

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2014/P	Richard Tomlinson	04/10/2020 20:59:34	OBJ	<p>I am writing in response to the appearance on Camden Planning's website of a third BIA for the basement development at this property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The construction of the basement was completed before the previous (2nd) BIA was registered, dated 11 September 2019. That BIA predicted Burland Scale 2 damage to No.76 Lawn Road. That retrospective application was therefore refused and enforcement action notified. This latest (3rd) BIA was registered 9 September 2020. This now predicts Burland Scale 1 damage to No.76 Lawn Road. <p>The appearance of the additional documents follows the objections that were submitted that asked why the basement had not been included in this retrospective application. The objections highlighted the history of the Burland Scale 2 predictions.</p> <p>This 3rd BIA raises several questions and I continue to object to this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basement construction was completed before both the 2nd or 3rd BIA reports. No works were carried out on the basement in between the two BIAs. The predicted damage to the neighbouring properties (Nos. 78 and 76) was already known before the two BIAs were written. How therefore is it possible for the damage scale prediction for No.76 to have been changed from Burland Scale 2 to Burland Scale 1 between the 2nd BIA and the 3rd BIA? Why are no reasons given for this lower damage prediction? Why no transparency on such an important matter? There is no meaningful difference between the extent of the basement as shown in the drawings submitted for the two BIAs in question. The construction methods were already known, and implemented, before either of these BIAs. So what accounts for the downgrading of the damage prediction? Isn't there something a bit absurd about twice publishing damage "predictions" after the basement development has already been completed? How can it ever be acceptable to grant retrospective planning permission for something as major as a basement? <p>This is particularly relevant to Lawn Road where permission has already been granted for a basement at 75 Lawn Road and an application is being reviewed for a basement at 76 Lawn Road.</p> <p>As detailed in my original objections, Camden did not intervene at No.77 while the basement was being built based on a BIA with predicted Burland scale 2 and without planning permission for what was actually being constructed. Camden let those works proceed.</p> <p>It is crucial that the damage predictions for basements are established and approved before construction starts in line with what is actually going to be built.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Any BIA must be vetted by Campbell Reith as part of the basement planning process and a full Campbell Reith audit published. Any such audit will need to justify the change from Burland scale 2 to Burland scale 1 for essentially the same excavation and basement works.</p> <p>I object to this application.</p>
2020/2014/P	Tom Symes	04/10/2020 20:42:53	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this application on the basis that LBC should not grant retrospective consent to the construction of a basement where works caused damage to the adjoining properties.</p> <p>Camden allowed work to proceed on the basis that the predicted damage in the Building Impact Assessment was Burland Scale 2. This contravened LBC policies.</p> <p>After the work has been completed this current application now predicts Burland Scale 1 damage, no reason has been given to support the change in predicted damage in the current application.</p> <p>Camden allowed the works to proceed but this cannot override the fact that the application stated that the works would involve Burland Scale 2 damage, contrary to Camden's policies. This is not something that can be corrected or authorised retrospectively by another application which, for unspecified reasons, recategorises works that have already been carried out, as Scale 1 not scale 2.</p> <p>The application is invalid and must be refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2014/P	Ellen Solomon	04/10/2020 20:51:44	OBJ	<p>I'm writing again because Camden Council has published a new BIA for 77 Lawn Road. As I said in my previous comments I lived and owned the next door house (76 Lawn Road) during this development.</p> <p>Both of the two most recent BIAs were written and registered after the basement construction had been completed. This seems extraordinary.</p> <p>The big question raised by the latest BIA is why have the damage predictions for my former house (No.76) been reduced from Burland scale 2 to Burland scale 1 despite the basement description in the two BIAs being essentially identical?</p> <p>Why have no reasons been given to explain this reduction in damage prediction? Camden should require an explanation.</p> <p>These predictions are being made after the event so why doesn't the BIA incorporate the scale of the damage that actually took place at the two neighbouring properties (Nos. 76 and 78)? There is no need to predict what is already known.</p> <p>These are questions that Campbell Reith must address if this application gets as far as being submitted for their audit.</p> <p>As you know, I alerted Camden enforcement back at the time when the first Burland scale 2 prediction was published. This level of damage breaches Camden's policy and guidance for basements. Yet Camden let the development continue even though it turns out there was no planning permission for what was actually being built.</p> <p>How can retrospective approval be acceptable for something as big as a basement development?</p> <p>I object to retrospective approval for this basement development, based on changing retrospective predicted damage forecasts for my former home.</p>