

Dear Ms Henry,

Letter of objection to planning application 2021/5750/P, 8 A Hampstead Hill Gardens

---

I write on behalf of 8 Hampstead Hill Gardens Ltd as owners of the 8 flats at this address, following a meeting of the owners on January 7.

In short summary, all of the owners at our meeting were unanimously opposed to the extreme development of the garage block behind 8A, but pleased with the improvements to the main building and the small garden area provided for at the front of the building. As others have noted, however, we are not keen on the glass balustrades or the glass conservatory extension which we feel are inappropriate.

**PRINCIPAL CONCERNS – COLLATERAL DAMAGE TO OUR BUILDING FOUNDATIONS AND STRUCTURE**

Our very real concerns are primarily to the possible damage to no.8, which of course adjoins 8A both to the party wall between our two buildings and the foundations of no.8.

The Soiltechnics Basement Impact Report commissioned by Daniel Jaffe, an 85-page document, refers to a number of potential negative impacts that might be encountered during the construction work. The forward “non-technical” summary of the report says that with “appropriate” controls the potential damage to adjoining properties CAN be limited to Burland Category 1 in accordance with planning guidance – not will be – so reading on there was a number of caveats thrown up in the detailed report.

Section 5.2.1 says construction of the proposed basement will cause ground movement that has the potential to cause damage to neighbouring structures. But section 5.2.2 says it is considered that the scheme CAN be suitably designed and constructed to maintain stability therefore MINIMISE damage.

Section 6.4.1 referring to existing foundations says that no.10 has a lower ground floor however the footprint is unknown similarly the FOUNDATIONS OF NUMBER 8 ARE NOT KNOWN - but it is ASSUMED that the foundations will be circa 1.0-m BGL.

Section 7.3.3 states that the construction of the basement will INDUCE GROUND MOVEMENTS WITHIN THE SOIL THAT HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO CAUSE DAMAGE TO NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES. Ground movement will occur due to the following activities:

- Construction of the underpins
- Excavation of the basement leading to inward yield
- Long terms settlement of the soil due to loads acting on the underpins

Section 7.3.9 says that the analysis will generally be limited to Burland category 1 however there are three panels shown to be category 2 which indicates UNACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF DAMAGE HOWEVER THESE RESULTS ARE NOT CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACCURATE REPRESENTATION.

I have put those concerning remarks in capitals to simply highlight that where such large reconstruction takes place of course things can go wrong. I don't doubt that the work will be done conscientiously -but if there are unexpected repercussions it's no.8 that will suffer the consequences.

**DISRUPTION**

The basement flats (no 1 and 2) and ground floor flats (no 3 and 4) at no. 8 would be disproportionately affected by the noise right outside their rooms which are just 2.5 metres away from the garages. Life would become almost unbearable with the enormous amount of noise concomitant with this large construction site that of course they would never have expected would materialise. To a lesser extent all the people living at no.8 would have their peaceful lives disrupted for at least a year possibly a year and a half.

#### **PRIVACY AND OVERLOOK**

There are clear overlook concerns for the basement flats (no 1 and 2) and ground floor flats (no 3 and 4), not simply during the proposed works but thereafter once the structure is built. The proposed plans to develop the top of the garage, albeit an outdoor space, is the equivalent of adding an additional story to the structure which will be used far more frequently than at present (for occasional maintenance) and will look directly (and closely) into the bedrooms of Flats 3 and 4.

#### **LOSS OF LIGHT**

In addition, there would be a loss of light for those basement flats as well as the ground-floor flats (3 and 4) as the proposed structure is higher than the current level.

#### **DISPROPORTIONALITY**

Certainly, the garage building is not attractive but nobody ever imagined it would become a development site for what would become an extension of the living accommodation of 8A. As Camden says, "the extension would occupy almost the entire plot, would not match the pattern of development in the wider area and would not be subservient to the host building". We fully agree with this statement and share Camden's concern.

#### **DENSITY & BUILD-UP**

The proposed development of a space that was once a garden into a larger structure and dwelling sets a precedent that would be

#### **DIMINUTION IN VALUE**

Whilst the work is in progress there will be a diminution in the value of the flats at no.8 -who wants to live next door to a building site? The value of the flats at no.8 is approximately 6-7 million pounds, but any owner needing to move would be faced with difficulty in selling. Equally those flats let by owners in the basement and ground-floor flats would probably have extreme difficulty in finding anyone wanting to pay rent.

With all the noise during the construction period this would to a lesser extent apply to all flats in the block. There could conceivably be quite a cost for this proposed work paid by the owners of 8 Hampstead Hill Gardens in a sense for the enrichment of the new owner of 8A.

#### **POSSIBLE FUTURE SALE**

It might be possible in the future for more development of the garage /living quarters so it could be sold as a separate dwelling which would not be a good outcome.

Finally, although my understanding is that it may fall outside of the jurisdiction of the planning department, we also have some concerns over whether the finance is in place to carry out the work envisaged and the inevitable delays and problems. Should the finance not be adequate, we would be left with a building site.

The above reflects the genuine concerns felt by the owners of no.8. We would be very happy if the garages were not turned into a living area but made a garden again and the garages demolished – a fitting end because so far as we can discover there was never any planning permission for them in the first place.

Yours sincerely,

Alan Fowle  
Pp 8 Hampstead Hill Gardens Ltd.