

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442P	deborah schneebeili	19/07/2018 00:59:46	OBJ	<p>As a near neighbour downhill from 1 Spencer Rise I wish to register my objections to the application.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I understand that there have been no basement developments in Spencer Rise. This is not surprising as the land is hilly, the street is so narrow that cars need to park on the pavements on both sides. the road is often congested with traffic backing up or down. the resulting lorries taking away spoil from a basement development would most certainly cause harm and inconvenience to to neighbours and neighbouring properties as well as disruption to adjoining roads. 2. Allowing this application would set a precedent an area that is thankfully free from such developments. Many residents are very very fearful of this. Spencer Rise and the surrounding south Dartmouth Park streets comprise of a tight knit friendly community. 3. I am very concerned about the disruption to groundwater. Historically, there was a large pond in York Rise at the bottom of Spencer rise along the course of the fleet river which now runs in a very large brick culvert under the road. There is a feed stream to the Fleet that runs behind the houses on the north side of Spencer rise. (this could account for the fact that the houses on that side have suffered from more movement). This is evidenced by continuous wet ground in my garden which is at the bottom of the hill, additionally I also have incurable damp walls in the ground floor of my house. My garden runs behind the gardens of the north side of Spencer Rise just a few feet away from the garden at no 1 so I feel I will be very badly affected by any excavations. It should be noted that the houses on the south side of Chetwynd Road ,whose gardens about no 1 Spencer Rise, are on much higher ground resulting in high retaining walls. The house directly behind the applicants house, no 72? has a 3 metre retaining wall with my garden (which is not in good condition) and presumably with the garden of no 1. This is significant as any excavations and vibrations could damage these walls, they are with a couple of metres of the proposed work. 4. The houses in Spencer Rise are not well built, the hilly ground is unstable and many have suffered from subsidence over the years. Allowing this application could have unforeseen consequences for neighbours and the integrity of their homes. 5. The character and amenity of the area will be needlessly changed by allowing this application. The architecture of the street is varied and modest, I think we should fight to retain this character. It is different and less grand than the larger houses in Dartmouth Park north of Chetwynd Road. This contrast should be preserved as it speaks not only of the architectural design but of the social conditions and heritage of our area. 6. Many houses have had work down to them over the years, as neighbours we tolerate the noise and inconvenience but a basement development is on a completely different scale and I believe that the noise, disturbance as well as anxiety about the effect on nearby properties will be intolerable. Some of the near neighbours are retired and elderly and they are fearful of how such a development could impact other lives. <p>I urge Camden to reject this application.... Basement developments are not at all suitable for Spencer Rise for all the reasons given above.</p> <p>I am happy to show the planners the site from my garden as I think the topography of the land is much easier</p>

Printed on: 19/07/2018 09:10:04

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				to understand than from the front of the house in Spencer Rise. Deborah Schneebeli [REDACTED]

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P	Robin Inray	18/07/2018 14:02:00	NOT	<p>I believe this proposal is totally inappropriate for this locality. I also believe it contravenes Camden's guidance regarding basement developments in almost every way: in the harm it will cause to neighbours (both immediate and further up the street), in the impact of the work on the local ground and water conditions, in the damage it will cause to the area, both in itself and as a precedent.</p> <p>Camden Guidance on Basements (2017) states "basement development must not cause harm to neighbouring properties; the structural, ground, or water conditions of the area; the character and amenity of the area; and the architectural character and heritage significance of the building and area".</p> <p>4 Harm to neighbouring properties: Spencer Rise was developed in the 1870s. Most if not all of the houses were cheaply constructed with only minimal foundations (my own still has earth directly under the floorboards). The street is therefore susceptible to movement, with a history of subsidence and underpinning (I assume Camden know this - it has owned properties in the street; it will also presumably have Building Control records of the underpinnings and shoring-up). Movement on the north side has been greater than on the south, so in the long term there must be a risk that substantial disturbance through excavation and groundworks on this bottom-of-street site will affect the essential stability not just of immediately adjacent houses but also of those further up the road. In the shorter term, the harm to the amenity of neighbours, both immediate and in the wider adjacent areas of Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during what would undoubtedly be a long construction process - excavation and carting away three or four hundred cubic meters of earth, successions of skip and concrete lorries. This constitutes massive disturbance in a narrow and generally quiet street. In normal circumstances such disturbance may be arguable as something to tolerate - we've all had work done on our houses - but when it comes to something as substantial as one huge excavation (and one which could well open the door to many others - see below), it cannot surely be argued as acceptable.</p> <p>4 The structural, ground, or water conditions of the area: This overlaps with the subsidence concerns laid out above. Firstly the Fleet River runs barely 30 meters away underneath York Rise, which is just 3 meters or so below the current ground level of 1 Spencer Rise. The river is hardly alluded to in the application, yet the excavation will be to a depth of some 4 meters - the same level as, or even below, the Fleet. Recent weather extremes of heat and wet and the consequent shrink-swell of London clay must surely risk the integrity of all water utilities in this area, including that of the river culvert. Secondly there seems to be a possibility that instability on the north side has been exacerbated by the presence of groundwater behind or below the houses on that side. Residents report drainage and damp issues. There certainly must be something that makes the north side less stable, and it would be remiss of Camden to give the go ahead to this proposal in such circumstances.</p> <p>4 The character and amenity of the area: A pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant regarding this site (2017/4115/PRE, 14/09/2017) referred not only to a basement extension, but also to the addition of a mansard roof and a rear extension: a two-storey house in a street of similarly modest buildings was to be turned into a dwelling more appropriate to the nearby Dartmouth Park area. Even this current application is disproportionate in its implications for the inhabitants of a historically small, mixed and established community. The fact that the first two aspects of the plans for the house (rear and roof extensions) have been turned down is surely no reason to allow this - by far the most damaging to the neighbourhood in every respect except visually - as some sort of consolation prize.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

So I urge the refusal of the application.

1. The previous roof-extension proposal was rejected mostly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current residents (many of them part of a long-term community) are the issues of potential subsidence, water problems, disturbance, quality of life, and precedent for future upheaval?
2. Is Camden really prepared to risk the structural integrity of a whole street of terraced houses and their residents' quiet enjoyment of their homes for the sake of a single speculative development?

Incidentally, the use of maps in Vincent & Rymill's "Desk Top Study" seems careless, even sloppy: it ignores the more accurate history provided to the applicant by the series of maps supplied to Ground & Water by Groundsure, and is not even correct in its estimate of the date the house was built - which was certainly before 1874 when the street was renumbered by the Post Office. Also sloppy is V&R's "Prediction of damage to adjoining properties" where they claim that "Strict control of the construction method together with the structural design will limit any potential damage to the adjoining garage". There is no garage involved. The sentence has surely been cut and pasted from another application. It is to be hoped that V&R's more important assessments are not as inaccurate and sloppy.

2018/2442/P Peter Evans 18/07/2018 20:13:42 OBJ

Peter Evans [REDACTED]

I would like to object to the planned basement excavation at 1 Spencer Rise NW5 (Application 2018/2442/P) for the following reasons:

The design, build and structure of the houses on Spencer Rise do not seem compatible with the deep excavations associated with a basement. Also, it appears to me to pose a high risk to the integrity of the adjoining buildings, as being located on a narrow street at the base of a hill and in close proximity to an underground water course.

The detrimental affect it will have on the Dartmouth Park Conservation area. I note from the drawings that the proposed basement has light wells to the front and rear of the property which seem to me to be entirely incongruous with the surrounding properties and feel of Spencer Rise.

The Structural Design Statement submitted (from Vincent & Rymill) makes mention of "Strict control of the construction method together with the structural design will limit any potential damage to the adjoining garage to categories 0 (nil) or 1 (slight) of the Burland Scale." I've tried looking but can see no adjoining garage to the property (it's a terrace house). With such an oversight by the consulting engineers I would hesitate to guess what other omissions they may have made in their appraisal and calculations for the proposed project.

I am also concerned that any approval for such a basement would set a precedent for similar developments to be considered in the future.

The impact to the neighbours in terms of noise, disruption and access (parking & driving) do not seem to have been assessed or time-lined. I could find no real indication of the period of works or any access statements.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2018/2442P	Main Liddell	18/07/2018 22:05:06	OBJ

Response:

I object to this proposal in the strongest of manners and do not see how it can under any circumstances be deemed appropriate.

Policy A5 of the Local Plan states that the Council will only permit basement development where it is demonstrated to its satisfaction that the proposal would not cause harm to:

- a) Neighbouring properties
- b) The structural, ground, or water conditions of the area
- c) The character and amenity of the area
- d) The architectural character of the building
- e) The significance of heritage assets.

The building work and potential consequences of that will severely impact my property (the direct neighbour at no3) as well as other neighbours higher up the street and further below, and place all of us greater danger of subsidence. It has been established by other neighbours that there have already been ground issues at a number of sites on this stretch of Spencer Rise, which is on a steep incline, and this building work would only exacerbate the risks. Whilst the applicant may put in measures to bolster and strengthen his own property, can you really be sure that the disturbance of a such a great amount of earth in the direct vicinity of mine and my neighbours properties will carry no risk to our buildings both during the actual construction and in the months and years that follow - especially given the knowledge provided by other neighbours about previous issues in the area?

I understand that a mere 30 metres away is the River Fleet in a Culvert under York Rise which sits at a similar level to that of the bottom of this proposed excavation. In addition, water cascading down the hill has caused issues for other buildings in the past - a cavernous hole around our properties is therefore wholly inappropriate and doesn't equate with the requirements that the proposal isn't a flood risk.

This will greatly affect the character of both the area, and the architectural character of the building. No 1 Spencer Rise, along with my house [redacted] and my neighbours [redacted] constitutes a set of 3 identical houses that have maintained their heritage characteristics. None of these, or indeed any of the houses on the incline up the hill were designed to have basements, or have excavated a basement subsequently - presumably in part because the ground was not deemed suitable for one at this point in the road. The houses have not been built for this kind of capacity - the gardens are small in complement to the houses - these houses are not supposed to be dwellings of the size proposed, and whilst they may attempt to be discrete in design, this will irrevocably change the look and nature of this set of properties.

The disruptive nature of the work involved to undertake this work must also be taken into consideration. This is a narrow street, with a heavy presence of parked cars, which need to park on the pavement, thus narrowing the already narrow pavement, and is often clogged by cars unable to pass each other. The work need to excavate a project of this nature, and the length of time this disruption could cause (reasonable assumptions at 18 months - 2 years) are completely unacceptable for a quiet community in a conservation area. The noise, and interference to my own property is unjust and would greatly impact minus and my neighbour's quality of life.

Further, I refer to the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement, dated

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

January 22nd 2009, on page 57 which states 'the conservation area contains very few residential properties with basement developments visible through windows, doors, light wells, railings or grilles fronting the highway. The unadorned gardens make an important contribution to the streetscape and character of the residential area. The creation of a light well fronting the highway would harm the relationship between the building and the street, could harm the appearance of the building and the streetscape, and further 'The inclusion of rooflights designed within the landscaping of a front garden can result in illumination and light spill from the subterranean and harm the appearance of a garden setting. As such the Council will normally resist basement development fronting the highway due to its impact on the appearance of the conservation area'. As these are the guidelines under which the conservation area operates, then this proposed basement, would under no design concept can be compliant.

In summation I have grave concerns about the negative damage that this work will likely inflict on my property, a beloved home I have put a lot of effort into - whilst [REDACTED] no 1 has not even been resident at his property since I purchased my house 7 years ago. I understand that I am not alone in my objections, and that many of my neighbours also have deep concerns about these proposals, their impact, and the precedent they set. I agree with them wholeheartedly. The applicant has recently had his application for a loft extension reject on the grounds that it would ruin the aesthetics of the street - a good decision. But I would urge you to also refuse this application, on far stronger grounds - the potential damage to surrounding buildings, the unacceptable disruption and impact on the street, as well as the travesty of doing this to a building of this nature in a conservation area. Please do not let this go ahead.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2018/2442/P	John Brodholt	18/07/2018 12:39:40	OBJ

Response:

I live [redacted] opposite to 1 Spencer Rise and object to this application to build a basement based on three points:

1) Section 7.2 of the Camden Council's 2017 Local Plan states that the Council will require that 'development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character and or appearance of the area.' Indeed, an earlier application in 2017 for the same property was turned down as it would significantly change the roof-line and character of the building. I argue that the same reasoning should be applied to this application since it does not preserve the character of the building, and hence the area. This new application claims that there will be no visible impact of the basement and in support provides a view of the proposed front elevation that is exactly the same as the current view. The implication is that the view of the building will remain totally unchanged and so preserves the character of the building. This is simply false. The view they provide is correct if you are four-foot tall and look from across the road, but anyone walking on the same side of the road will see down into a lightwell containing a new full-sized window. It is simply untrue to say that this will not change the look and character of the building.

In addition, the lightwell will take up 20 to 25% of the current front garden. This is a significant change to the garden, again something which is against the Conservation Area view that 'unaltered front gardens make an important contribution to the streetscape and character of the residential area.'

As can be clearly seen in the first photograph in the Design and Access Statement, this is an attractive two-story Victorian house that has undergone no significant changes to its exterior for 140 years. The application is deliberately misleading in providing a view of the proposed front elevation that is the same as the current one. The proposal will add an extra window to the façade which will be clearly visible from the street. This is perhaps an even more important change to the façade as altering the roof line and so should be refused.

2) Camden Council recognises that basements are a special, controversial and divisive type of development and so has a specific section in its Local Plan dealing with them. In particular, the Local Plan acknowledges that construction of a basement can have 'significant construction impacts due to the need to remove spoil and the general complexities of excavation. The Council recognises the need to protect the environment and adjoining neighbours properties and buildings from these impacts.' In other words, it is implicit that the construction impacts must be considered during planning application stage. In order to consider the impact of the construction stage itself, Camden states on page 215 of the Local Plan that it will generally require a Construction Management Plan for basement developments. This is particularly important for a small residential street like Spencer Rise with its many families and children.

However, there is no Construction Management Plan. There is a one-page section called Construction Sequence which gives some understanding of the scale of the project but, importantly, there are no time scales at all. It states that the site will be boarded off and a skip placed in the street, but it also states that a conveyor will be used to remove the soil. This presumably will require the pavement to be closed. But for how long? The experience and wording in the local plan is that basement construction timescales are measured in years rather than months.

3) If approved, this application will set an important precedent since no other basement has ever been approved in Spencer Rise. If agreed there will be further basement applications on a regular basis for years to

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

come, leading to constant disruption, pavement closures and parking space suspensions in what is a very small residential street.

Below are a couple of other points:

4) The application states that the basement stays within the current footprint of the house. This is again misleading, both lightwells extend outside the footprint of the house.

5) The application provides an aerial photograph of the house to be developed, however, it actually highlights the wrong house (see second photograph in the Design and Access Statement). This adds to the other careless errors pointed out in other objections.

In summary, the applicant tried and failed to extend the house upwards last year. I ask that this application to extend downwards is also rejected. It will harm the look and history of the house and garden, it will be hugely disruptive, and it will set an undesirable and divisive precedent.
