

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4585/P	Jennifer Sandler	21/11/2021 14:29:00	OBJ	<p>I first moved into the ground floor flat at 109 Canfield Gardens,(adjacent to 111 Canfield Gardens) in the early 1980's and wish to strongly object to planning application number 2021/4585/P for several important reasons:</p> <p>1) Interference with Ground Water and Surface Water drainage Canfield Gardens is in the Goldhurst Local Flood Risk zone and my back garden has frequently flooded after heavy rainfall since 2002, with standing water over the whole lawn for 2 - 3 days. One consequence of this is that my scheduled visits from my gardeners have to be postponed as they are unable to work. (See photos below taken this summer.) There is also already an important and substantial risk of flooding in my cellar and I have concerns that this risk is increased as a result of further excavation works at 111 Canfield Gardens, as proposed in this planning application. The flooding in the cellar at 109 Canfield Gardens first occurred after the excavation works at 111 Canfield Gardens to create the basement accommodation. The flooding and damp in my cellar became so bad that in 2013, works were needed to waterproof my cellar and install a pump at 109 Canfield Gardens. The presence of a large non-draining patio area already created in the rear garden at 111 Canfield Gardens significantly reduces the surface area available for rainwater reabsorption, and already adds to the risk of localised flooding.</p> <p>2) Potential Risk of Structural Damage There is a history of subsidence at 109 Canfield Gardens since the previous excavation works were carried out at 111 Canfield Gardens to form the extensive basement accommodation and there was some damage to the party wall between 111 and 109 during previous works since which time periodic repair and re-plastering has been required. There is therefore a significant risk that further excavation works at 111 Canfield Gardens would risk a recurrence of structural damage at 109 Canfield Gardens and problems affecting the party wall between 111 and 109 Canfield Gardens.</p> <p>3) Noise In further support of our objection, you may find it helpful to know that I am also very concerned about the potential impact of the noise and underground vibration from use of a CarDok mechanism next door. Firstly, my bedroom is on the ground floor at the front of the house in the room closest to the proposed underground garage which shares a party wall. [REDACTED] therefore highly likely to be disturbed by the operation of an underground garage in the late evening. I am also aware that I would be able to hear the lift operating during the daytime in my living room which also shares a party wall with 111 where I entertain and regularly host meditation groups. (Provisionally stopped due to Covid restrictions.)</p> <p>4) Environmental considerations This planning application goes against Camden Council's commitment to reduce cars in the area. Many of the front gardens in Canfield Gardens have already been dug up with consequent reduction in surface area for water drainage and reduction of green space in an area known locally as 'The Gardens Area'. Building an underground garage with a car lift at 111 Canfield Gardens would be completely out of keeping with Camden Council's South Hampstead Character Strategy 2011 and our Conservation Area and which would create a very unpopular precedent.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received: Comment: Response:

Printed on: 24/11/2021 09:10:05

I therefore earnestly request that Camden will reject this application!

Thank you

Mrs Jennifer Sandier

20210712_172221.jpeg
20210712_192512.jpeg

2021/4585/P	G Power	20/11/2021 17:36:27	OBJ	I live on the same section of Canfield Gardens and this area is becoming increasingly prone to flooding. This summer, the water table rose to cover half the garden on several occasions, and myself and neighbours lost several mature trees to the water-logging. The more basements that are dug, the worse this will become, as there will be less 'soak' for the water. Surveyors have noted the problem stems from there being an underground river. To make things worse, few of the properties have proper foundations. The success of this application will create a precedent. Apart from affecting the environment, this proposal is not creating more housing, and it is encouraging car ownership at a time when the general movement is to reclaim cities for people rather than cars. I can also imagine that automatic gates and lifts cause noise pollution in a street where most properties are flats. At present, this property, I understand, has mature trees on one side. Are these then felled? I also cannot understand such a need to 'store' cars at such a social and environmental cost to the local community.
-------------	---------	---------------------	-----	--
