

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5834/P	Sasha Levy	02/03/2022 20:39:27	OBJ	<p>I object to the above planning application</p> <p>CRASH has warned on numerous occasions in the past of the disastrous cumulative effects of unlimited basement development in any one street - a fact confirmed by Dr Michael de Freitas Faculty of Engineering, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Imperial College, London. (His articles on the subject of basements and their cumulative effects should be studied by all Town Planners and Council Structural Engineers!) There is already depressing evidence of existing watercourses and underground springs having been diverted as a result of the huge amount of additional concrete injected into this immediate area for the necessary footings of these developments. This has had some disastrous effects for neighbouring properties where it is now not unusual for gardens to remain waterlogged for long periods - something that was not previously apparent. Camden Planning can surely no longer ignore the all-too-evident proofs of such occurrences or any longer fail to investigate thoroughly the cumulative effects of this number of basements in one short run of properties.</p>
2021/5834/P	Alan Mason	01/03/2022 12:23:12	OBJ	<p>Section 4 of the Application. Description of the works: "Enlarge existing basement...". This description is inaccurate as there is no existing basement. What there is is a half-height cellar created, as in so many Victorian houses, for the storage of coal and other 'dirty' materials. Such cellars were never intended as habitable spaces. The applicant is proposing to not only convert the existing coal cellar into a habitable space by its conversion into a basement, but to extend it throughout the footprint of the building. This is a gross over-development of a building that has already suffered numerous alterations, a number of which have been carried out without consent or not in accordance with given consent (as reported to LBC). The creation of front and rear lightwells, plus a further rear extension continue to degrade the site through loss of forecourt and garden resulting in loss of amenity. The Council has a duty to "pay special attention to the preserving or enhancing the special character or appearance of those [the SHCA] areas". The current application patently does neither, and the Council is urged to refuse permission.</p>
2021/5834/P	CRASH	01/03/2022 11:17:33	OBJ	<p>CRASH (Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead) would like to object to aspects of this application. The addition of a light well to the front of the property with a structural grill will cause light spillage and is also in the area that the previously granted permission for this property required planting as a condition of the approval. It is not clear from the drawings provided with the application whether the car parked on the front "garden" will still fit without protruding onto the pavement if the lightwell is installed. The current state of the front of the property is already in breach of the permission granted previously - there is insufficient planting, the small area of front wall reinstated is not wide enough and there are supposed to be railings on top of it (in line with the conservation area) which were not installed. If permission is granted additional planting in the front garden should be required.</p> <p>In terms of the rear extension CRASH would request that a green roof is installed given the reduction in greenery and permeable surfaces already in the rear garden and front garden. The basement impact assessment also notes there are tree roots in evidence but no impact statement has been provided on potential impact on trees located in the rear gardens.</p>