

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Ursula Owen	12/07/2018 13:16:53	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have four principal grounds for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process 2. The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which have been historically particularly liable to subsidence. 3. In regard to the application's reference to flood risk, there seems no mention of the presence of the River Fleet in a culvert under York Rise - only 30 metres away. 4. If approval was given for this, it would set a precedent for other similar developments already well-provided with three storey houses, and is narrow and small in scale. <p>1. Harm to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area caused by the building process.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is a narrow, steep sloping street where on-pavement parking has to be permitted to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also frequently used as a rat-run when utilities close neighbouring streets. There are angry Mexican stand-offs and often damage to parked cars. The almost permanent presence of a skip and skip lorries, cement wagons and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will aggravate this situation. It will also for a considerable period knock out at least a couple of parking spaces in a street where parking is already at a premium. At an estimate, it's likely that at more than 400 cubic meters of earth will need for be removed for the basement along, plus stuff from levelling the garden area and other debris from clearing the house for refurbishment. This all seems likely to mean the use of 50 or more standard sized skips.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on traffic, the disturbance to neighbours (of which i am a close one, am elderly, have been here for 44 years and work at home) on both sides of the road and up and down the street will be huge and unpleasant in an area which is usually a calm and tranquil area.</p> <p>2. Impact of the work on the line of houses on north side of Spencer Rise.</p> <p>Applicants may argue that the presence of a substantial concrete box will help block downhill movement. I'm not competent to argue this technical point, but disturbance of the ground during construction will surely upset the status quo, might in the case of my house, 1c Spencer Rise, affect party walls. There are several large cracks in my house now.</p> <p>3. Flood risk</p> <p>The River Fleet passes the bottom of Spencer Rise 30 metres away, and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. I would be surprised, given the number of burst water pipes in London recently due to ageing infrastructure and unusual variations in climate conditions, if this did not constitute some kind of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Approval would set a precedent.</p> <p>In an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (Ref 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) referred not just to a basement extension but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension. The roof extension was turned down mainly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, risk to their own houses and</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

the precedent for more upheaval in the future.

IN SUMMARY:

In response to the 2017 pre-planning enquiry, Camden wrote amongst other things things that they would require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) do not the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- b) avoid cumulative impacts;
- c) do not harm the amenity of neighbours

I would argue that :

1. In a steep street with a known history of subsidence (unforeseen when the buildings were originally constructed, even apparently careful calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of surrounding buildings given this substantial intervention. Nor can they guarantee the integrity of the water environment, especially regarding the River Fleet.
2. The cumulative impact of approval - in terms of setting a precedent for basement developments - would be seriously detrimental and would permanently change the nature of the street.
3. The harm to the amenity fo neighbours, both immediate, which obviously affects me particularly, and other adjacent neighbours to 1 Spencer Rise, but also the wider adjacent areas Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would be a long construction process. Having lived here for over 45 years, participated in local life, and hoping very much to spend my old age in the house, I can't deny that I dread the prospect of this permission being granted.

It is for these reasons I urge the refusal of this application.

I would like to be notified of the committee date. Many thanks

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Ursula Owen	12/07/2018 13:16:54	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have four principal grounds for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process 2. The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which have been historically particularly liable to subsidence. 3. In regard to the application's reference to flood risk, there seems no mention of the presence of the River Fleet in a culvert under York Rise - only 30 metres away. 4. If approval was given for this, it would set a precedent for other similar developments already well-provided with three storey houses, and is narrow and small in scale. <p>1. Harm to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area caused by the building process.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is a narrow, steep sloping street where on-pavement parking has to be permitted to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also frequently used as a rat-run when utilities close neighbouring streets. There are angry Mexican stand-offs and often damage to parked cars. The almost permanent presence of a skip and skip lorries, cement wagons and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will aggravate this situation. It will also for a considerable period knock out at least a couple of parking spaces in a street where parking is already at a premium. At an estimate, it's likely that at more than 400 cubic meters of earth will need for be removed for the basement along, plus stuff from levelling the garden area and other debris from clearing the house for refurbishment. This all seems likely to mean the use of 50 or more standard sized skips.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on traffic, the disturbance to neighbours (of which i am a close one, am elderly, have been here for 44 years and work at home) on both sides of the road and up and down the street will be huge and unpleasant in an area which is usually a calm and tranquil area.</p> <p>2. Impact of the work on the line of houses on north side of Spencer Rise.</p> <p>Applicants may argue that the presence of a substantial concrete box will help block downhill movement. I'm not competent to argue this technical point, but disturbance of the ground during construction will surely upset the status quo, might in the case of my house, 1c Spencer Rise, affect party walls. There are several large cracks in my house now.</p> <p>3. Flood risk</p> <p>The River Fleet passes the bottom of Spencer Rise 30 metres away, and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. I would be surprised, given the number of burst water pipes in London recently due to ageing infrastructure and unusual variations in climate conditions, if this did not constitute some kind of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Approval would set a precedent.</p> <p>In an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (Ref 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) referred not just to a basement extension but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension. The roof extension was turned down mainly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, risk to their own houses and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the precedent for more upheaval in the future.

IN SUMMARY:

In response to the 2017 pre-planning enquiry, Camden wrote amongst other things things that they would require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) do not the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- b) avoid cumulative impacts;
- c) do not harm the amenity of neighbours

I would argue that :

1. In a steep street with a known history of subsidence (unforeseen when the buildings were originally constructed, even apparently careful calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of surrounding buildings given this substantial intervention. Nor can they guarantee the integrity of the water environment, especially regarding the River Fleet.
2. The cumulative impact of approval - in terms of setting a precedent for basement developments - would be seriously detrimental and would permanently change the nature of the street.
3. The harm to the amenity fo neighbours, both immediate, which obviously affects me particularly, and other adjacent neighbours to 1 Spencer Rise, but also the wider adjacent areas Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would be a long construction process. Having lived here for over 45 years, participated in local life, and hoping very much to spend my old age in the house, I can't deny that I dread the prospect of this permission being granted.

It is for these reasons I urge the refusal of this application.

I would like to be notified of the committee date. Many thanks

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Ursula Owen	12/07/2018 13:16:55	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have four principal grounds for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process 2. The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which have been historically particularly liable to subsidence. 3. In regard to the application's reference to flood risk, there seems no mention of the presence of the River Fleet in a culvert under York Rise - only 30 metres away. 4. If approval was given for this, it would set a precedent for other similar developments already well-provided with three storey houses, and is narrow and small in scale. <p>1. Harm to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area caused by the building process.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is a narrow, steep sloping street where on-pavement parking has to be permitted to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also frequently used as a rat-run when utilities close neighbouring streets. There are angry Mexican stand-offs and often damage to parked cars. The almost permanent presence of a skip and skip lorries, cement wagons and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will aggravate this situation. It will also for a considerable period knock out at least a couple of parking spaces in a street where parking is already at a premium. At an estimate, it's likely that at more than 400 cubic meters of earth will need for be removed for the basement along, plus stuff from levelling the garden area and other debris from clearing the house for refurbishment. This all seems likely to mean the use of 50 or more standard sized skips.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on traffic, the disturbance to neighbours (of which i am a close one, am elderly, have been here for 44 years and work at home) on both sides of the road and up and down the street will be huge and unpleasant in an area which is usually a calm and tranquil area.</p> <p>2. Impact of the work on the line of houses on north side of Spencer Rise.</p> <p>Applicants may argue that the presence of a substantial concrete box will help block downhill movement. I'm not competent to argue this technical point, but disturbance of the ground during construction will surely upset the status quo, might in the case of my house, 1c Spencer Rise, affect party walls. There are several large cracks in my house now.</p> <p>3. Flood risk</p> <p>The River Fleet passes the bottom of Spencer Rise 30 metres away, and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. I would be surprised, given the number of burst water pipes in London recently due to ageing infrastructure and unusual variations in climate conditions, if this did not constitute some kind of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Approval would set a precedent.</p> <p>In an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (Ref 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) referred not just to a basement extension but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension. The roof extension was turned down mainly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, risk to their own houses and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the precedent for more upheaval in the future.

IN SUMMARY:

In response to the 2017 pre-planning enquiry, Camden wrote amongst other things things that they would require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) do not the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- b) avoid cumulative impacts;
- c) do not harm the amenity of neighbours

I would argue that :

1. In a steep street with a known history of subsidence (unforeseen when the buildings were originally constructed, even apparently careful calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of surrounding buildings given this substantial intervention. Nor can they guarantee the integrity of the water environment, especially regarding the River Fleet.
2. The cumulative impact of approval - in terms of setting a precedent for basement developments - would be seriously detrimental and would permanently change the nature of the street.
3. The harm to the amenity fo neighbours, both immediate, which obviously affects me particularly, and other adjacent neighbours to 1 Spencer Rise, but also the wider adjacent areas Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would be a long construction process. Having lived here for over 45 years, participated in local life, and hoping very much to spend my old age in the house, I can't deny that I dread the prospect of this permission being granted.

It is for these reasons I urge the refusal of this application.

I would like to be notified of the committee date. Many thanks

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Ursula Owen	12/07/2018 13:16:56	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have four principal grounds for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process 2. The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which have been historically particularly liable to subsidence. 3. In regard to the application's reference to flood risk, there seems no mention of the presence of the River Fleet in a culvert under York Rise - only 30 metres away. 4. If approval was given for this, it would set a precedent for other similar developments already well-provided with three storey houses, and is narrow and small in scale. <p>1. Harm to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area caused by the building process.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is a narrow, steep sloping street where on-pavement parking has to be permitted to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also frequently used as a rat-run when utilities close neighbouring streets. There are angry Mexican stand-offs and often damage to parked cars. The almost permanent presence of a skip and skip lorries, cement wagons and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will aggravate this situation. It will also for a considerable period knock out at least a couple of parking spaces in a street where parking is already at a premium. At an estimate, it's likely that at more than 400 cubic meters of earth will need for be removed for the basement along, plus stuff from levelling the garden area and other debris from clearing the house for refurbishment. This all seems likely to mean the use of 50 or more standard sized skips.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on traffic, the disturbance to neighbours (of which i am a close one, am elderly, have been here for 44 years and work at home) on both sides of the road and up and down the street will be huge and unpleasant in an area which is usually a calm and tranquil area.</p> <p>2. Impact of the work on the line of houses on north side of Spencer Rise.</p> <p>Applicants may argue that the presence of a substantial concrete box will help block downhill movement. I'm not competent to argue this technical point, but disturbance of the ground during construction will surely upset the status quo, might in the case of my house, 1c Spencer Rise, affect party walls. There are several large cracks in my house now.</p> <p>3. Flood risk</p> <p>The River Fleet passes the bottom of Spencer Rise 30 metres away, and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. I would be surprised, given the number of burst water pipes in London recently due to ageing infrastructure and unusual variations in climate conditions, if this did not constitute some kind of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Approval would set a precedent.</p> <p>In an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (Ref 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) referred not just to a basement extension but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension. The roof extension was turned down mainly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, risk to their own houses and</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

the precedent for more upheaval in the future.

IN SUMMARY:

In response to the 2017 pre-planning enquiry, Camden wrote amongst other things things that they would require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) do not the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- b) avoid cumulative impacts;
- c) do not harm the amenity of neighbours

I would argue that :

1. In a steep street with a known history of subsidence (unforeseen when the buildings were originally constructed, even apparently careful calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of surrounding buildings given this substantial intervention. Nor can they guarantee the integrity of the water environment, especially regarding the River Fleet.
2. The cumulative impact of approval - in terms of setting a precedent for basement developments - would be seriously detrimental and would permanently change the nature of the street.
3. The harm to the amenity fo neighbours, both immediate, which obviously affects me particularly, and other adjacent neighbours to 1 Spencer Rise, but also the wider adjacent areas Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would be a long construction process. Having lived here for over 45 years, participated in local life, and hoping very much to spend my old age in the house, I can't deny that I dread the prospect of this permission being granted.

It is for these reasons I urge the refusal of this application.

I would like to be notified of the committee date. Many thanks

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Ursula Owen	12/07/2018 13:17:02	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have four principal grounds for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process 2. The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which have been historically particularly liable to subsidence. 3. In regard to the application's reference to flood risk, there seems no mention of the presence of the River Fleet in a culvert under York Rise - only 30 metres away. 4. If approval was given for this, it would set a precedent for other similar developments already well-provided with three storey houses, and is narrow and small in scale. <p>1. Harm to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area caused by the building process.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is a narrow, steep sloping street where on-pavement parking has to be permitted to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also frequently used as a rat-run when utilities close neighbouring streets. There are angry Mexican stand-offs and often damage to parked cars. The almost permanent presence of a skip and skip lorries, cement wagons and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will aggravate this situation. It will also for a considerable period knock out at least a couple of parking spaces in a street where parking is already at a premium. At an estimate, it's likely that at more than 400 cubic meters of earth will need for be removed for the basement along, plus stuff from levelling the garden area and other debris from clearing the house for refurbishment. This all seems likely to mean the use of 50 or more standard sized skips.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on traffic, the disturbance to neighbours (of which i am a close one, am elderly, have been here for 44 years and work at home) on both sides of the road and up and down the street will be huge and unpleasant in an area which is usually a calm and tranquil area.</p> <p>2. Impact of the work on the line of houses on north side of Spencer Rise.</p> <p>Applicants may argue that the presence of a substantial concrete box will help block downhill movement. I'm not competent to argue this technical point, but disturbance of the ground during construction will surely upset the status quo, might in the case of my house, 1c Spencer Rise, affect party walls. There are several large cracks in my house now.</p> <p>3. Flood risk</p> <p>The River Fleet passes the bottom of Spencer Rise 30 metres away, and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. I would be surprised, given the number of burst water pipes in London recently due to ageing infrastructure and unusual variations in climate conditions, if this did not constitute some kind of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Approval would set a precedent.</p> <p>In an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (Ref 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) referred not just to a basement extension but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension. The roof extension was turned down mainly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, risk to their own houses and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the precedent for more upheaval in the future.

IN SUMMARY:

In response to the 2017 pre-planning enquiry, Camden wrote amongst other things things that they would require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) do not the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- b) avoid cumulative impacts;
- c) do not harm the amenity of neighbours

I would argue that :

1. In a steep street with a known history of subsidence (unforeseen when the buildings were originally constructed, even apparently careful calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of surrounding buildings given this substantial intervention. Nor can they guarantee the integrity of the water environment, especially regarding the River Fleet.
2. The cumulative impact of approval - in terms of setting a precedent for basement developments - would be seriously detrimental and would permanently change the nature of the street.
3. The harm to the amenity fo neighbours, both immediate, which obviously affects me particularly, and other adjacent neighbours to 1 Spencer Rise, but also the wider adjacent areas Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would be a long construction process. Having lived here for over 45 years, participated in local life, and hoping very much to spend my old age in the house, I can't deny that I dread the prospect of this permission being granted.

It is for these reasons I urge the refusal of this application.

I would like to be notified of the committee date. Many thanks

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Ursula Owen	12/07/2018 13:16:52	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have four principal grounds for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process 2. The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which have been historically particularly liable to subsidence. 3. In regard to the application's reference to flood risk, there seems no mention of the presence of the River Fleet in a culvert under York Rise - only 30 metres away. 4. If approval was given for this, it would set a precedent for other similar developments already well-provided with three storey houses, and is narrow and small in scale. <p>1. Harm to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area caused by the building process.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is a narrow, steep sloping street where on-pavement parking has to be permitted to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also frequently used as a rat-run when utilities close neighbouring streets. There are angry Mexican stand-offs and often damage to parked cars. The almost permanent presence of a skip and skip lorries, cement wagons and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will aggravate this situation. It will also for a considerable period knock out at least a couple of parking spaces in a street where parking is already at a premium. At an estimate, it's likely that at more than 400 cubic meters of earth will need for be removed for the basement along, plus stuff from levelling the garden area and other debris from clearing the house for refurbishment. This all seems likely to mean the use of 50 or more standard sized skips.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on traffic, the disturbance to neighbours (of which i am a close one, am elderly, have been here for 44 years and work at home) on both sides of the road and up and down the street will be huge and unpleasant in an area which is usually a calm and tranquil area.</p> <p>2. Impact of the work on the line of houses on north side of Spencer Rise.</p> <p>Applicants may argue that the presence of a substantial concrete box will help block downhill movement. I'm not competent to argue this technical point, but disturbance of the ground during construction will surely upset the status quo, might in the case of my house, 1c Spencer Rise, affect party walls. There are several large cracks in my house now.</p> <p>3. Flood risk</p> <p>The River Fleet passes the bottom of Spencer Rise 30 metres away, and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. I would be surprised, given the number of burst water pipes in London recently due to ageing infrastructure and unusual variations in climate conditions, if this did not constitute some kind of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Approval would set a precedent.</p> <p>In an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (Ref 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) referred not just to a basement extension but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension. The roof extension was turned down mainly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, risk to their own houses and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the precedent for more upheaval in the future.

IN SUMMARY:

In response to the 2017 pre-planning enquiry, Camden wrote amongst other things things that they would require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) do not the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- b) avoid cumulative impacts;
- c) do not harm the amenity of neighbours

I would argue that :

1. In a steep street with a known history of subsidence (unforeseen when the buildings were originally constructed, even apparently careful calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of surrounding buildings given this substantial intervention. Nor can they guarantee the integrity of the water environment, especially regarding the River Fleet.
2. The cumulative impact of approval - in terms of setting a precedent for basement developments - would be seriously detrimental and would permanently change the nature of the street.
3. The harm to the amenity fo neighbours, both immediate, which obviously affects me particularly, and other adjacent neighbours to 1 Spencer Rise, but also the wider adjacent areas Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would be a long construction process. Having lived here for over 45 years, participated in local life, and hoping very much to spend my old age in the house, I can't deny that I dread the prospect of this permission being granted.

It is for these reasons I urge the refusal of this application.

I would like to be notified of the committee date. Many thanks

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Ursula Owen	12/07/2018 13:16:53	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have four principal grounds for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process 2. The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which have been historically particularly liable to subsidence. 3. In regard to the application's reference to flood risk, there seems no mention of the presence of the River Fleet in a culvert under York Rise - only 30 metres away. 4. If approval was given for this, it would set a precedent for other similar developments already well-provided with three storey houses, and is narrow and small in scale. <p>1. Harm to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area caused by the building process.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is a narrow, steep sloping street where on-pavement parking has to be permitted to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also frequently used as a rat-run when utilities close neighbouring streets. There are angry Mexican stand-offs and often damage to parked cars. The almost permanent presence of a skip and skip lorries, cement wagons and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will aggravate this situation. It will also for a considerable period knock out at least a couple of parking spaces in a street where parking is already at a premium. At an estimate, it's likely that at more than 400 cubic meters of earth will need for be removed for the basement along, plus stuff from levelling the garden area and other debris from clearing the house for refurbishment. This all seems likely to mean the use of 50 or more standard sized skips.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on traffic, the disturbance to neighbours (of which i am a close one, am elderly, have been here for 44 years and work at home) on both sides of the road and up and down the street will be huge and unpleasant in an area which is usually a calm and tranquil area.</p> <p>2. Impact of the work on the line of houses on north side of Spencer Rise.</p> <p>Applicants may argue that the presence of a substantial concrete box will help block downhill movement. I'm not competent to argue this technical point, but disturbance of the ground during construction will surely upset the status quo, might in the case of my house, 1c Spencer Rise, affect party walls. There are several large cracks in my house now.</p> <p>3. Flood risk</p> <p>The River Fleet passes the bottom of Spencer Rise 30 metres away, and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. I would be surprised, given the number of burst water pipes in London recently due to ageing infrastructure and unusual variations in climate conditions, if this did not constitute some kind of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Approval would set a precedent.</p> <p>In an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (Ref 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) referred not just to a basement extension but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension. The roof extension was turned down mainly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, risk to their own houses and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the precedent for more upheaval in the future.

IN SUMMARY:

In response to the 2017 pre-planning enquiry, Camden wrote amongst other things things that they would require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) do not the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- b) avoid cumulative impacts;
- c) do not harm the amenity of neighbours

I would argue that :

1. In a steep street with a known history of subsidence (unforeseen when the buildings were originally constructed, even apparently careful calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of surrounding buildings given this substantial intervention. Nor can they guarantee the integrity of the water environment, especially regarding the River Fleet.
2. The cumulative impact of approval - in terms of setting a precedent for basement developments - would be seriously detrimental and would permanently change the nature of the street.
3. The harm to the amenity fo neighbours, both immediate, which obviously affects me particularly, and other adjacent neighbours to 1 Spencer Rise, but also the wider adjacent areas Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would be a long construction process. Having lived here for over 45 years, participated in local life, and hoping very much to spend my old age in the house, I can't deny that I dread the prospect of this permission being granted.

It is for these reasons I urge the refusal of this application.

I would like to be notified of the committee date. Many thanks

2018/2442/P Linda Black 12/07/2018 10:32:27 OBJ

In addition to the points made in my previous objection to the above application, after looking into the issue further I am now concerned about the risk of flooding. A consequence of the recent work to contain flooding on the Heath could be to risk increasing the run-off of excess water into the Fleet. This passes the bottom of Spencer Rise, only 30 meters away and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. In addition, I now understand that the owner of the property does not live there and the house is rented out. It appears therefore that not only would the proposed extension be disproportionate to the area, but it would be for individual monetary gain, with total disregard to the existing community and environment. I would also like to emphasise the known risk of subsidence in the street. This has already affected several properties and can only be increased by the excavation. I urge you to reject this proposal as being highly detrimental to the neighbourhood and its residents.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Ursula Owen	12/07/2018 13:16:45	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have four principal grounds for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process 2. The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which have been historically particularly liable to subsidence. 3. In regard to the application's reference to flood risk, there seems no mention of the presence of the River Fleet in a culvert under York Rise - only 30 metres away. 4. If approval was given for this, it would set a precedent for other similar developments already well-provided with three storey houses, and is narrow and small in scale. <p>1. Harm to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area caused by the building process.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is a narrow, steep sloping street where on-pavement parking has to be permitted to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also frequently used as a rat-run when utilities close neighbouring streets. There are angry Mexican stand-offs and often damage to parked cars. The almost permanent presence of a skip and skip lorries, cement wagons and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will aggravate this situation. It will also for a considerable period knock out at least a couple of parking spaces in a street where parking is already at a premium. At an estimate, it's likely that at more than 400 cubic meters of earth will need for be removed for the basement along, plus stuff from levelling the garden area and other debris from clearing the house for refurbishment. This all seems likely to mean the use of 50 or more standard sized skips.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on traffic, the disturbance to neighbours (of which i am a close one, am elderly, have been here for 44 years and work at home) on both sides of the road and up and down the street will be huge and unpleasant in an area which is usually a calm and tranquil area.</p> <p>2. Impact of the work on the line of houses on north side of Spencer Rise.</p> <p>Applicants may argue that the presence of a substantial concrete box will help block downhill movement. I'm not competent to argue this technical point, but disturbance of the ground during construction will surely upset the status quo, might in the case of my house, 1c Spencer Rise, affect party walls. There are several large cracks in my house now.</p> <p>3. Flood risk</p> <p>The River Fleet passes the bottom of Spencer Rise 30 metres away, and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. I would be surprised, given the number of burst water pipes in London recently due to ageing infrastructure and unusual variations in climate conditions, if this did not constitute some kind of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Approval would set a precedent.</p> <p>In an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (Ref 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) referred not just to a basement extension but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension. The roof extension was turned down mainly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, risk to their own houses and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the precedent for more upheaval in the future.

IN SUMMARY:

In response to the 2017 pre-planning enquiry, Camden wrote amongst other things things that they would require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) do not the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- b) avoid cumulative impacts;
- c) do not harm the amenity of neighbours

I would argue that :

1. In a steep street with a known history of subsidence (unforeseen when the buildings were originally constructed, even apparently careful calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of surrounding buildings given this substantial intervention. Nor can they guarantee the integrity of the water environment, especially regarding the River Fleet.
2. The cumulative impact of approval - in terms of setting a precedent for basement developments - would be seriously detrimental and would permanently change the nature of the street.
3. The harm to the amenity fo neighbours, both immediate, which obviously affects me particularly, and other adjacent neighbours to 1 Spencer Rise, but also the wider adjacent areas Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would be a long construction process. Having lived here for over 45 years, participated in local life, and hoping very much to spend my old age in the house, I can't deny that I dread the prospect of this permission being granted.

It is for these reasons I urge the refusal of this application.

I would like to be notified of the committee date. Many thanks

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Ursula Owen	12/07/2018 13:16:52	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have four principal grounds for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process 2. The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which have been historically particularly liable to subsidence. 3. In regard to the application's reference to flood risk, there seems no mention of the presence of the River Fleet in a culvert under York Rise - only 30 metres away. 4. If approval was given for this, it would set a precedent for other similar developments already well-provided with three storey houses, and is narrow and small in scale. <p>1. Harm to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area caused by the building process.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is a narrow, steep sloping street where on-pavement parking has to be permitted to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also frequently used as a rat-run when utilities close neighbouring streets. There are angry Mexican stand-offs and often damage to parked cars. The almost permanent presence of a skip and skip lorries, cement wagons and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will aggravate this situation. It will also for a considerable period knock out at least a couple of parking spaces in a street where parking is already at a premium. At an estimate, it's likely that at more than 400 cubic meters of earth will need for be removed for the basement along, plus stuff from levelling the garden area and other debris from clearing the house for refurbishment. This all seems likely to mean the use of 50 or more standard sized skips.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on traffic, the disturbance to neighbours (of which i am a close one, am elderly, have been here for 44 years and work at home) on both sides of the road and up and down the street will be huge and unpleasant in an area which is usually a calm and tranquil area.</p> <p>2. Impact of the work on the line of houses on north side of Spencer Rise.</p> <p>Applicants may argue that the presence of a substantial concrete box will help block downhill movement. I'm not competent to argue this technical point, but disturbance of the ground during construction will surely upset the status quo, might in the case of my house, 1c Spencer Rise, affect party walls. There are several large cracks in my house now.</p> <p>3. Flood risk</p> <p>The River Fleet passes the bottom of Spencer Rise 30 metres away, and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. I would be surprised, given the number of burst water pipes in London recently due to ageing infrastructure and unusual variations in climate conditions, if this did not constitute some kind of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Approval would set a precedent.</p> <p>In an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (Ref 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) referred not just to a basement extension but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension. The roof extension was turned down mainly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, risk to their own houses and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the precedent for more upheaval in the future.

IN SUMMARY:

In response to the 2017 pre-planning enquiry, Camden wrote amongst other things things that they would require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) do not the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- b) avoid cumulative impacts;
- c) do not harm the amenity of neighbours

I would argue that :

1. In a steep street with a known history of subsidence (unforeseen when the buildings were originally constructed, even apparently careful calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of surrounding buildings given this substantial intervention. Nor can they guarantee the integrity of the water environment, especially regarding the River Fleet.
2. The cumulative impact of approval - in terms of setting a precedent for basement developments - would be seriously detrimental and would permanently change the nature of the street.
3. The harm to the amenity fo neighbours, both immediate, which obviously affects me particularly, and other adjacent neighbours to 1 Spencer Rise, but also the wider adjacent areas Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would be a long construction process. Having lived here for over 45 years, participated in local life, and hoping very much to spend my old age in the house, I can't deny that I dread the prospect of this permission being granted.

It is for these reasons I urge the refusal of this application.

I would like to be notified of the committee date. Many thanks

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Ursula Owen	12/07/2018 13:16:55	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have four principal grounds for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process 2. The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which have been historically particularly liable to subsidence. 3. In regard to the application's reference to flood risk, there seems no mention of the presence of the River Fleet in a culvert under York Rise - only 30 metres away. 4. If approval was given for this, it would set a precedent for other similar developments already well-provided with three storey houses, and is narrow and small in scale. <p>1. Harm to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area caused by the building process.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is a narrow, steep sloping street where on-pavement parking has to be permitted to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also frequently used as a rat-run when utilities close neighbouring streets. There are angry Mexican stand-offs and often damage to parked cars. The almost permanent presence of a skip and skip lorries, cement wagons and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will aggravate this situation. It will also for a considerable period knock out at least a couple of parking spaces in a street where parking is already at a premium. At an estimate, it's likely that at more than 400 cubic meters of earth will need for be removed for the basement along, plus stuff from levelling the garden area and other debris from clearing the house for refurbishment. This all seems likely to mean the use of 50 or more standard sized skips.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on traffic, the disturbance to neighbours (of which i am a close one, am elderly, have been here for 44 years and work at home) on both sides of the road and up and down the street will be huge and unpleasant in an area which is usually a calm and tranquil area.</p> <p>2. Impact of the work on the line of houses on north side of Spencer Rise.</p> <p>Applicants may argue that the presence of a substantial concrete box will help block downhill movement. I'm not competent to argue this technical point, but disturbance of the ground during construction will surely upset the status quo, might in the case of my house, 1c Spencer Rise, affect party walls. There are several large cracks in my house now.</p> <p>3. Flood risk</p> <p>The River Fleet passes the bottom of Spencer Rise 30 metres away, and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. I would be surprised, given the number of burst water pipes in London recently due to ageing infrastructure and unusual variations in climate conditions, if this did not constitute some kind of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Approval would set a precedent.</p> <p>In an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (Ref 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) referred not just to a basement extension but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension. The roof extension was turned down mainly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, risk to their own houses and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the precedent for more upheaval in the future.

IN SUMMARY:

In response to the 2017 pre-planning enquiry, Camden wrote amongst other things things that they would require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) do not the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- b) avoid cumulative impacts;
- c) do not harm the amenity of neighbours

I would argue that :

1. In a steep street with a known history of subsidence (unforeseen when the buildings were originally constructed, even apparently careful calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of surrounding buildings given this substantial intervention. Nor can they guarantee the integrity of the water environment, especially regarding the River Fleet.
2. The cumulative impact of approval - in terms of setting a precedent for basement developments - would be seriously detrimental and would permanently change the nature of the street.
3. The harm to the amenity fo neighbours, both immediate, which obviously affects me particularly, and other adjacent neighbours to 1 Spencer Rise, but also the wider adjacent areas Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would be a long construction process. Having lived here for over 45 years, participated in local life, and hoping very much to spend my old age in the house, I can't deny that I dread the prospect of this permission being granted.

It is for these reasons I urge the refusal of this application.

I would like to be notified of the committee date. Many thanks

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Ursula Owen	12/07/2018 13:17:06	OBJEMAIL	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have four principal grounds for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process 2. The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which have been historically particularly liable to subsidence. 3. In regard to the application's reference to flood risk, there seems no mention of the presence of the River Fleet in a culvert under York Rise - only 30 metres away. 4. If approval was given for this, it would set a precedent for other similar developments already well-provided with three storey houses, and is narrow and small in scale. <p>1. Harm to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area caused by the building process.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is a narrow, steep sloping street where on-pavement parking has to be permitted to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also frequently used as a rat-run when utilities close neighbouring streets. There are angry Mexican stand-offs and often damage to parked cars. The almost permanent presence of a skip and skip lorries, cement wagons and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will aggravate this situation. It will also for a considerable period knock out at least a couple of parking spaces in a street where parking is already at a premium. At an estimate, it's likely that at more than 400 cubic meters of earth will need for be removed for the basement along, plus stuff from levelling the garden area and other debris from clearing the house for refurbishment. This all seems likely to mean the use of 50 or more standard sized skips.</p> <p>Apart from the impact on traffic, the disturbance to neighbours (of which i am a close one, am elderly, have been here for 44 years and work at home) on both sides of the road and up and down the street will be huge and unpleasant in an area which is usually a calm and tranquil area.</p> <p>2. Impact of the work on the line of houses on north side of Spencer Rise.</p> <p>Applicants may argue that the presence of a substantial concrete box will help block downhill movement. I'm not competent to argue this technical point, but disturbance of the ground during construction will surely upset the status quo, might in the case of my house, 1c Spencer Rise, affect party walls. There are several large cracks in my house now.</p> <p>3. Flood risk</p> <p>The River Fleet passes the bottom of Spencer Rise 30 metres away, and at approximately the same depth as the bottom of the proposed basement. I would be surprised, given the number of burst water pipes in London recently due to ageing infrastructure and unusual variations in climate conditions, if this did not constitute some kind of flood risk.</p> <p>4. Approval would set a precedent.</p> <p>In an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (Ref 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) referred not just to a basement extension but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension. The roof extension was turned down mainly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, risk to their own houses and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the precedent for more upheaval in the future.

IN SUMMARY:

In response to the 2017 pre-planning enquiry, Camden wrote amongst other things things that they would require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) do not the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- b) avoid cumulative impacts;
- c) do not harm the amenity of neighbours

I would argue that :

1. In a steep street with a known history of subsidence (unforeseen when the buildings were originally constructed, even apparently careful calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of surrounding buildings given this substantial intervention. Nor can they guarantee the integrity of the water environment, especially regarding the River Fleet.
2. The cumulative impact of approval - in terms of setting a precedent for basement developments - would be seriously detrimental and would permanently change the nature of the street.
3. The harm to the amenity fo neighbours, both immediate, which obviously affects me particularly, and other adjacent neighbours to 1 Spencer Rise, but also the wider adjacent areas Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would be a long construction process. Having lived here for over 45 years, participated in local life, and hoping very much to spend my old age in the house, I can't deny that I dread the prospect of this permission being granted.

It is for these reasons I urge the refusal of this application.

I would like to be notified of the committee date. Many thanks
