



18<sup>th</sup> June 2018

**Planning Application 2018/2481P**

I live locally and was involved with both Neighbourhood Development Forum planning matters and the campaign to improve basement construction.

The basement plan in this application is overlarge and in direct breach of several of Camden's Local Plan policies. It ignores policy A5 taking up more than 50% of the front garden. This is detrimental to the character of the streetscape. CLP A1 4s as the site is in the middle of a terrace of homes and such an intrusive development harms "the appearance or setting of the property or the established character of the surrounding area"

The Design & Access statement provided in this application states in point 2.2 of the introduction "Basement/lower ground floor conversions are also **common place**, with a number of front light-wells and access stairs present."

Basements are NOT in fact commonplace in this road. 80% of the houses do not have them. On the west side (even numbers) there only one single basement developed @ 16 - eight houses distant with a fenced light well and no external stairs. On the eastern side of the road (odd numbers), there are only 3 basement developments with access stairs the handful of others have well-integrated fenced light wells with planting and drainage at the front and adequate space for the new larger waste/recycling bins.

**24: Where basements and visible light wells are not part of the prevailing character of a street, new light wells will only be acceptable if they appear as discreet interventions that do not harm the architectural character of the building or result in harm to the character or appearance of the surrounding area. In situations where light wells are not part of the established street character, the characteristics of the front garden will help to determine the suitability of light wells." Camden policy**

The basement Impact assessment by Hall Davis Engineers is missing detailed information to deal with issues such as land stability, water tables (including perching water) to reassure the proposal will not harm the hydrogeology and land stability of the property and its neighbours.

In answer to the BIA screening checklists questions :

Q 10 - "Is the site within an aquifer? If so, will the proposed basement extend beneath the water table such that dewatering may be required during construction?" The applicant has said No, but houses in this street are only just above the water table and The route of the Westbourne River has a material impact on this area

When digging test holes at other properties in the road, the excavation frequently filled with water and the basement @ 29 flooded numerous times needing sustained pumping out. The route of the Westbourne River (in blue on map) has a material impact on this area and the water table here rises and falls between summer and winter.

A borehole report is included from Netherwood Road (at considerable distance from the site in Kylemore Road) dated August 1969 which was a very long time ago and at the end of a long dry summer.

Q13- "Will the proposed basement significantly increase the differential depth of foundations relative to neighbouring properties?"  
The applicant's representative again has answered "no". I disagree. The properties either side have existing cellar/s/ basements but this scheme proposes that the foundations will be underpinned in order for the floor to be lowered between 0.850 & 1.1m" and will obviously create a significant increase in the differential depth of foundations relative to the neighbouring properties.  
Are party wall agreements in place?

For the reasons explained above, I strongly object to this application. It should be refused until completely revised.

Yours truly,

John Eastwood

