

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/G140/P	Tamar Wang	18/01/2019 17:38:13	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I am writing to register my concerns over the proposed basement plan. I am particularly concerned with the potential subsidence risks.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>The flat was awaiting repairs after serious cracking due to subsidence. It eventually resulted in the whole of my dining room ceiling (at the front of the house) collapsing and repairs also necessary to the kitchen ceiling. My downstairs neighbour also had severe damage. The cause was traced to the roots of a tree at the end of the garden - further away from the house than the proposed basement excavations at no.56. It was also far further than the 6 metres which your Party Wall policy allows for determining a Party Wall award. ( I have tried several times to ring the number at Camden planning given to speak to someone to find out whether, given the depth of excavations necessary at no.56, no 58 should in fact be awarded Party Wall protection, but no one has answered the call - and I would like clarification on this )</p> <p>Since the repairs, I have had a few cracks reappearing but nothing continuing to worsen. However it has proved extremely difficult to insure the property, with our insurers refusing at one point and only conceding after repeated requests and the length of time we had been clients. No other insurers would take us on board - and all this because of this history of subsidence. For this reason I am extremely reluctant to agree to any excavation to foundations which carry even a slight risk. Apart from the danger, damage and disruption, we run the risk of not being able to insure our homes.</p> <p>I have been in touch with my neighbours and know that Mr Farrow has made several further comments including concerns about the trial excavations carried out during the stable hot weather last summer and about the water table. He has also included technical comments by a surveyor. All of these have increased my concerns and I would urge you to consider them.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Tamar Wang</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/6140P	Paul Farrow	18/01/2019 16:53:00	OBJ	<p>I would like to register an objection to this planning application on four grounds:</p> <p>1) The properties in question (no 56, the applicant, and its two neighbouring properties no.s 54 and 58) all have a history of notable subsidence that had to be rectified at considerable expense and irritation to the owners. I understand from the previous owner of no. 56 that it was underpinned (both the front bays and the left-hand side wall) about 30 years ago. Following that there was no further subsidence until he sold the house in February 2018. My house (no. 54) had the two front bays underpinned about 15 years ago, since when we have not had any problems. I understand that no 58 has also been underpinned (over 20 years ago) although with ongoing problems. It would be a great pity to cause renewed problems to no.s 54 and 58 for the sake of an enlarged cellar at no. 56.</p> <p>2) We have spoken to an independent consulting engineer who has found some discrepancies and omissions in the plans submitted. I include an extract from his comments for your attention:</p> <p>'There are a few technical issues raised in the SI (BIA doc 8) that do not seem to have been carried forward in the SE design:</p> <p>BIA Doc 8 - SI</p> <p>1. Page 25/26 - contains a discussion about dessication of the Clay in the southerly corner of house. Notes that dessication has been proved to 2.5m below ground level and that foundations should be founded below this and up to a depth of 3.35m. Also comment on using a void former below the basement slab to counteract heave. Clay noted as high plasticity (PI)</p> <p>2. Page 27/28 - comments on rear extension foundations to be 1.6 to 2m below ground level. Note about raft being impractical</p> <p>BIA doc 7</p> <p>3. Para 4.5 notes comment about heave</p> <p>4. Para 9.3 - comments about monitoring under PW Act</p> <p>If you refer to Conisbee drawing SSK-03 in BIA doc 9, you can see that they are showing the southerly foundation as it is existing - namely 2.5m below ground, and that this doesn't impact on foundations to No. 54. However, if they followed the SI guidance, and encountered roots at depth, those foundations could be 0.85m deeper than shown and impact on No. 54.</p> <p>Referring to same sketch and the structural calculations (Doc 13), there is no provision for Clay heave in the foundation design, nor indeed any design for the base slab. There is no comment on the impracticality of a raft nor design for an accidental head of water of 1m below ground level. There is no slenderness check on the retaining wall design provided, nor a design for the suspended ground floor slab. There is no comment on where &amp; how the thrust from the top of the retaining wall goes back into the ground.</p> <p>SSK-005 in the same package shows the rear foundations at 0.8m below ground level, not the 1.6-2.0m</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:

Response:

mentioned in the SI.5

3) As far as I know there are no fully sunken basements such as is proposed on the upper part of Dartmouth Park Road, between York Rise and Dartmouth Park Hill. It would be a great pity if a successful application for such a basement by no. 56 led to a spate of similar applications, with the associated threat of subsidence, heave (etc.) for the road as a whole.

4) I am not a surveyor or an engineer, but some of the methodology employed and referenced in the planning application seems questionable e.g. the bore holes sunk to test the water level were sunk at the end of August 2018, after the longest period of hot weather in 40 years! It is difficult to see how useful conclusions can be drawn from that analysis. For the record, my own cellar has had water coming up through the floor in the last two years, suggesting that the water table is not far below the current floor level.

Please get back to me if you want any further explanation on the above points.

---