

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 24/07/2018 09:10:04
2018/2442/P	[REDACTED]	21/07/2018 22:03:15	OBJ	<p>I object to this planning application on four grounds:</p> <p>1.</p> <p>Spencer Rise has a pronounced slope and there is already regular significant subsidence and ground movement to properties within the vicinity of the proposed development.</p> <p>I have consulted a reputable building firm with a good knowledge of the basement development process and an understanding of the type of soil in Spencer Rise, I have been advised that the construction process will have an effect on my property with vibrations effecting and exacerbating the ground movement and subsidence. This will also apply to other neighbouring and adjacent properties.</p> <p>A recent consultation with an architect corroborated this conclusion with the advice being that there is 'considerable risk' to my property. Based on this I have very serious concerns about this proposal being granted permission.</p> <p>I request the Council carry out due diligence through their contractors by taking soil samples, examining evidence of existing subsidence in adjacent and neighbouring properties and considering existing structural surveys carried out by residents (I have one). I invite any assessment survey to include my property as an example. The Council has a duty to conduct a fair assessment based on investigation and assessment of factual information including that presented by residents.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Spencer Rise is part of a Conservation area. The Camden Council has produced a policy reference document with regards to this, (Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, Appraisal and Management Statement) (Adopted 22 January 2009). A PDF of this document can be obtained online. A section of the document has been devoted to basement development at the bottom of page 56 and continuing to page 57. In summary: 'As such the Council will normally resist basement development fronting the highway due to its impact on the appearance of the conservation area.'</p> <p>This document stipulates in the introduction (Section 2.1) that it should be used as a guide in planning the approach to a Conservation area.</p> <p>With this in mind I ask that the Council follow the stated policy directives and guidance laid out for the area in this document.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Basement construction would cause severe disruption within this narrow road with skips and construction vehicles blocking the thoroughfare for traffic and the pavements blocked restricting access to disabled or older pedestrians for an extended length of time.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>Granting permission would set a precedent as there are no basement developments currently on the road. Such a development would have an effect on the character of the road and would run contrary to its Conservation Area status. Biodiversity would also be affected through the loss of front gardens.</p>	

Printed on: 24/07/2018 09:10:04

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P		22/07/2018 11:17:59	OBJ	<p>I have read and share the concerns already raised about this planning proposal. Such a major excavation seems to pose both a structural threat to neighbouring properties and is out of character with the area.</p> <p>1. Conservation Area and character: This is a conservation area and our homes are described as Artisan cottages. Light well in this tiny front garden will change the character. The development is out of proportion and out of character with the area and if passed would set a precedent. This isn't Bishops Avenue.</p> <p>2. Water table: There is evidence that such basement excavations have unforeseen impact on the water table. The Corporation of London has recently spent millions to reduce the risk of flooding to precisely this area around the river Fleet</p> <p>Please notify me of the committee date.</p>

---

Application No: 2018/2442/P  
Consultees Name: [REDACTED]  
Received: 21/07/2018 19:49:15  
Comment: OBJEMAIL

Response: 1 Spencer Rise, London, Nw5 1ar Proposed Basement Under Existing Building With Light Wells At Front & Rear

Planning Objection submitted by: [REDACTED]

I object strongly to the application, with regard to the Camden Local Plan (2017) on the following grounds:

(i) risk of harm to neighbouring properties, and to the structural, ground, or water conditions of the area:  
The north side of Spencer Rise is a fluid, elastic structure that moves as result of seasonal/climatic change. Substantial subsidence works were undertaken at the rear of Number 7 about a decade ago, with further investigation about to be undertaken around cracking at the front. This lateral concertina effect is visible in the non-rectangular envelopes of the floor profiles of Number 1 (and the other houses). In fact, this concertina effect also operates vertically with any basement dug to the boundary walls not remaining permanently within the vertical demise.

The structure under threat is more than one row of houses; it is a delicate and characterful network of: terrace, rear projections and original brick walls enclosing gardens.

Apart from the groundwater conditions, (the terrace is on the steep clay embankment of the riverbed of the contained river, metres away, at York Rise), movement can also be attributed to the readily felt shockwaves from speeding vehicles taking off across the traffic calmer outside number 5. Sewer smells in this area are noticeable from time to time, suggesting a fragility to the underground waste piping.

These are not propitious conditions, into which it would be safe to introduce further variables, unpredictable & uncontrollable, posed by a deep excavation and permanent siting of a new substantial, fixed, structure below ground level. Further, continuing amenity will require a monitoring and maintenance of waterproofing membranes under stress. The stability & integrity of the existing structures would be seriously threatened by this kind of development here and, in fact, anywhere, on this steep hill.

(ii) risk of harm to the character and amenity of the area, architectural character of the building and significance of heritage assets:  
The application dates the building of number 1 to between 1886 and 1906. In fact, Spencer Rise (then 'Road') on the Conservative Land Society's estate, was a patch work development for artisans undertaken in the 1870s (see Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Statement (2009), para 7.60) and certainly by 1885 was fully developed (except 1a, 1b, 1c) with a Mr. Henry Freeman in residence at number 1 (see the Hampstead & Highgate Directory of 1885-6, p 217). Numbers 1,3,5 form one of the earliest joint developments, retaining a harmonious external character, worthy of conservation.

The introduction of light wells at the front of the property, very visible to passersby, given the very narrow front gardens would detract from the aesthetic appeal and social context of this historic artisan development. Further, these would interfere with the access to and siting of the waste bins which cannot be placed feasibly elsewhere.

Application No: 2018/2442/P  
Consultees Name: [REDACTED]  
Received: 21/07/2018 19:49:28  
Comment: OBJEMAIL

Printed on: 24/07/2018 09:10:04

Response: 1 Spencer Rise, London, Nw5 1ar Proposed Basement Under Existing Building With Light Wells At Front & Rear

Planning Objection submitted by [REDACTED]

I object strongly to the application, with regard to the Camden Local Plan (2017) on the following grounds:

(i) risk of harm to neighbouring properties, and to the structural, ground, or water conditions of the area:  
The north side of Spencer Rise is a fluid, elastic structure that moves as result of seasonal/climactic change. Substantial subsidence works were undertaken at the rear of Number 7 about a decade ago, with further investigation about to be undertaken around cracking at the front. This lateral concertina effect is visible in the non-rectangular envelopes of the floor profiles of Number 1 (and the other houses). In fact, this concertina effect also operates vertically with any basement dug to the boundary walls not remaining permanently within the vertical demise.


The structure under threat is more than one row of houses; it is a delicate and characterful network of: terrace, rear projections and original brick walls enclosing gardens.

Apart from the groundwater conditions, (the terrace is on the steep clay embankment of the riverbed of the contained river, metres away, at York Rise), movement can also be attributed to the readily felt shockwaves from speeding vehicles taking off across the traffic calmer outside number 5. Sewer smells in this area are noticeable from time to time, suggesting a fragility to the underground waste piping.

These are not propitious conditions, into which it would be safe to introduce further variables, unpredictable & uncontrollable, posed by a deep excavation and permanent siting of a new substantial, fixed, structure below ground level. Further, continuing amenity will require a monitoring and maintenance of waterproofing membranes under stress. The stability & integrity of the existing structures would be seriously threatened by this kind of development here and, in fact, anywhere, on this steep hill.

(ii) risk of harm to the character and amenity of the area, architectural character of the building and significance of heritage assets:  
The application dates the building of number 1 to between 1886 and 1906. In fact, Spencer Rise (then 'Roadt) on the Conservative Land Society's estate, was a patch work development for artisans undertaken in the 1870s (see Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Statement (2009), para 7.60) and certainly by 1885 was fully developed (except 1a, 1b, 1c) with a Mr. Henry Freeman in residence at number 1 (see the Hampstead & Highgate Directory of 1885-6, p 217). Numbers 1,3,5 form one of the earliest joint developments, retaining a harmonious external character, worthy of conservation.

The introduction of light wells at the front of the property, very visible to passersby, given the very narrow front gardens would detract from the aesthetic appeal and social context of this historic artisan development. Further, these would interfere with the access to and siting of the waste bins which cannot be placed feasibly elsewhere.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 24/07/2018 09:10:04
2018/2442/P		22/07/2018 21:08:29	OBJ	<p>An additional thought:  The applicant, as I understand it, doesn't live in this property. He rents it out.  An increasing number of houses in Spencer Rise are rentals.  Owners of rented properties are obviously less interested than owner-occupiers in the community they've invested in, more interested in the value of the rental.  Approving this application for the expansion of a rental property risks signalling to all rental (and prospective rental) owners that they can improve their income by adding a basement, despite not being a part of and involved in the local community.  I believe Camden has a good record of protecting and promoting the idea of neighbourhood and community. To protect this neighbourhood, and the community of those who live, have lived, and wish to live long-term in Spencer Rise from non-resident speculation, Camden must surely reject this proposal.</p>	

---

Printed on: 24/07/2018 09:10:04

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P		22/07/2018 11:31:51	COMMENT	<p>I strongly object to this proposal on four principal grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process.</li> <li>2. The impact of the work on line of terraces on the north side of Spencer Rise, which historically have been liable to subsidence.</li> <li>3. The applications references to flood risk does not take into Account the River Fleet in a culvert less than 30 meters away</li> <li>4. Approval would set a precedent for other similar developments in a street that is narrow, small in scale.</li> </ol> <p>1: Harm to neighbouring properties and access to homeowners in the street as a result of the building works would seriously be disrupted. Spencer Rise is a narrow, sloping, road with 2 way traffic where on-pavement parking is essential to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also used as an alternative route when road works closes neighbouring wider streets. The the presence of a skip and a succession of skip-lorries, cement deliveries and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will be dangerous and aggravate an already permanently congested area particularlary during rush hour. Parking is already insufficient for local residents. A lengthy construction period will require parking bay suspension for skips/ deliveries which will make an very difficult parking situation much worse.</p> <p>It's estimated the proposed excavation will require 52 skips which will change our tranquil happy environments into a continual very unpleasant traffic jam and a danger close to an awkward junction.</p> <p>2: The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which historically have been liable to subsidence. A concrete box as part of the proposed planning for number 1 may secure this property but at the cost of disturbing the security of the rest of the terrace especially if there are extremes in weather conditions in the future.</p> <p>3: Flood Risk - there is no mention in the application of the River Fleet a few meters away at the cross roads of York Rise and Spencer Rise and no mention of tributary streams running into the Fleet.</p> <p>4: Approval would set a precedent for other similar developments in a narrow street of small three storey houses.</p> <p>Ive noticed an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant Ref: 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) requesting a basement extension and a mansard roof and a rear extension which is surely over development for houses in this street. It is well known that the applicant does not live in the property and his architectural practice (of his own name) has created the plans for these works as a property development exercise. If granted he is likely to sell the property for a profit and leave the neighbours to deal with the aftermath of the fall out from these construction works.</p> <p>Summary:</p> <p>Camden require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✗ do not harm the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;</li> <li>✗ avoid cumulative impacts;</li> <li>✗ do not harm the amenity of neighbours;</li> </ul> <p>In this instance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expert calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>surrounding buildings following such a substantial intervention; nor can they ensure the integrity of the water environment, especially with regard to the River Fleet.</p> <p>2. If allowed this planning would sett a precedent for basement developments in the street which it would be difficult to refuse and this would be detrimental.</p> <p>3. The harm to the amenity of neighbours, both immediate and in the wider area of Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during a long construction process in a very narrow street 2 way street where 2 cars are unable to pass</p> <p>I urge the refusal of this application. I would add that the previous proposal, for a roof extension (2018/0930/P), was refused, mostly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long-term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, and the precedent for future upheaval?</p>

---

Printed on: 24/07/2018 09:10:04

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2442/P		22/07/2018 11:31:42	COMMENT	<p>I strongly object to this proposal on four principal grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The harm caused to neighbouring properties and the amenity of the immediate area by the building process.</li><li>2. The impact of the work on line of terraces on the north side of Spencer Rise, which historically have been liable to subsidence.</li><li>3. The applications references to flood risk does not take into Account the River Fleet in a culvert less than 30 meters away</li><li>4. Approval would set a precedent for other similar developments in a street that is narrow, small in scale.</li></ol> <p>1: Harm to neighbouring properties and access to homeowners in the street as a result of the building works would seriously be disrupted. Spencer Rise is a narrow, sloping, road with 2 way traffic where on-pavement parking is essential to allow access by emergency and refuse vehicles. It is also used as an alternative route when road works closes neighbouring wider streets. The the presence of a skip and a succession of skip-lorries, cement deliveries and other construction vehicles at the bottom of the road will be dangerous and aggravate an already permanently congested area particularlary during rush hour. Parking is already insufficient for local residents. A lengthy construction period will require parking bay suspension for skips/ deliveries which will make an very difficult parking situation much worse.</p> <p>It's estimated the proposed excavation will require 52 skips which will change our tranquil happy environments into a continual very unpleasant traffic jam and a danger close to an awkward junction.</p> <p>2: The impact of the work on the whole line of houses on the north side of Spencer Rise, which historically have been liable to subsidence. A concrete box as part of the proposed planning for number 1 may secure this property but at the cost of disturbing the security of the rest of the terrace especially if there are extremes in weather conditions in the future.</p> <p>3: Flood Risk - there is no mention in the application of the River Fleet a few meters away at the cross roads of York Rise and Spencer Rise and no mention of tributary streams running into the Fleet.</p> <p>4: Approval would set a precedent for other similar developments in a narrow street of small three storey houses.</p> <p>Ive noticed an earlier pre-planning enquiry by the same applicant Ref: 2017/4115/PRE; 14/09/2017) requesting a basement extension and a mansard roof and a rear extension which is surely over development for houses in this street. It is well known that the applicant does not live in the property and his architectural practice (of his own name) has created the plans for these works as a property development exercise. If granted he is likely to sell the property for a profit and leave the neighbours to deal with the aftermath of the fall out from these construction works.</p> <p>Summary:</p> <p>Camden require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✗ do not harm the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;</li><li>✗ avoid cumulative impacts;</li><li>✗ do not harm the amenity of neighbours;</li></ul> <p>In this instance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Expert calculations backing this proposal cannot foresee or guarantee the longer term stability of</li></ol>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>surrounding buildings following such a substantial intervention; nor can they ensure the integrity of the water environment, especially with regard to the River Fleet.</p> <p>2. If allowed this planning would set a precedent for basement developments in the street which it would be difficult to refuse and this would be detrimental.</p> <p>3. The harm to the amenity of neighbours, both immediate and in the wider area of Spencer Rise and York Rise, would be extensive and damaging during a long construction process in a very narrow street 2 way street where 2 cars are unable to pass</p> <p>I urge the refusal of this application. I would add that the previous proposal, for a roof extension (2018/0930/P), was refused, mostly for aesthetic reasons. How much more important for current (many long-term) residents are the issues of disturbance, quality of life, and the precedent for future upheaval?</p>

---

Application No: 2018/2442/P  
Consultees Name: [REDACTED]  
Received: 21/07/2018 19:48:59  
Comment: OBJEMAIL

Printed on: 24/07/2018 09:10:04

**Response:**

1 Spencer Rise, London, Nw5 1ar Proposed Basement Under Existing Building With Light Wells At Front & Rear

Planning Objection submitted by: [REDACTED]

I object strongly to the application, with regard to the Camden Local Plan (2017) on the following grounds:

(i) risk of harm to neighbouring properties, and to the structural, ground, or water conditions of the area:  
The north side of Spencer Rise is a fluid, elastic structure that moves as result of seasonal/climatic change. Substantial subsidence works were undertaken at the rear of Number 7 about a decade ago, with further investigation about to be undertaken around cracking at the front. This lateral concertina effect is visible in the non-rectangular envelopes of the floor profiles of Number 1 (and the other houses). In fact, this concertina effect also operates vertically with any basement dug to the boundary walls not remaining permanently within the vertical demise.

The structure under threat is more than one row of houses; it is a delicate and characterful network of: terrace, rear projections and original brick walls enclosing gardens.

Apart from the groundwater conditions, (the terrace is on the steep clay embankment of the riverbed of the contained river, metres away, at York Rise), movement can also be attributed to the readily felt shockwaves from speeding vehicles taking off across the traffic calmer outside number 5. Sewer smells in this area are noticeable from time to time, suggesting a fragility to the underground waste piping.

These are not propitious conditions, into which it would be safe to introduce further variables, unpredictable & uncontrollable, posed by a deep excavation and permanent siting of a new substantial, fixed, structure below ground level. Further, continuing amenity will require a monitoring and maintenance of waterproofing membranes under stress. The stability & integrity of the existing structures would be seriously threatened by this kind of development here and, in fact, anywhere, on this steep hill.

(ii) risk of harm to the character and amenity of the area, architectural character of the building and significance of heritage assets:  
The application dates the building of number 1 to between 1886 and 1906. In fact, Spencer Rise (then 'Roadt) on the Conservative Land Society's estate, was a patch work development for artisans undertaken in the 1870s (see Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Statement (2009), para 7.60) and certainly by 1885 was fully developed (except 1a, 1b, 1c) with a Mr. Henry Freeman in residence at number 1 (see the Hampstead & Highgate Directory of 1885-6, p 217). Numbers 1,3,5 form one of the earliest joint developments, retaining a harmonious external character, worthy of conservation.

The introduction of light wells at the front of the property, very visible to passersby, given the very narrow front gardens would detract from the aesthetic appeal and social context of this historic artisan development. Further, these would interfere with the access to and siting of the waste bins which cannot be placed feasibly elsewhere.