

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1677/P	Mr Andrew C Millett	24 Courthope Raod  NW32LB NW32LB	13/05/2025 21:28:06	COMMNT	We live at 24 Courthope Road and object on the basis of noise and dust pollution and traffic disruption during construction. Builders are often onsite outside regulated hours (e.g. Saturday afternoon and at weekends). We are concerned about flooding and know of other houses affected by subsidence and minor damage to property from basement works. It does nothing to contribute to the neighbourhood.

---

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1677/P	Julia MacKenzie and Mitsuko Forstater	19a&b Courthope Road	13/05/2025 20:24:01	COMMNT	<p>Planning application 2025/1677/P: 17 Courthope Road</p> <p>We have viewed the proposals for digging out the basement under the main part of the house (front and middle rooms, hall and coal cellar) for a bedroom/cinema, utility room and WC, and for constructing a front light well at no. 17 Courthope Road, NW3 2LE.</p> <p>We live next door at no. 19: Ground Floor flat at 19a (Julia MacKenzie) and upper floors at 19b (Mitsuko Forstater).</p> <p>We strongly object to the proposed work.</p> <p>Our objections are as follows:</p> <p>1. Structural implications for the adjoining properties at no. 19 (and no. 15). We are in agreement with the comments made by A.P. Mann BSc; PhD, FISTructE; FREng (advisor to Julian Graffy at no. 15 Courthope Road) and wish those to be considered as part of our remarks.</p> <p>We draw attention to the following items in that report:</p> <p>Overview: 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.</p> <p>2.1 Proposed basement plans and sections along with the description of construction methodology show no recognition of existing cellars in adjacent properties. The cellar most 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).</p> <p>3.8 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.</p> <p>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. ...There is no indication that the base slab is anchored down to the side foundations to resist the upward forces.</p> <p>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,</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>this prediction seems very optimistic and it also fails to account for the possibility of significant displacements arising during the temporary build condition.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 of the workforce, nor safely in terms of its potential effect on the existing structures (numbers 15, 17 and 19).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>5.3 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.</p> <p>2. We draw attention to the Concept Consultancy report submitted by the owners of no. 17.</p> <p>Point 1.0 in that report states "The proposals are to demolish the existing house and construct a new house with a larger footprint and a basement over the full footprint of the house." This is completely wrong. The house is not going to be demolished. The inaccuracy and negligence concerning the facts undermines the rest of the report.</p> <p>Point 2.2 in that report states "The site contains an existing house which was built in the 1930's." That is incorrect. The houses were built 1890–1899. Again, this does not inspire confidence in the overall report.</p> <p>Point 2.3 states: "The existing property is a two-story building terrace house." The house is three-stories. Again, a sloppy attitude to facts in an important technical document.</p> <p>Point 2.3 states: "There are no trees within the property boundary, or within adjacent properties." In fact, there is a myrtle tree in the front garden of no. 19.</p> <p>Point 4.0 states: "The basement floor construction will not be lower than the prevailing groundwater level in this area so will not interfere with the natural flow of the groundwater." The cellars in this road (including no. 19) have all had issues with groundwater and lowering of the foundations in no. 17 will potentially interfere with the flow of groundwater and displace it into the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Point 4.0 also states: "The existing foundations of the adjacent property are expected to be stepped brick on a concrete strip footing." Given the importance of the proposed structural</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>changes, there should be more than an assumption on this point. The new owners of no. 17 have made no contact with the owners of no. 19 to view the cellar or test the foundations. It is not clear how the existing cellar at no. 19 will be protected along the party wall with no. 17 at the basement level. We are concerned that the proposed development will require underpinning our party wall. If this is not done properly there could be serious consequences for our property.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the proposed new drainage run. It is shown with a series of tight bends that might affect the flow of soil and rainwater leading to an increase in the risk of blockage. The proposed permanent use of pumps (and backup) raises sustainability issues.</p> <p>3. The proposed basement bay window and light well in the front garden marks a radical departure from the look of the houses and front areas of houses in this street. Courthope Road is part of the Mansfield Conservation Area. The proposal contravenes the policy outlined in the Mansfield Conservation Area Management Strategy adopted in 2008 (<a href="https://www.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/7828520/Mansfield+Conservation+Area+Appraisal+adopted+Dec+2008.pdf/4c61565b-4838-5752-bf45-0a5495ce0550">https://www.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/7828520/Mansfield+Conservation+Area+Appraisal+adopted+Dec+2008.pdf/4c61565b-4838-5752-bf45-0a5495ce0550</a>); see the section entitled "Basement Development":</p> <p>"The conservation area does not contain any residential properties with basement development that is visible via as a result of [of] associated windows, doors, light wells, railings or grilles fronting the highway. The unaltered front gardens make an important contribution to the streetscape and character of the residential area. The creation of a light well fronting the highway would harm the relationship between the building and the street, could harm the appearance of the building and the streetscape, and is likely to consume much or all of the garden area found within the conservation area. Railings around lightwells would cause a cluttered appearance to the front of the dwelling and would compete with the appearance of the front boundary wall due to the small size of the gardens found in the conservation area. The inclusion of rooflights designed within the landscaping of a front garden can result in illumination and light spill from the subterranean rooms and harm the appearance of a garden setting. As such the Council will normally resist basement development fronting the highway due to its impact on the appearance of the conservation area."</p> <p>We are concerned that if this application is granted permission, it sets a precedent for other basement applications in the street with consequent changes to the visual look of the area, plus implications for the groundwater displacement and structure of the houses in the street.</p> <p>4. The proposed work to the basement will involve a great deal of noise from plant machinery, vibration and disruption over an extended period of time: at least one year and more likely two. The owner of the ground-floor flat (19a) works from home (as does Julian Graffy at no. 15). There is already going to be disturbance because of the planned extension of the kitchen at the back of the house (the kitchen wall abuts the bedroom of 19a) and the basement proposal would considerably extend the period in which there will be noise, disorder and bother. The removal of a huge amount of soil will require skips in the street for a long time. The work will increase the traffic flow in a street where there is room for only one vehicle to go up or down the street at one time with few passing places because of cars parked on both sides of the road.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>To summarise, we object to this application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Insufficient consideration has been given to the structural implications of the proposal on the neighbouring properties.</li><li>2. The impact on groundwater displacement and drainage have not been considered properly. Nor the sustainability/environmental implications of the permanent use of pumps.</li><li>3. The effect on the overall streetscape and specifically the light spill and harm to the appearance of the garden setting, in contravention of the Mansfield Conservation Area Strategy. It would set a precedent for other basement conversions in Courthope Road and the neighbouring streets in the Mansfield Conservation Area leading to overdevelopment.</li><li>4. The disturbance in terms of noise, vibration and increased traffic over an extended period of time (at least a year), particularly given that one of the residents at no. 19 works from home (as does the owner at no. 15).</li></ol> <p>Comments made by Julia MacKenzie and Mitsuko Forstater 19 (a and b) Courthope Road London NW3 2LE</p>

---