
From: Peres Da Costa, David
Sent: 06 February 2020 09:24
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning application 2019/1515/P - 26 Netherhall Gardens

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Can this be logged as an objection on M3 and added to HPE RM

Thanks

David Peres da Costa
Senior Planning Officer

Tel.: 020 7974 5262
Visit camden.gov.uk for the latest council information and news

Sent: 06 February 2020 08:41
To: Peres Da Costa, David <David.PeresDaCosta@Camden.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning application 2019/1515/P

Planning application 2019/1515/P

Site Address - 26 Netherhall Gardens London NW3 5TL

Dear,

I understand a Members' briefing is soon to take place regarding this application. Given the controversial nature of this development, the many applications submissions by the appellant over the last 6 years - including 2 planning inspectorate appeals which were both turned down - and the huge amount from comments from local residents and local conservation groups, I believe it is totally unfair to make a final decision on this application in a secret meeting.

The appellant has submitted many incomplete and conflicting analysis over time, which on its own is unacceptable. But most importantly, the appellant has never addressed the 2 main issues pointed out by us, residents and neighbours:

- that of the UNACCEPTABLE – and excessive - felling of yet more trees in this neighbourhood (4 major trees and damage to another large mature lime tree) due to the construction of a yet another massive basement and the increase of hard surfacing in this development, and

- that of the INVALIDITY of all studies and risk analysis related to the ground movement and alteration of water flows, as these all wrongly assume, I cite " an absence of immediately neighbouring basements...." This assumption is WRONG, as no 24 has large foundations of up to 2 meters in height, ie the equivalent of a full basement height. As a result, there is a serious risk to the foundations of '24 and 24 a, individually and as a 'combined structure' as a result of the aforementioned risks, which up to now has been completely ignored. This is unacceptable.

On this basis, I urge Camden to postpone any briefings and open the discussion from a Member's Briefing to a full Public hearing, so that these points can be addressed by us, residents.

1. Removal of 4 mature trees and damage to the roots of 1 other large mature tree goes against government's policy to protect our climate and environment and unnecessarily adds to the risks of ground movement

In total, 4 trees T6, T7, T8 and T9 will be removed and their removal will have a serious impact on another very large, mature lime tree T2. I urge Camden to act responsibly and conserve these trees in order to protect our climate and environment for generations to come. Their removal is also detrimental to the ground stability and greenery of this conservation area. There are no plans, nor is there any space, to grow and replace these trees.

2. The planning application should not be granted as the studies and risk analysis related to ground movement and altered water flows are deeply flawed as they assume "an absence of immediately neighbouring basements". This assumption is wrong, as no 24 has large foundations, which will be put under serious pressure because of the predicted ground movements and predicted water flow analysis. This fact has been completely ignored so far. As such, no mitigating measures have been proposed to mitigate this serious risk of damage to the foundations of 24 and the combined structure of 24 and 24a as a result of this development.

It is unthinkable that the developer has not even once visited the immediate neighbouring properties of no 24 and 24a (and no 28?) so as to assess their building construction, the existence of basements, type of foundations or any other relevant building characteristics. As the predicted ground movement and altered water flows are expected to pose a serious risk on nearby basements, Camden cannot approve this planning application without requesting further in-depth investigation and risk analysis of ground movement and altered flows on no24 on this matter.

⇒ All Ground movement and altered water flow studies in this application have assumed, I cite " an absence of immediately neighbouring basements...." (see **ALL** BIA audits and water flow analysis done since 2014). This is a wrong assumption as no 24 has large foundations of up to 2 meters of height, ie the equivalent of a full basement height.

⇒ The studies (a.o. SJ SDCS study of Jan 2017) also assumed that the buildings of no 24 and no 24a are of 'single' structures each. Again this assumption is WRONG. Both buildings are in fact intricately connected. This renders the conclusions of the developer that 'maximum damage of no 26 development to immediate properties is of Burland Category 0 to Category 1' invalid, totally invalid given that the developer has not even acknowledged the existence and nature of the 'foundations of the the combined structure of no 24 and 24a '. Unacceptable given this combined structure only sits a few meters away from no 26.

I urge Camden to visit our property and request that the developer performs a full investigation and structural analysis into 24 and 24a (and their connectivity) and 28. Camden should request that all measures to fully mitigate these risks. Considering the size of this development (deep basement and huge excavation of rear garden) and the direction of ground and surface water flow, the impact on the wider hydrogeological the environment could be very significant. With foundations as high a 2 meters at no 24, the risks of damage posed to no 24 and 24a as a result of increased ground instability and altered (ground and surface) water flows as a result of no 26 could be very real and significant.

This risk is then further compounded by the already aggressive and massive nature of the proposed development, which the developer only scathes over:

- The development sits on a slope in excess of 7 degrees, in an area which is already very prone to subsidence, which Camden is very well aware of.
- The development will result in a quintupling of the ratio of hard vs soft surfacing from today's ratio of 1.2 to a staggering 5.4 ratio (or more than 80% of this development will be taking up by hard surface). No SUD's drainage can cope with this vast amount of altered water flows given the constraint and boundaries of the site (only 1 meter from 24a boundary).

- The development includes excessive felling of 4 trees and damage the roots of another mature tree, which will further increase the risk of ground instability.
- The proposed basement will extend beneath the water table surface and hence will materially change the groundwater flow regime and increase the degree of dampness or seepage for the existing nearby structures.
- The development is only within 100m of tributaries of the Westbourne River, but has been largely ignored.

Given the flawed studies, the 'category 1 risk of land stability impact on neighbouring properties' seems largely under-estimated and hence becomes totally UNACCEPTABLE.

I urge Camden to cancel the Member's Briefing and open the discussion to a full Public hearing.

