				<i>.</i>	Printed on: 09/05/2025	09:10:04
Application N 2025/1677/P	Consultees Name Izampela Exeoulitze	Recipient Address 7 Courthope Road 2nd and 3rd floor flat Camden London NW3 2LE	Received 08/05/2025 16:32:49	Comment COMMNT	 Printed on: 09/05/2025 Response I wish to formally object to the proposed development on the following grounds: 1. Impact on the Streetscape The proposed alterations would significantly alter the established character and appearance of the streetscape. The area maintains a cohesive architectural identity, and this development would disrupt the visual harmony of the street. Such a change is not sympathetic to the existing built environment and would diminish the historic and aesthetic value of the area. 2. Risk to Groundwater and Structural Integrity of Nearby Properties The proposal to excavate a basement raises serious concerns regarding groundwater management and the potential impact on neighbouring structures. Based on local knowledge and historical mapping, properties at numbers 17 and 18 sit almost directly above the historic course of the River Fleet. Excavating in such a sensitive and hydrologically active area risks disturbing groundwater levels, increasing the likelihood of water ingress, and potentially causing subsidence or structural damage to adjacent buildings. 3. Unwelcome Precedent for Future Developments Approval of this application would set a troubling precedent for similar developments in the area. Once granted, it may encourage further basement excavations and structural alterations in a historically sensitive and hydrologically vulnerable zone. This cumulative effect could irreversibly alter the character of the neighbourhood and significantly increase the risk to the local anvironment and potential to exponent endoted by the structural alterations in a historically sensitive and hydrologically vulnerable zone. This cumulative effect could irreversibly alter the character of the neighbourhood and significantly increase the risk to the local anvironment and potential conversioned and significantly increase the risk to the local anvironment and potential environment and potential conversioned and significantly i	09:10:04
					Given these concerns, I respectfully urge the planning authority to consider the wider implications of this proposal and to reject the application.	
2025/1677/P	Clarinda Still	11 Courthope Road 11 Courthope Road 11 Courthope Road	08/05/2025 14:30:00	OBJ	We live at Number 11 Courthope road. We object to the application. We have seen the plans and notice a basement is planned. A few years ago, our neighbours at no13 built a basement beneath their house. As a result of the construction, we had major problems with cracks in our walls. It shows how much the adjoining house are affected. These house are old and don't have sufficient foundations to take these kind of major construction projects. We also object to the bay window and light well. None of the other houses have this and it will change the character of the street and set a precedent for others.	
2025/1677/P	N Mattisson	1 Courthope Road	08/05/2025 17:01:44	SUPPRT	As a resident of Courthope Road, I support the basement proposal at No. 17. The submitted reports give me confidence that the works are well-designed and won't change the character of the street.	

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1677/P	Chris Harrowell	20 Courthope Road	08/05/2025 11:03:43	OBJ	Having viewed the proposals for this application, we object on the following grounds:
		London NW3 2LB			The proposed basement bay window and light well to the front of the property contravene the historic appearance of the Mansfield Conservation Area. As far as we are aware, none of the existing 1890's late Victorian terraced houses of this type in Courthope Road and adjacent roads have this feature, which detracts from the architectural consistency of the terrace and the street.
					Camden's Policy A5 of the Camden Local Plan focuses on the scale, design, and impact of basements, requiring applicants to demonstrate minimal disturbance to adjacent dwellings, gardens, trees, and the overall character of the conservation area.
					The Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) submitted with the application appears to indicate that there will not be issues with ground water percolation and displacement, which can affect clay soil and cause structural movement in buildings nearby. We live diagonally opposite No 17 and have had issues with ground water in the past, with a consequent subsidence claim which has impacted on insurance premiums. Our cellar and those of some neighbours encounter water ingress from time to time, as they are the original Victorian cellars with brick walls and brick or earth flooring.
					There is concern that should this application be approved, it will set a precedent for similar basement applications in the Mansfield Conservation area which will likely have a cumulative effect on ground water percolation, with a risk to neighbouring properties and associated structural movement.
					The Basement Impact Assessment does not seem to take into account the impact of the earlier basement to No 13 Courthope Road, which was approved under Planning Application 2013/1300P.
					No 15 Courthope Road sits between No's 13 and 17 and it is understood that No 15 suffered disturbance and cracking arising from the previous works to No 13. It is likely that further disturbance to No 15 will result from the proposed basement works to No 17, as No 15 would then be straddling the new basements of No's 13 and 17 on either side.
					No 19 Courthope Road adjoins No 17 on the other side and is likely to be similarly affected. The existing Victorian cellar to No 19 adjoins that of No 17. The proposals do not appear to adequately indicate how the existing cellar to No 19 will be protected along the Party Wall with No 17 at basement level.
					We have observed that when drilling or digging works have been taking place in the street or in neighbouring properties, our whole house shakes due to the nature of the soil and the foundations, as do those of our neighbours. It is accepted that noise and disruption are an inevitable part of building works and are finite, but there is a detrimental impact for those of us who work from home. Those of us in the vicinity of No 17 will likely need to undertake a schedule of condition prior to work starting in order to record any subsequent vibration damage arising

Printed on: 09/05/2025

09:10:04

from the works, should it become necessary to make a claim against the applicants.

The earlier basement application 2013/1300P for the neighbouring property, No 13 Courthope Road was approved in 2013, before the latest Camden Planning Guidance – Basements, which was formally adopted in January 2021. The basement at No 13 was constructed to the rear of the property, under the former kitchen outrigger wing, with a lightwell at the rear. The basement at No 13 did not extend under the main house reception rooms and the original Victorian cellar under the hallway was retained. It is understood that this arrangement was negotiated at the time with Camden Planners and avoided sinking a lightwell to the front of the property, thus preserving the integrity of the Conservation Area. Retention of the original Victorian cellar under the hallway of No 13 minimised disturbance to the adjoining cellar at No 15. This could be regarded as a precedent for any new basement proposal at No 17 or other similar properties in Courthope Road. However the concerns regarding the effects on overall ground water percolation remain, particularly should more basements subsequently be constructed under other neighbouring properties in future.

The proposals for No 17 indicate that the existing combined soil and rainwater drain is in a straight run from the rear of the property to a manhole at the front, passing beneath the ground floor reception rooms at approximately 2m below external ground level. Once the proposed new basement is excavated, this drain will effectively pass through the basement rooms at midriff level and will need to be diverted. The proposals show this drain diverted around the inside of the new basement rooms and around the outside of the proposed front lightwell. The proposed drainage run is shown with a series of tight bends, which may affect flow and increase risk of blockage.

The proposals indicate that there will be reliance on electric pumps for the basement WC, utility, perimeter groundwater drainage and front lightwell rainwater drainage. If so, duplicate pumps will likely be needed in the event of failure, along with backup in the event of a power cut. This raises potential sustainability concerns. It is understood that duplicate pumps are already fitted in the previously constructed basement at No 13 to remove water accumulation. Should this set a precedent for other basements in the road, there will be a cumulative effect of reliance on power to discharge drainage in addition to the capacity of the existing Victorian natural gravity system.

In summary we object to this application on the grounds of:

- 1. Negative visual impact on the Mansfield Conservation Area.
- 2. Impact on ground water percolation and drainage.
- 3. Structural disturbance to adjoining properties.
- Risk of setting a precedent for further basement conversions in Courthope Road and adjoining streets, with consequent adverse environmental impact.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1677/P	Julian Graffy	15 Courthope Rd Camden NW3 2LE	08/05/2025 19:04:07	OBJ	BASEMENT APPRAISAL AT: 17 Courthope Road, Camden, London NW3 2LE Planning Application: 2025/1677/P
					AP Mann BSc; PhD, FIStructE; FREng (advisor to Professor Julian Graffy 15 Courthope Rd) OVERVIEW
					Objections to this submission have already been submitted on architectural / conservation
					grounds. We share those objections. This separate objection is now based on structural safety
					grounds. The presented basement construction proposals raise serious doubts as to the stability
					the safety of the construction operatives and stability / damage to numbers 15, 17 and 19. The
					proposed construction methodology is inconsistent with assumptions made by Southern Testing
					such that ST's predictions of ground movements affecting Courthope Road itself and house
					numbers 15 and 17 are likely to be too optimistic. Overall, it would be unwise to grant planning
					permission until there is confidence that the construction is safe to build. I am prepared to supply
					KEY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS
					Drawings: 3422 810A
					3422 811A
					3422 812A
					Construction Method Statement 17, Courthope Road NW3 2LE
					All issued by Concept Consultancy Structural Designers Ltd (77 Canton Hill, London NVV8
					1.0 GENERAL
					1.1 The general aspiration is (in relation to No 17 Courthope Rd):
					'Construction of a single storey, habitable, basement beneath front room, middle room, and
					entrance hall of original house footprint, removal of brick coal cellar, and construction of front lightwell'
					Approximate depth below ground level 3.5m
					Approximate area: 40m2 (one bedroom one bathroom)
					 Planned start date: 09/2025 1.2 A basement impact study has been prepared by Southern Testing and broadly ST's reports
					conclude that basement construction would be acceptable in the location and would not interfere
					with groundwater movements etc. Some parameters were given in relation to basement design.
					The ground at depth will probably be London clay
					• A safe bearing pressure at depth of 100kN/m2 was advised for foundations onto London
					Clay
					 Alternion is grawn to potential structural enects on the cellars under the adjoining buildings. There will be hydrostatic unlift and ground heave affecting the floor slab. There will also be
					water pressure plus pressure from retained ground under the adioining buildings acting on
					basement side retaining walls.
					The basement will need water proofing
					2.0 KEY CONSTRUCTION PROPOSALS:
					2.1 Proposed basement plans and sections along with the description of construction
					methodology snow no recognition of existing cellars in adjacent properties. The cellar most

Printed on: 09/05/2025

09:10:04

affected is likely to be that under No 19 which shares a party wall with No 17. There is no recognition that constructing the existing cellars (in Victorian times) will have left back fill soil around them in a loose state and unsuitable for propping against (a required feature of stability in the proposed basement construction).

Front Elevation

2.2 Construction of the two side retaining walls for the light well may well affect the properties on either side, particularly No 15 where the retaining wall is extremely close to the boundary. No proposals have been suggested as to how this wall might be constructed whilst retaining land on No 15. No construction proposals have been suggested either for the retaining walls along the front of the light well where the proximity of these walls to Courthope Rd poses a stability threat to the road / footpath. Southern Testing's deformation assessment concluded such movements would be low, but that only applies to displacements occuring after installation of the proposed below ground structure and does not account for potentially higher displacements occurring during construction.

2.3 There is no indication on the drawings of where existing drainage runs are and as drains currently pass below the house and through the front garden, so they clash with the deepened basement proposal.

3.0 PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS

3.1. The overall proposal is to construct the basement under number 17 by underpinning the party walls with numbers 15 and 19 in reinforced concrete down to the future basement foundation level. The proposal (drawing 810A) is that this should be by 'hit and miss' underpinning in segments about one metre wide. The proposal is to excavate and cast pins to their full height in one stage rather that adopting a sequential underpinning in consecutive layers. 3.2 The plan identifying individual pins numerically is misleading since it fails to account for the difference in party wall depths on the two opposite sides. On the side of number 17, the existing walls are much deeper in recognition of the adjoining cellar in number 19.

3.3 To construct individual pins, an access hole about one metre wide and two to three metres deep will be needed and this is stated to be hand dug (Stages 1, 2, 3). Hole plan dimensions are about 1m x 1.1m. The drawings recognise the issue of soil temporary stability lateral to the new retaining wall (i.e. under numbers 15 and 19) by shoring and propping onto a retained central earth mound. The drawings do not recognise the need for shoring up the other three sides of ground around the excavation either by facing boards or propping when clearly this would be required. This propping need means that even if a worker were required to enter such a deep hole, worker access (and facility for rapid egress) would be crossed (and hindered) in both directions by propping. Additional propping would be required thereafter to retain shuttering for the wall concreting. As drawn, the temporary props for side soil retention seem to pass through (?) the concrete. No one should be expected to work in these deep and congested conditions which overall appear fundamentally unsafe. Any dislodgement of props could prove fatal. 3.4 The future retaining walls are planned to be 325mm thick in reinforced concrete (Stage 4). The drawings stipulate that the walls must be cast full height (~3m) up to 75 mm below the existing foundations with that 75mm void later dry packed. Within the information provided, there are no indications as to how reinforcement can be handled and installed in the constricted working conditions described above. Nor are there are any indications how shuttering could be installed and adequately propped to retain concrete pressures. It is guite impracticable to feed concrete into a retaining wall up to three metres high through a 75mm gap at the top and then

Page 13 of 21

Comment Response

compact it across the full height. There are no indications on the drawings of how such a head of concrete could be prevented from leaking sideways out of the shuttering at depth (again with potentially disastrous consequences). Even minor leakage from the soil side could expose the rear rebar and so destroy longer term durability.

3.5 In the sequencing shown, pins are cast full height to above final foundation level. The pin is then excavated beneath (Stage 5 and 6) and a horizontal section of concrete foundation is poured below. Clearly, at least for the first pin segments constructed (Stage 4), the 3m cast concrete wall then has no means of vertical base support in the temporary condition: there is nothing to stop such segments falling downwards whilst excavation proceeds below. 3.6 No information is provided on the planned structural system but it does not appear credible that walls can resist lateral pressure by developing base bending resistance in conjunction with the foundation. So, presumably the long side retaining walls are envisaged as spanning vertically (supported laterally top and bottom) carrying significant soil and hydrostatic pressures. To resist such forces, there must be significant wall shear capacity top and bottom. Yet as drawn, the only shear resistance available at the top of the walls (certainly until the full wall length is completed) is provided by bed joint mortar in the old Victorian brickwork, presumed 9" wide. Such resistance will be totally unreliable but required by the proposal since the planned sequence of pin construction starts towards the wall centre and moves outwards. Hence, there will be no plan 'box' action to provide an alternative stability system until full pin completion: (pins on 3 of the 4 corners are the last to be cast).

Box action after all pins are cast is only viable if there is plan horizontal resistance along the wall. But no horizontal reinforcement seems to have been provided. All pins will tend to act as individual units perhaps only interconnected by local dowels

3.7 A new temporary prop has been indicated (Stage 6) spanning right across the basement room but it props at a level keeping the brickwork apart and not the concrete retaining walls. At the wall base, shear resistance will be limited by the bond capacity of the foundation concrete being pushed underneath the new concrete wall. Nobody can ascertain the degree of contact or compaction that will be achieved so that resistance value is also extremely dubious. Resistance at the base will also be limited by the small amount of passive resistance in front of the foundation. The consequences of any wall base kicking in whilst in the temporary condition will obviously be disastrous.

3.8 To progress construction, the central mound is then gradually reduced with a separate steel prop added between walls at a set height. The two side walls are unstable (without this additional prop) until the foundation slab is cast between the two side walls. But in the condition shown in Stage 8 (just before the bottom slab is in position) there is potential for a global rotation of the wall about the prop line with the base of the wall moving in towards the centre and moving outwards into the soil below Numbers 15 and 19. The only prevention against such rotation at the wall top is the low shear resistance within the brickwork and perhaps some soil resistance below the floors of the adjoining properties, albeit soil levels are unknown and the state of soil compaction is completely uncertain. Rotation resistance at the bottom will be limited by shear capacity as described in (3.7).

3.9 The same condition could occur in Stage 7 if the prop ends have been loosened for adjustment up and down (if that is an intent). In Stage 7 there is the additional possibility of the upper segment of retaining wall above the prop having to act as a vertical cantilever and deflecting inwards because the shear resistance below the party walls preventing deflection will

be low too. This implies it is essential to have reinforcement on both faces of the retaining walls. 3.10 The base slab needs to act both as flooring and as a prop between the two longer side walls. Southern Testing have advised that the slab must be designed against upwards hydrostatic pressure and soil heave. There are no indications on the drawings that these design cases have been considered. A conventional solution to soil heave might be to provide some compressive medium below the slab and there may also be a need to provide thermal insulation. But each of those components have a substantial thickness and adding them would necessitate reducing the soil level in front of the wall foundation so eliminating any passive resistance there. This renders the risk of wall rotation even higher in its temporary condition just before slab casting. There is no indication that the base slab is anchored down to the side foundations to resist the upward forces.

3.11 The final Stage 9, shows the cross section as an inverted U with no props. This arrangement can only be viable if the walls have been created into a plan box section. But reliance is then being placed on there being wall horizonal bending resistance in the longitudinal direction. However, no rebar seems to have been provided in that direction linking up the separate pins in an effective manner. Without such rebar, stability is entirely dependent on the shear resistance through the brickwork, which from earlier comments is quite unreliable 4.0 DISPLACEMENTS

4.1 A major design objective is to minimise displacements in both the temporary and permanent conditions both of which were investigated by Southern Testing. To control vertical deflections (settlement) Southern Testing advised limiting foundation bearing pressures to 100 kN/m2. 4.2 Party wall loadings are indicated at ground rule level of 68.7 kN/m (dead) and 17.2 kN/m) (live). The new side wall self-weight is about ~ 27.3 kN/m. This makes the total loading at wall base onto foundations ~ 113.2 kN/m. Foundation thickness is not given but, as drawn, it appears about 325 mm (same as walls). Thus, allowing some 450 spread, the effective foundation width might be 650 mm. Hence bearing pressure is ~ 113.2/0.65 =174 kN/m2 ~ 75% more than Southern Testing recommend so invalidating all Southern Testing's displacement predictions from their Damage Report. And that applied loading is eccentric to the base, so peak bearing pressures would be higher still.

4.3 Southern Testing concluded in their damage report that the displacements affecting numbers 15 and 19 Courthope Rd would be 'very slight'. In the light of all the above comments, this prediction seems very optimistic and it also fails to account for the possibility of significant displacements arising during the temporary build condition.

4.4 No indications at all have been given for the methodology of constructing the light well retaining walls next to the road nor of their stiffness in the temporary and permanent conditions. So again, any displacement predictions by Southern Testing should be looked at as potentially applicable for a case after construction and not accounting for displacements taking place during construction. Give the proximity of the lightwell walls to the Courthope Road boundary, there should be concern that the roadway and pavements will be affected if care is not taken.
4.5 Although Southern Testing make a point of mentioning potential effects on neighbouring cellars, the presented construction scheme makes no mention of that at all and what has been shown potentially undermines the floor of existing cellars with detrimental effects.
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 I do not consider that the presented scheme for basement construction at No 17 adequately demonstrates that the basement can be constructed safely with regards to the health and safety

Page 15 of 21

of the workforce, nor safely in terms of its potential effect on the existing structures (numbers 15, 17 and 19). It should be obvious from comments made, that there are far too many technical questions and queries which ought to be addressed before the scheme can be allowed to proceed. It would be unwise to grant planning permission until there is confidence that the works can be executed safely. There have been too many instances of damage (occasionally catastrophic) during domestic building alteration to believe risks might be trivial. 5.2 None of the documentation has included recommendations for record surveys before construction nor record photographs of walls before construction to provide a basis for future compensation claims should deformations exceed acceptable ones. 5.3 The documentation does make recommendations for compliance with the Party Wall Act. Essentially No 17 owners must engage a party wall surveyor to consider the proposed works and their implications on the party walls, obviously before any work is carried out. This is for the benefit of all those potentially affected which includes the owners of No 17. 5.4 It is also essential that the domestic client of number 17 (Mr and Mrs Markham) ensures that their design and construction contractors are competent with regards to basement design and construction (a legal obligation on Mr and Mrs Markham) and that their team have adequate insurance to carry out this type of work since it is potentially risky. It is strongly recommended that the structural design engineers are required to supervise any work carried out and that such engineers are formally required to approve detailed method statements prepared by the contractors.