

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/3948/P	d mcmillan	20/10/2019 18:23:11	COMMNT	<p>This is a character cottage, one of a matching pair, which is significant in a conservation area. The scheme proposed will change the nature &amp; look of the properties. The scope of the proposed basement gives rise to concerns in an area where there are undergrounds streams, railway lines &amp; trains running under Netherhall Gds from Finchley Road which are audible during the night. Given its proximity to 59 Maresfield Gardens where a triple basement house is about to be built neighbours must be concerned this scheme will impact on our utilities which run under the road servicing all properties.</p> <p>We strongly object to their plan to use the Disabled Bay outside 47d to site skips for the duration of the build. There is a need for Residents Parking Bays; there are too few, particularly in a street that is constantly used for the school-runs. Residents should not forego essential parking to allow for on-street skips.</p>
2019/3948/P	Viviana Antinolfi	22/10/2019 22:41:46	OBJ	<p>I oppose the excavation of the new basement of the basis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. footprint/boarder of the property is incorrect as driveway of 47 Netherhall been incorrectly included in the footprint - no lightwell should be allowed</li> <li>2. Driveway is used for emergency, temporary workmen and building a lightwell should not be permitted as would interfere with the communal use of the space - in addition as the driveway is communal it should not be used during the work as a permanent base for the builders/skips..</li> <li>3. Noise and disturbance would highly affect the quality of life of neighbours for a very long period</li> <li>4. Risk associated to excavating and potential subsidence and damage to neighbouring buildings</li> </ol>
2019/3948/P	Neda Toofanian	20/10/2019 22:33:14	COMMNT	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I think such a basement would take a very long time to completing would cause a lot of disruption, noise and pollution for the neighbours.</p> <p>This basement will drop below the ground water level and has drainage implications.</p> <p>There is a historical stream underground and there is no implication that this stream no longer runs there and may disrupt it and cause flooding.</p> <p>us as neighbours are very concerned of such basement excavation not only because it causes havoc in our road but it would likely cause damage to the neighbouring property. we are in a conservation area and we should take this kind of constructions very seriously.</p>
2019/3948/P	Karen Simon	20/10/2019 14:38:21	OBJ	<p>We object to the plans to construct a basement for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the property is directly above an underground railway. Building a basement directly above the railway tunnel could affect the structural foundations of our property.</li> <li>2. The building would extend right under the property's front garden as well as entirely under the house as it currently stands.</li> <li>3. The advice seems to indicate potential damage to the adjacent property (no. 49) which could in turn affect our property.</li> <li>4. The proposed basement would be below groundwater level and is above an aquifer therefore there cannot be a guarantee of drainage problems in the future.</li> </ol>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2019/3948/P	Marc van der Lubbe	22/10/2019 22:43:06	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to this planning application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Footprint far too big (150 perc of existing footprint)</li><li>2. Basement level will be below groundwater level with inherent risks associated</li><li>3. Lightwell in courtyard which is communal</li><li>4. Significant risk of damage to other properties</li><li>5. Sub standard living space created (ie poor light in basement)</li><li>6. Property boundaries only assumed, ie boundaries not properly identified</li><li>7. Project near a historical stream</li></ol>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/3948/P	Sarah Robins	18/10/2019 12:39:18	OBJ	<p>OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 2019/3948/P - proposed basement to 47d Netherhall gardens</p> <p>We are the freeholders of 47 Netherhall Gardens, comprising of 10 flats.</p> <p>We own the forecourt, accessed from Netherhall Gardens, of which 47, 47b, 47c and 47d adjoin.</p> <p>We would like to make you aware of the following:-</p> <p>As stated, 47d Netherhall Gardens adjoins our forecourt and There are limitations in the owners title on their ability to carry out certain works. The 1949 Transfer imposes restrictive covenants on the owner of 47d Netherhall Gardens including:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Not to park any vehicles of any description on the land edged blue on the plan – this is effectively the forecourt of 47 Netherhall Gardens.</li> <li>· Not to make any structural alterations modifications or extensions to the exterior of the premises... without the plans first being “submitted to and approved by the Transferor”.</li> </ul> <p>We strongly object to the planning application submitted on the following grounds:-</p> <p>Having been given access, by Mr Rohan Heath of 47c, to the report from the consulting engineering firm Eldred Geotechnics Ltd Mr Heath employed to give opinion on the BIA report ( conducted by CET Infrastructure ) we fully concur with Mr Heath's objections submitted.</p> <p>Some of the findings from the Eldred Geotechnics Ltd report are extremely worrying and we are deeply concerned about the possible danger to the foundations of our forecourt and the surrounding buildings and our services and drainage that run through the forecourt.</p> <p>We completely agree with Mr Heath's other objections to the proposed development and consider the extent of the proposal to be over bearing on a small site, especially as the house is in a conservation area.</p> <p>In particular we are also concerned with the proposed light well bordering on our forecourt and the loss of valuable amenity this would cause. The existing flower bed, which is proposed to be replaced by a light well, is appreciated by all the residents around the forecourt and very visible from the road.</p> <p>Another of our big concerns is the long term noise, mess and disturbance from the construction of the proposed development for all the neighbouring residents.</p> <p>In view of the above and all the other objections that have been put forward we feel there are very good reasons to decline this application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Sarah Robins</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
				On behalf of Stuart Lightband Ltd

---