

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5141/P	Marilyn Fricker	06/11/2019 10:33:41	INT	<p>I write to object to the application for a basement level extension with modern raised roof lights projecting at least one metre above existing garden level to this historically and environmentally important end of terrace cottage.</p> <p>I live directly opposite the existing end of terrace Grade II listed property and overlook the entire area which is the subject of this Application.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The end cottage forms part of a continuous row of historically and environmentally important cottages. Willow Cottages must be considered as a whole and deserve to be considered collectively. One cottage at No 33 should not be considered in isolation. The visual impact and beauty of the cottages is affected by the appearance of one of them.</li> <li>2. A modern building attachment impacts negatively on the environmental significance of each and every one of the Willow Cottages. They need to be regarded as a whole development and not , as in this application, a separate , free standing property. Visually, any modern attachment detracts from the totality and environmental significance of the whole row.</li> <li>3. The design is aesthetically challenging to the rest of the cottages.</li> <li>4. As this corner of Hampstead is a Conservation Area , the spirit and significance of the Conservation Area must be honoured. It will be challenging if this modern structure were to be permitted. To suggest that a few nearby properties in other streets, have somehow achieved planning permission does not justify permission allowing this cancerous growth which is ugly, modern and challenging style.</li> </ol>
2019/5141/P	Peter Ratzer	10/11/2019 19:43:11	COMMNT	<p>I would like to express my reservations about the development due to the potential effect on the underground water flows in the immediate area. The Building Impact Statement (BIA) maintains that the impact of the basement will be negligible, but since the proposed extension is 'essentially an independent reinforced concrete box' it will inevitably affect the flows of water in the vicinity as they will have to find a way round the new structure. It is claimed that the layered aquifer system will not be affected by the proposed works, although the proposed basement and foundation works will penetrate the made ground/Claygate Member interface somewhat ('not...appreciably' are the words used in 3.3.1 of the BIA). It is stated in 5.1.2 of the BIA that 'The ground water flow may be altered by the proposed extension. Changes in flow regime could potentially cause the groundwater level within the zone encompassed by the new flow route to increase or decrease locally. For existing nearby structures then the degree of dampness or seepage may potentially increase as a result of changes in groundwater level.' 7.3 on Hydrogeology appears to contradict this: 'It is considered that given the proposed development will not alter any existing perched water flows the development thus poses no potential risk to water flow or to any nearby underground structures.'</p> <p>I query whether a seven-week monitoring exercise in the boreholes (see 3.3.1) was sufficient to establish the variability of the water levels and flows in the area. There was no significant variation in water levels over the seven-week period, but in the following two weeks the water level rose by a significant 1.8 m. While the comment is made that changes in the water flow in the more permeable Claygate Member/London Clay are 'possibly' due to seasonal rainfall variation I believe that there is ample evidence of such changes in the local area as a result of heavy rains. I believe the proposed development will have a potentially significant effect on nearby properties.</p>