means that when we have heavy rain, the run off from the hillside between the back of Downshire Hill building and the back of Pilgrims lane (about 120feet), because of the clay subsoil, can be substantial.</p> <p>Whilst there is no street flooding (so 100year flood guidelines are not applicable)' residents with basements have found they flood as the water from hill side run off can not escape fast enough as the buildings often occupy the full plot width on the hill side.</p> <p>With the building of the new basement water flow under the building will be nil. I am therefore unconvinced that the storage water proposed on site is sufficient. I am not an expert but it seems they have proposed 3.2cu meters of storage which over the garden would equate to a just over one inch rain fall in a cloud burst. I have not included run off from adjacent gardens here. We certainly have had more than this in 30 minutes, whilst I have lived here, in certain storms.</p> <p>Can the site engineer confirm that the storage proposed is sufficient given unique situation of Downshire Hill as I am sure the owner and neighbours do not want water overflowing and cascading down the garden retaining walls</p>
2017/5780/P	Oliver Froment	10 Pilgrim's Lane NW3 1SL	07/12/2017 22:59:11	COMMNT	<p>This application should be refused in its present form as it unnecessarily endangers Tree Preservation Order trees (TPO) that give substantial amenity to the whole community. The SUDS should be located further away from the tree protection area and south of the proposed location. These TPO's were issued several years ago as a result of petitions signed by over 100 local residents. It is perfectly feasible to have the SUDS built further away from the proposed location.</p> <p>It is also very regrettable that the owner of the house is now proposing this because the basement that they have built has produced water infiltration issues that have forced them at the last minute to come up with this proposal in order to evacuate through a pumping network, the underground water problems that they have caused in the first instance. We had previously warned the applicant that their scheme was deficient in that respect but the applicant refused to listen at the time. It is also very regrettable that the applicant did not consult with the local residents despite both the Hampstead Neighbouring Plan and the Camden Planning framework explicitly recommending for applicants to consult with residents. Please refuse this application in its present form. The applicant needs to redraft his application and have a location for the SUDS that is at least away from the TPO trees by 1.5 meter from its present proposed location. Please keep me informed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5780/P	Oliver Froment	10 Pilgrim's Lane NW3 1SL	07/12/2017 22:59:05	COMMNT	<p>This application should be refused in its present form as it unnecessarily endangers Tree Preservation Order trees (TPO) that give substantial amenity to the whole community. The SUDS should be located further away from the tree protection area and south of the proposed location. These TPO's were issued several years ago as a result of petitions signed by over 100 local residents. It is perfectly feasible to have the SUDS built further away from the proposed location.</p> <p>It is also very regrettable that the owner of the house is now proposing this because the basement that they have built has produced water infiltration issues that have forced them at the last minute to come up with this proposal in order to evacuate through a pumping network, the underground water problems that they have caused in the first instance. We had previously warned the applicant that their scheme was deficient in that respect but the applicant refused to listen at the time. It is also very regrettable that the applicant did not consult with the local residents despite both the Hampstead Neighbouring Plan and the Camden Planning framework explicitly recommending for applicants to consult with residents. Please refuse this application in its present form. The applicant needs to redraft his application and have a location for the SUDS that is at least away from the TPO trees by 1.5 meter from its present proposed location. Please keep me informed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5780/P	John Hersov	23 Willoughby Road Hampstead London NW3 1RT	06/12/2017 16:43:30	COMMNT	<p>I am writing in supporting of my very elderly (95 & 89) parents who live at No 4 Downshire Hill NW3 INR,as I did with the original planning application. They received no formal notification of this latest application, which I have just learnt about today, 6 days before the responses deadline.</p> <p>Potentially, this plan could have a serious impact on my parents' property.</p> <p>The proposed siting position of the cellular storage tank is right in line with the house foundations at No 4. If there is any suggestion of water overflowing or water having been struck underground at No 3 this would fit in with many other documented concerns of digging below ground level in the Hampstead area.</p> <p>We do not want to see the foundations of our parents home put at risk by unmonitored actions .</p> <p>I would urge the Camden Planning Department to request immediate access to the property at No 3 in order to examine closely how the underground development constraints of this proposal are being adhered to, and consider other potential designs.</p> <p>Also on the impact of water draining regarding the TPOs on the 2 trees in the garden of No 3. Are these orders being respected?</p> <p>I understand there is a party wall agreement between No 3 and No 4.</p> <p>Can Camden ensure that this is being adhered to and not ridden roughshod over by the development at No 3? Please could a Council Planning Officer make contact with the people in charge of the development at No 3 and ensure that my parents' rights as local residents are respected and not ignored. This would require the Council to act as their advocate and also to represent the wider local community in this latest example of large scale property development in a heavily populated area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5780/P	Mrs E Goldsmith	4 Downshire Hill London NW3 1 NR NW3 1 NR NW3 1 NR NW3 1 NR	07/12/2017 22:02:30	COMMNT	<p>I heard about the application by chance as there was no formal notice.</p> <p>I urge this application be dismissed. I object to the position on Drawing 01 job KS 2176 of the proposed water tank and recomend it be placed in the car parking area of No 3 Downshire Hill so the water displaced from the tank flows towards the front garden of No 4 and not towards the basement flat and foundations of No 4. The present position of the tank will affect the roots of the Prunus (Cherry Tree) which is protected by a T.P.O. According to British Standard BS 5837 the tree protection zone is 12 times the diameter of the tree trunk at 1.5m. The digging and removal of soil could cut and damage the tree roots, causing compaction, waterlogging and endanger the stability of tree. Prunus trees do not respond well to waterlogged soil which could result as the tank releases water. Also the tree roots could grow into the tank damaging it and affect the drainage capacity, with disastrous consequences.</p>
