

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/6105/P	Gideon Kasfiner	17/02/2019 18:39:32	COMMNT	We are concerned on 2 points firstly regarding the traffic problems that are caused at the junction of St Marks Crescent & Gloucester Avenue and secondly that works are carried out at the allowed hours.
2018/6105/P	Helen Scott	15/02/2019 13:38:23	OBJ	<p>I have 2 serious concerns:</p> <p>1:regarding the high groundwater.I think it needs bottoming out where this water is coming from before excavation is commenced, so that suitable dewatering can be designed. The monitoring boreholes were poorly designed and better care should have been taken in design to assess the source of the groundwater.</p> <p>The Structural Method Statement is very poor. It has quite a few basic errors, eg stating groundwater is below basement foundation level. It does not give anywhere near enough detail of construction and retaining wall calculations for planning.</p> <p>2/ St Marks Crescent is a single lane two way street. The carriageway available is 2 M across at its narrowest point. It is completely unsuitable to this type of construction traffic. There is no Construction management plan or traffic management plan. We currently have daily problems with lorries on pavements/constuctions deliveries occluding bays without suspensions/damage to pavements by construction traffic without repair/cars parking on pavement to avoid damage by construction traffic</p>
2018/6105/P	andrew scott	15/02/2019 13:41:01	OBJ	<p>The proposal has failed to demonstrate that there will not be significant adverse impacts on residential amenity resulting from construction activity, notably from lorry traffic on an unsuitable road. It will exacerbate existing problems with lorry traffic which include daily violations of parking/traffic restrictions. There are also significant concerns regarding the basement impacts of the proposal in relation to excavation and dewatering and further detailed information is required to ensure there are no significant impacts. The proposed additional storey in addition to the existing excavated area is contrary to criteria g of Policy A5. In addition, there are also some concerns regarding the size of the basement in relation to requirements set out in Policy A5.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with Policies A1, A4, A5 and T4 of the Camden Local Plan</p> <p>There are several omissions from the application including lack of a site specific Flood Risk Assessment and most notably a lack of a Construction Management Plan which is a serious omission due to the potential impacts on residential amenity.</p>