
From: Thomas Finnerty [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 May 2018 18:47
To: Farrant, Ben
Subject: Re: 2018/0263/P and 2018/0931/L - 3 Mornington Crescent

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Ben,

Many thanks for your email. I thought that I might just add my last ten cents worth!

BIA Appendix C - Historical maps

Very interesting from an historical viewpoint, especially regarding changes in the railway lines! It contains some rather poor outlining in blue of No. 3 Mornington Crescent but my copies of maps 12,15,16,17 & 18 are completely illegible. However, the outlines do tell us that No.3 possibly had a rear extension at various points in time but there is no indication whatsoever as to its size or to the fact that it was anything other than a single storey extension. This is, of course, confirmed by my contacts who lived in the building in the 1970's.

BIA Appendix B -Groundsure Report

For those living in the area, this really didn't tell us very much. However, we were greatly relieved that no coal mining had been detected beneath our buildings.

BIA Appendix A - Proposed Basement Drawings

Drawing No.4 "Remnants from previous extension". This is pure conjecture. There is no evidence whatsoever that a second storey ever existed.

Drawing No 11 The extension of 1035mm (5 sq. Mtr. ?) into the rear garden would appear to put our older building in the shade.

Drawing No.14 The new rear facade now appears higher than the rear first floor window of No. 3. Is this really necessary and what does it do to the amount of light entering the staircase of No.3 to say nothing of the loss of light in the basement and ground floor of No. 4.

There remains no indication of height for the overall structure!

BIA Appendix D - Ground Water Investigation Report

Given the disclaimers at 1.1 and 1.2. it would appear that anything goes! It is of note that the borehole was placed in the middle of the garden and the trial pits near the walls alongside No's 1 and 5 (sic). Quite some distance in all cases away from No.3! Water seepage was noted at 4.7Mtr. The planned concrete slab base is estimated at 3Mtr. bgl. any continued seepage is therefore most likely to be forced sideways into the adjacent buildings?

Screen Scoping and BIA

Since the borehole test was conducted in the middle of the garden and the two trial pits were on the exterior walls, no reliable heave or slip movements were ever likely to be found.

Item 6.2. Tables 1.a. and 2. The response to both should have been recorded as "unknown". The current buildings have been in situ for almost 200 years. We are certain that nobody did a subterranean ground water examination in those days. Then,as now, if a developer found a water source in his way, he drained

and covered it over hoping to be long gone before its discovery. There is currently and has been for as long as we are aware a problem with damp in one area of the basement of No.3. This is well known to LBC (Camden) who, as far back as the 1970's relocated a tenant from the basement to a flat higher up in the building due to the damp conditions there.

Why then was the borehole drilled in the garden and not in the immediate vicinity of the damp area?

Item 9.3. "The proposed extension.....predominantly faces into the garden." Does it? The proposal drawings indicate that the predominant facing/contact will be with the Party Wall of No.4.

Item 10.2. The comment regarding No. 4 is Rubbish! The sole interest in this document appears to be cracking in No.3. No's will not be affected ie. Category 0 "Negligible Damage". I should wish to take this opportunity to assure all concerned that any damage occasioned to our property at No. 4 will be regarded as "Severe" and actionable.

Full BIA - All parts

This is largely the same variety of documents as previously submitted but including figures and sideways maps. One item of interest does, however, emerge which states inter alia that "Ground movements resulting from underpinning are not well documented". This would appear to give the lie to much of what has been submitted to planners under "Appendix D" and "Screen Scoping".

Much of what has been ,submitted has been shoddy, inaccurate and simply false and does in our opinion very little to advance what can be termed as an ill-advised and worthless project serving solely the interests and desires of a very small minority in the area whilst disrupting and inconveniencing the majority in the immediate vicinity.

Sincerely,
Shirley & Tom Finnerty

P/s. You may well wish to check with Camden's legal team as to the appropriateness of the use of in-house planning decisions in this particular application.





