

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0645/P	David Gowers	FLAT 9 KINGSLAND BROXWOOD WAY London NW8 7QJ	01/05/2018 02:41:41	WREP	<p>I have great concerns about the Basement Impact Assessment report compiled by Campbell Reith, Consulting Engineers, on behalf of Camden Council.</p> <p>In the Basement Impact Assessment Audit Check List; why has the question: Has the scheme avoided cumulative impacts upon structural stability or the water environment in the local area? Not been answered?</p> <p>It states that:</p> <p>An impact assessment has been undertaken to assess the magnitude of movement at the closest neighbouring properties of No. 16 and No.72 Kingsland, located 9.5m and 7.5m from the site, respectively. This is incorrect. The nearest properties are 54 and 72 and 1 and 9 and not 16, which is at the other end of the block 1-16.</p> <p>On page 8-13 and the page: Appendix 1: Residents' Consultation Comments, why does it say:</p> <p>123 Broadhurst Gardens, London NW6 3BJ BIA – Audit; when this report is about 29 Barrie House and not 123 Broadhurst Gardens? This is not professional.</p> <p>At 4.23. it states: Basement to No. 72 Kingsland is 7.5m away from the property and No.1-16 Kingsland is 9.5m away. The assessment indicates that Damage Category 1 “very slight damage” is applicable for No. 72 Kingsland and Damage Category 0 “negligible damage” is applicable for No. 16 Kingsland. The predicted movements at the neighbouring properties are small and are unlikely to result in damage in excess of Category 1 (‘very slight’). It is 54 and 72 and 1 and 9 that will be affected.</p> <p>Why does 5.12. state:</p> <p>The Ground Movement Assessment (GMA) has been produced that predicts Damage Category 0 for No. 72 Kingsland and Damage Category 1 for No. 72 Kingsland and No.1-16 Kingsland. GMA has used horizontal and vertical movement values associated with a contiguous piled wall installation rather than those associated with a secant piled wall as proposed, and are likely to be more onerous. The GMA should therefore be amended to take into account predicted movement values associated with the proposed form of construction.</p> <p>The above section is contradictory and gives confusing and incorrect information. Please read section 4.23 and compare and you will see the errors. It does not feel one with confidence that this report is competent.</p> <p>Under Residents' Consultation Comments, why is there no comments from any other resident from the surrounding area?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0645/P	Mr. David Gowers	FLAT 9 KINGSLAND BROXWOOD WAY London NW8 7QJ	01/05/2018 02:50:18	WREP	<p>In 2012 planning permission was given by the council for a house to be built where the Porter's Lodge is now..</p> <p>This planning permission was not taken up. I believe one reason was that the large tree in the front was subject to a Tree Protection Order after complaints by residents. This did not suit the owner of Barrie House.</p> <p>Why are they now trying to build a large property that benefits on-one and will cause much disruption to many local people?</p>
