

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6266/P	Derek Flack	02/03/2022 10:45:07	JUST	<p>Good Morning. My name is Derek Flack, and I live at 35 Hampstead Lane, immediately next to the property, the subject of this planning application. I AM THEREFORE THE MOST AFFECTED BY IT.</p> <p>The proposed new build scheme comprises a basement built right hard up against our joint party wall. The upper floor replaces like for like the current garage. The return wall of my house at 35 is 1 metre away from that party wall. I have a side path between the house, and the party wall. This carries foul and surface water drainage to the street.</p> <p>The scheme architecturally is far better than the first one proposed in the original pre-app.</p> <p>HOWEVER, I HAVE GRAVE CONCERNS ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SCHEME.</p> <p>The design, involves a huge dig almost from the front to the back of the site in 33. It is a massive engineering job. The plot of 33HL is approximately 28 metres long from front boundary to Hampstead Lane, to the boundary wall at the very back of the plot. It is proposed to excavate 25 metres of that in length by a width of about 4.5 metres.</p> <p>It is appreciated Camden has its own guid lines on basement construction. There has been desk top studies of the area, and morphstructures have carried out some preliminary work too. At no point has anybody actually carried out any borehole investigations or other physical checks in the ground. Highgate Village is known for its problems with springs, shrinkage, and insurance claims as a result of construction assumptions proving incorrect, with damage to adjoining property. if I recall the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan states over 50% of insurance claims are due to problems caused by this type of construction.</p> <p>I therefore want to see the planning application held in abeyance until full borehole and other normal actual ground surveys are completed, and proven to be entirely satisfactory. This is neither a question of "it will be alright on the night", nor a question of just leaving it for another day for the Building Regulations team [often outsourced to a friendly consultant by the applicant]. Simply, if the case cannot be absolutely proven that it is safe to build, then the planning application should be rejected, rather than just make some standard planning condition and permit the application, for problems later.</p> <p>Secondly, the party wall between 33/35 is very old and attractive. The applicant's architect has promised to underpin it. Could you please make a planning condition that the wall has to be preserved intact. It is not good enough for the wall to fall down anywhere, and be rebuilt with bricks of a different age and colour etc.</p> <p>Could the planning officer, and planning committee, [assuming it is not a delegated decision], give very careful thought to my comments.</p> <p>Thank you-Derek Flack</p>