

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4302/P	Richard Morgan	31/05/2018 21:45:03	OBJ	Objection to planning application 2017/4302/P

We continue to object to the revisions to planning application 2017/4302/p, for the following reasons:

1. The drawings fail to record the location of adjacent structures, and in particular attached structures to the East of the plot, as a result of which the BIA fails to include any consideration of those structures, as well as failing to address the damage to the party wall to the East (rear) of the proposed development.
2. The supporting documentation fails to include the significant geological information previously submitted in support of 2014/3330/p, as a result of which the Planning Committee and any consultants retained to review of the BIA will not be appraised of the fundamentally unstable, waterlogged and contaminated soil into which the applicant proposes to excavate.
3. The application involves the substantial demolition of a building making a positive contribution to a conservation area without the applicant satisfying the appropriate requirements for such.
4. There is no drawing of the proposed section of the building "as built", as a result of which the impact of the proposed significant alteration to the historical "build line" at the rear of the mews is not readily apparent. As one can see from L14771, Drawing 10 issue P3 the proposed rearmost wall at ground level is to be built well beyond rear wall of 11 John's Mews, which is, itself, beyond the defining rear elevation along the rest of the mews, including 13-15 at 1st floor level. This detrimentally affects the setting of the listed buildings on John Street by materially altering the relationship between the mews houses on John's Mews and those on John Street by changing the rear building line in a conservation area.
5. A consequence of the proposed new floor heights and the location of the new proposed ground floor rear elevation is that there will be a full width glazed rear overtopping the height of the rear party wall but within only a few feet of it, and within 5 metres of the rear of our property, and 2 metres or so of the rear of 25 John Street, resulting in intrusive overlooking. This is a substantial interference with the amenity of neighbouring properties.
6. The proposed treatment of the roof of the ground floor rear elevation as a sebum bed, with sliding doors opening on to it, suggests that it is intended to be used as a roof terrace immediately adjacent to our rear elevation and looking directly into the rear of our property. Any permission should be conditional on it being impossible to gain access to the flat roof and all rear windows being obscure glazed.
7. The proposed new rear elevation generally involves the substantial demolition of the rear of the building and the creation of new large glazing areas, with consequent overlooking. Any permission should be conditional on all rear windows being obscure glazed with restricted opening to prevent noise and light pollution.
8. The revised plans allegedly reduce the depth of the excavation but with no datum line from which ground level is to be taken and there is no dimensioning on the internal heights. The surprising thing about the revised application is the fact that, on the basis of a less transparent BIA than previously submitted and a stated new maximum excavation depth of 2.9 metres BGL, it is asserted that the damage assessment will be below Burland Scale 1, despite the fact that all previous BIAs for this site have exceeded this threshold and

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

have put it at the Burland Scale 2 threshold in some cases. From this it is to be inferred that even on the most optimistic basis, an excavation of 2.9 metres will put the scheme on the threshold. However, there is no way to examine whether the proposed methodology provides an appropriate approach as there is no detail in the calculation from which it might be possible to see whether the anticipated damage is below Burland Scale 1 and if so how close to the threshold of Burland Scale 1 damage an excavation of that depth might approach, there is no detail about how the construction is to be undertaken and there is no consideration of the structures on John Street that abut or form part of the rear party wall of the property. The BIA therefore gives the impression of hiding more than it is revealing, and we have no confidence either that the calculations are a fair reflection of what damage will occur or that there will be any real impediment to a deeper excavation, as had previously been planned.

9. Further there is no consideration of the method and depth of drilling for the underpins to the soon to be unsupported rear party wall, where previous reports have considered this to be a critically important aspect and one in respect of which significant damage might occur.

10. Yet further, the new proposed structure does not have a footprint extending to the rear party wall, nor will the existing spine wall extend to the rear party wall, from which it is to be imagined that the rear wall will experience greater heave and compressive forces, as it is no longer loaded from above and from the internal spine wall, yet this is not addressed.

11. If this revised application is to be taken forward, all the available information from both this application and 2014/3330/p needs to be considered by the independent audit of the BIA, irrespective of whether it is current or not, and if permission is to be considered, careful thought should be given as to how, and if so what, condition is to be imposed so as to ensure that any excavation does not exceed the depth at which the Burland Scale 1 damage threshold will be exceeded. An example of previous information available is included as Appendix 1.

12. Finally, there is no consideration about whether vibration from excavation will cause any, and if so what, damage to adjacent properties.

We continue to rely on our previous objections to this application.

Appendix 1

Barret Mahony, who produced calculations based on a previously revised construction methodology that does not form part of the supporting documents for this application, stated:

“The soil adopted here [for the modelling] is described as ‘stiff clay’ and the temporary support provided is stiff. Made ground is found over most of the dig depth, which is likely to be lower strength. To overcome these inconsistencies, the following construction methodology is proposed:

- It is necessary to increase stiffness of the soil prior to the works so that the ‘stiff’ setting is more appropriate. To achieve this, compensation grouting should be carried out in the area near the adjoining walls

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

which are at risk.

- Following underpinning, temporary works providing lateral support to the underpins should be installed to ensure that support equivalent to a 'high stiffness retaining wall' is provided."

In their revised BIA, Chelmer then relied on Barret Mahony and said as follows in the paragraph numbers identified:

"6.10 Several significant assumptions have been made in this assessment owing to a lack of appropriate published data sets for the ground conditions at this site, as set out in paragraph 6.16 below, so ground improvement works as also described in paragraph 6.16 will be essential before these excavations proceed, together with special working methods during the excavation process, in order for the actual displacements to be kept in line with these predictions.

.....

6.16 It should be noted that the XDISP data provided by Barrett Mahony are for high stiffness support of stiff clays, whereas the proposed works involve excavation of underpins in Made Ground, however no other published data exist which are more appropriate. So the Made Ground beneath the adjoining properties [my emphasis] will need to be grouted comprehensively, broadly as proposed by Barrett Mahony, though they will need to include an initial phase (or phases) of consolidation grouting prior to the compensation grouting or the latter probably would not work as intended. The temporary support then provided as the underpins are excavated must provide a high stiffness support system at all times.

.....

7.19 Use of best practice construction methods will be essential to ensure that the ground movements are kept in line with the above predictions."
