
From: Stephen Elias [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 June 2022 15:25
To: Leela Muthoora
Subject: Planning Application - 2021/6074/P - No34 Meadowbank

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Leela

As you know we are the managing agents for the Meadowbank Estate (Park View (Primrose Hill) Management) our client has become aware of revised reports presented after the final date for comments of 19th April 2022, and therefore feel they should be given the opportunity to comment against these reports. Please note their comments below. May I ask you to confirm that these comments will be added to the current objections to these works.

"We note that in connection with the above application revised reports on ground movement assessment, basement impact assessment and geotechnical assessment have been filed. These must be read carefully and in conjunction with the original reports.

We draw your attention to the basement impact assessment section 3.01 question 5

As part of the surface drainage will more rainwater (eg surface rainwater and runoff) than at present be discharged to the ground (eg via soakaways and/or SUDS)

The answer to question 3.01 5 has been changed from

Currently surface water from the site is discharged to the ground in the communal garden area only, and this will also be true after the proposed works.

To

Soil infiltration drainage is considered impractical due to the anticipated impermeable nature of the ground conditions, the small size of the site and the proximity of the surrounding buildings and boundaries. We understand that the existing drainage is discharged to the public sewer, and this will also be the case following the works.

and

Confirmation of ground conditions is required

The key changes are

1. reference to communal garden discharge is removed

The wording was

the site is discharged to the ground in the communal garden area only, and this will also be true after the proposed works.

It is now

We understand that the existing drainage is discharged to the public sewer, and this will also be the case following the works.

The fact is that the site is discharged to the ground in the communal garden area and then into the public sewer. Thus both statements could be argued to be true but the second one is misleading as it does not make the key reference to the communal garden. It is a known fact the communal garden can flood and so this proposed development clearly increases that risk

2. Unsupported reference to ground condition

The new report asserts that soil infiltration drainage is considered impractical on the grounds of the impermeable nature of the ground conditions. It then goes on to state that confirmation of ground conditions is required. In other words there is no grounds for making the assertion in the first place.

3. Reference to impracticality

The new report states

Soil infiltration drainage is considered impractical due to the anticipated impermeable nature of the ground conditions, the small size of the site and the proximity of the surrounding buildings and boundaries.

The fact is the entire scheme is impractical and one example of this is that it is entirely unreasonable to avoid responsibility for drainage and flood risk on the ground of impracticality.

There is a disconnection between the revised application's admission that soil infiltration drainage is impractical and its assertion that water will run off into the public sewer. In theory, excess water in the garden is meant to drain into the public sewer. However, previous flooding in the garden onto the terrace of homes opposite number 34 demonstrates that theory and practice are different things. The proposed basement will simply exacerbate the existing soil infiltration drainage issue, which the public sewer connection cannot handle satisfactorily, thus increasing not decreasing the risk of surface water flooding as described.

The fact is that this entire scheme, not just an appropriate soil infiltration drainage system, is impractical and we urge to the planning committee to refuse this planning application."

Regards

Stephen

Esskay Management Services LLP Lane House, 24 Parsons Green Lane London SW6 4HS Tel: 020 7331 8888 Fax: 020 7331 8800 Website: esskay.management
--

The information contained in this communication is confidential and intended only for the use of the recipient named above, and may be legally privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend it to the sender and delete the original message and copy of it from your computer system. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to our official business should be understood as neither given nor endorsed by this company.