

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5695/P	Philip Sanders	01/02/2021 09:54:58	OBJ	<p>1 We live two doors down at 54 Hillway. We have serious concerns about this project that compel us to object to the plans that have been lodged. Hillway is one of the steeper roads in Camden with a gradient up to 12.5%. The site is over Claygate Member and London clay, soils which have a moderate bearing capacity and are subject to complex drainage patterns. The excavation and construction of a basement of this large size must impact the surrounding area, including our house.</p> <p>2 No 54 Hillway has twice been subject to subsidence damage. The unstable condition of this property may be exacerbated by increased sideways pressure downhill and interruptions to the soil structure and underground water flow. If the scheme cannot be modified or improved to ensure the elimination of risk of damage to neighbouring properties we consider it should be refused on these grounds as unsuitable to the conditions of the site.</p> <p>3 No 54 is less than 15m south of 58 Hillway. It is lower down the hill and so additionally subject to fluctuations in soil pressure and groundwater movements. The astatic conditions of clay on a slope have already enabled ground heave and settlement of our property, the stresses from which have given rise to structural damage over a period of more than 15 years. The latest remedial work in 2020 included type 16 semi-structural repairs to cracks necessitating cutting plaster back to brick work for an EML fix, which seems to equate to category 3 damage on the Burland scale.</p> <p>4 Ours is not the only property on Hillway experiencing structural issues. We are aware of other subsidence claims on the estate. In the somewhat unpredictable state of the substrata and structural stability of No 54 it is foreseeable that a project such as this could significantly exacerbate an already delicate situation; now or at any time in the future. We understand that to date no full basements have been constructed on the Holly Lodge Estate except possibly one in the side road, Makepiece Avenue, which does not abut another building.</p> <p>5 The BIA at section 9.2, para 7, states "the excavation of the proposed basement could induce movements and potential damages on the neighbouring building to the south (56 Hillway)." Buildings at 60 and 63 Hillway and 221-226 Oakshott Avenue are all noted to be located at distances greater than 15m and therefore considered unlikely to be affected by measurable ground movements.</p> <p>6 The applicant's Basic Impact Assessment (BIA) at section 10.2 considers a scenario SC1 addressing the risks to No 56. The applicants consultants already expect horizontal movement of 4mm and vertical deflection of 0.5mm. They classify this as Burland Scale Damage Category 1. They concede that there will be heave and settlement both in the immediate and the long term. The point up to which this estimated movement is anticipated to occur is the point at the lower side of No 56 where it physically joins No 54. The identified risk therefore clearly impacts our property as well.</p> <p>7. We are concerned to see that the BIA does not address ground movements in relation to our property despite it being largely within the 15m radius. Moreover, remarks about the effects on No 56 are made on the basis of certain assumptions which it is explicitly acknowledged are uncertain without full examination. Given that 54 and 56 are conjoined, onward transmission of horizontal pressures on 56 to 54 as well cannot be ruled out, in which case further movement and exacerbated damage is foreseeable. This is especially so if, as the BIA postulates, the extent of movements such as horizontal deflection discussed in section 9.3 are not as expected or have other unforeseen consequences.</p> <p>8. No 56 is estimated to be a horizontal distance of 6.5m from No 58 plus an intervening space of 2.8m being</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the side passages between. That makes 9.3m from No 58 to the point of attachment of the other side of 56 to our house. No 54 itself has a width of 9.8m from the point of attachment to the flank of 56 to the point of its attachment to the wall of No 52. Therefore 5.7m of No 54 is located within the 15m radius from No 58. The internal wall between the sitting room and the front entrance hall stands on the outer edge of that radius. It is this internal wall that has suffered the most serious subsidence damage, with cracks and fractures on both sides of the ground floor wall and of the bedroom and study wall on the first floor immediately above.

9 It is further noteworthy that in section 9.3 the consultants set out reservations regarding aspects of the scheme and stress the responsibilities of the contractors to monitor changes and alert the consultants for a review of their stated assumptions in case they are invalidated. The damage sustained may be caused by a variety of factors including periods of drought and heavy rainfall on the clay on which the house is built. Groundwater levels and flows are difficult to predict. In section 11.1 the risk of effects on the surrounding groundwater table is discussed with the warning that it "could trigger consolidation phenomena and the uncontrolled development of ground movements".

10. Given the provisional and conditional nature of much of the BIA feasibility study any planning approval based on the application as it stands must inevitably be liable to invalidation or breach in the course of further technical investigations, structural work-ups and preliminary site work.

11 Camden Planning Policy A5 Basements sets out policies that will be taken into account when assessing basement schemes.

At 6.112 it is stated:

"The Council will only permit basement development where it is demonstrated to its satisfaction that the proposal would not cause harm to:

- a) neighbouring properties;
- b) the structural, ground or water conditions of the area;
- c) the character and amenity of the area;
- d) the architectural character of the building; and
- e) the significance of heritage assets.

12 Further on, the Policy states:

"The Council will require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- n). do not harm neighbouring properties, including requiring the provision of a Basement Impact Assessment which shows that the scheme poses a risk of damage to neighbouring properties no higher than Burland Scale 1 'very slight'
- plus further requirements o) - u).

13 We submit that this application fails to satisfy Camden Council's tests.

14 A bond or other financial guarantees against the costs of long term maintenance and rectification would scarcely be satisfactory to us. We wish to have assurance that damage into the future caused by any upheaval will not occur.

15. These are our particular concerns. We also have others relating to the noise and disruption that will be caused. Furthermore, such a development would set an undesirable precedent for other basement projects on

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				the conservation area if this application is allowed.
2020/5695/P	Mark Rogers	30/01/2021 15:07:31	OBJ	<p>I would like to register an objection to the proposed basement construction because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is already a large house which has already been extended and this enormous basement will create a building with much larger floor area than the original architects intended and will be out of keeping with the nature of the estate. 2. The disruption to the neighbours of the huge quantity of earth to be removed is not acceptable. 3. The estate is built on a very steep slope comprising London clay. Groundwater springs appear in many of our gardens. A nearby house on Hillway has recently suffered subsidence (requiring nearby trees to be felled). Building a basement of this size is likely to cause subsidence to nearby properties. 4. There has been a lot of copycat development on the Estate with many houses being extended in the last 5 years. If permission is granted for this basement, it is likely that many other applications will follow and use this as a precedent. For all the reasons stated above this would be detrimental to the environment of the Estate and out of keeping with the intended four-bedroom semi-detached mock Tudor style which is in a conservation area.