
From: Fieldsend, Sofie
Sent: 08 January 2021 10:32
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 2020/5187/P
Attachments: water landmark.pdf

Subject: 2020/5187/P

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Sofie,

I am a neighbour and also a property developer.

This application relies upon the reader being able to interpret drawings with no narrative which is insufficiently clear. However, you will be aware that the levelling has included removal of at least 2m depth including topsoil across the "garden" part of the site.

The site is a surface water flood area (see Landmark report attached) and the removal of topsoil, vegetation and in particular trees (in a CA without consent 2.10 draft CPG on trees Nov 2018) will aggravate the problem.

You will also be aware that this application is part of a suite of related applications concerning the sites of 14 and 14a. One of these is a pre-app to build a three storey dwelling including a basement at the site now referred to as 14a. A basement would normally require about 2.6m of storey height plus the concrete slab and the foundations trench say 3m all in. In any event a basement is defined as being partly underground not necessarily fully (CPG Introduction 1.4). Having already obtained 2m of this it would be only a minor step to for an extra 1m to have a full basement. Furthermore this is across much of the site. So a number of questions remain unanswered. These include whether the basement will be too large based on CPG Policy A5 h of no more than 50% of the garden; whether harm is caused to neighbouring properties CPG A5f; and whether the new lower level is considered to be the ground floor effectively giving rise to two levels of basement in breach of CPG Policy A5 f.

So the application is too vague to be determined and is linked to other

applications and an intended application and should not be considered in isolation. Assuming this is a basement or an intended basement there is no BIA and so this would need to be supplied as well as part of the public consultation documentation.

The applicant has also behaved in an unneighbourly and unlawful way by refusing to serve party wall notices in respect of this application and work done to the basement of 14 possibly in connection to 2020/5383/P or work carried out at the same time without planning. I am aware that party wall notices should have been served in respect to at least some if not all of number 2 and potentially neighbouring properties, 12 and 16 and also two properties in Rosslyn Hill. Not a single party wall notice has been served.

Finally number 2 is a listed property and the application will result in less than substantial harm to its setting para 134 NPPF.

Yours sincerely,

--

Alex Shinder

Address: 9 Hampstead Hill Gardens London NW3 2PH



--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>