				Printed on: 27/07/2021 09
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2544/P	Gabriel Turner	26/07/2021 17:57:46	OBJ	I oppose the application for the following reasons:
				 There is no application for retrospective planning permission for the basement extension under the house, for which the lightwell provides light. The extension of the basement, creating a bedroom and bathroom, was carried out recently without any planning permission. The document 'existing and proposed basement floor plan' shows the extended basement and developments under the house, including the removal of sections of the front wall of the building. Accordingly, this application is incomplete. Application Form Section 6 states that the work on the lightwell was completed on 20.8.2017. This is incorrect as the small
				wall around the lightwell was being constructed on 12.3.2021 (photo URL https://photos.app.goo.gl/vJSKQTu2YNnshHBB9) and the grid was being fitted on 20.7.21 (photo URL
				 https://photos.app.goo.gl/gd7L7ZobHsvXhTJW7). b. Section 7, under the heading "loss of garden land" states that there is no loss of garden land. This is incorrect. The lightwell has been dug in the front garden of the property, which forms part of the Common Parts belonging to the leaseholders of all 3 flats in the building. There is a loss of garden land in the front garden, which is stated in this application to be 0.1 hectares.
				c. Section 10 headed "Development Dates" states that the date of completion was August 2017. This is incorrect as the small wall around the lightwell was being constructed on 12.3.2021 and the grid was being fitted on 20.7.21.
				d. Section 14 states that the external materials include only a metal grille. This is incomplete, as the development includes external painted cement features, covering breeze blocks used in construction. See photo https://photos.app.goo.gl/vJSKQTu2YNnshHBB9 from 22.03.2021.
				 e. Section 15 headed "Rights of Way" states that the proposals do not require any diversions/extinguishments and/or creation of rights of way. This is not true. The lightwell has been dug on the Common Parts of the property, over which the leaseholders of the 3 flats in the building have rights of way. The creation of the lightwell has extinguished the right of way over the area of the lightwell. 3. Supporting Letter
				 a. Under the heading "site and surrounding area" the letter states that the property has a large rear garden, "which is used exclusively by the ground floor flat". This is misleading as the rear garden is one of the Common Parts of the freehold, and the leaseholders of all three flats have a right to use the garden. b. Under the same heading, the letter states that 'Lightwells are present along Bartholomew Road frontages'. The example photographs do not show lightwells. Rather, they show lower ground floors where the front garden area is sunken, and part or all of the windows to the lower ground floors are above ground level and
				visible from the street level. The proposed development is dissimilar from other examples on the street as it is part of an entirely subterranean basement extension and the lightwell would provides its only natural light. There is no other example of a basement and lightwell in Bartholomew Road.
				c. Under the heading "Subterranean Developments" it is stated that an Assessment of the basement impact is submitted in support of the application to demonstrate that the basement maintains the structural stability of the building and avoids adverse effects to drainage. However, this Assessment is not available on the public website, nor has it been provided to this objector, who is the leaseholder of flat 23C in the building and directly affected by any compromising of its structural stability. So far as I am aware, it has not been provided to Camden Building Control who have written to the applicant.
				This aspect is of considerable importance, since a substantial part of the main front wall of the building has been removed. If this Assessment has not been included in the application, the application should clearly be

Comment: Response:

rejected. If the Assessment has been included, it should be scrutinised carefully and should be made available for comment. Therefore, if it has been submitted, please make it available and allow further time for myself and others to comment.