

Printed on: 09/12/2022 09:10:09

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3837/P	Jack Grimston	09/12/2022 07:15:40	OBJ	<p>I own and live in the first-floor flat at 48 Compayne Gardens, the neighbouring house to 46 Compayne Gardens.</p> <p>My comments on the application cover the following points</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.General: Lack of information.</li><li>2.No consultation.</li><li>3.Unacceptable [REDACTED] from proposed glass-sided extension.</li><li>4.Overall stability of our house: no assessment carried out.</li><li>5.Boundary wall: risk of undermining, no consideration given.</li><li>6.Proposals for further concreting over at front of property.</li><li>7. Unexplained cross-boundary protrusion in plans.</li></ol> <p>1.General: Lack of information.</p> <p>My comments are confined to a few specific areas of the application. I welcome the applicants intention to refurbish the house, but I do object to approval of the plans on the current basis. The information in this application does not provide any explanation of how the proposed conversion of the cellar into a full basement will be carried out in a way that protects the stability of our house and of the garden boundary wall between the two properties. I ask that the council require the applicant to provide the missing information before making a decision.</p> <p>2.No consultation.</p> <p>I am concerned and disappointed by the failure to provide any information or consult me or the other owners and residents of Number 48. This is despite a previous assurance that we would be kept informed of all planned works.</p> <p>It was only by chance we became aware that application had even been submitted. If one of the residents of our house had not happened to notice a small plastic sign dangling from a nearby lamppost, it is quite possible the application would have gone past the deadline for comments without our even knowing about it. We received no paper through the door or email from Camden council, the applicant or anyone else.</p> <p>The lack of consultation is particularly concerning given that this is an explicit requirement of the Camden Planning Guidance for Basements, 2021, and is highlighted to the applicant in the Jomas Ground Investigation and Basement Impact Assessment, which I note was prepared as far back as July 2022, providing plenty of opportunity for early consultation. The requirement for consultation with neighbours is emphasised numerous times in this report, see for example paragraph 2.2.12.</p> <p>3. [REDACTED] from proposed glass-sided extension.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.12 of the architects report by UPP says that the extension proposals 'integrate large levels of glazing in the rear and side elevation facing the boundary with No.48.1 The side of the existing extension is brick without any windows. It looks down the garden of Number 46 without intruding on the neighbouring houses. The proposed glass-sided extension, by contrast, would look straight into my bedroom window on the first floor from a short distance. This can be seen clearly from the rear-view sketches 046CO-A-07-003 and 046CO-A-07-004. The bedroom window in question is the first-floor window on the right that is closest to 46 Compayne Gardens.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The loss of privacy is worsened by the proposal to raise the extension up on a platform and by the fact that a kitchen, unlike a garden, is likely to have people in it year-round at any time of the day and evening.

This is an unacceptable level of intrusion, particularly for bedrooms, and it should be a condition of any permission for the new extension that it has no side window. The proposed glazed rear to the extension would provide plenty of light.

I would also comment that the bare aluminium frames proposed for the extension are out of keeping with the character of the rest of the houses in the conservation area.

I do not object to the idea of a green roof, but they do tend to die off in a dry summer, leaving an unsightly brown mess.

4 Overall stability of our house: no assessment carried out.

The Basement Impact Assessment, for example in paragraph 2.2.12, says the applicant should provide materials including plans and sections to show foundation details of adjacent structures; programme for enabling works; construction sequence methodology; proposals for monitoring during construction; ground movement assessment; drainage assessment.)

The Impact Assessment also says at paragraph 7.5.4 that the applicant should undertake pre-condition surveys of adjacent structures.)

I am concerned that little of this information has been provided.

Our house is not simply an adjacent structure, it is a semi-detached part of the same structure, so anything that affects the stability of Number 46 affects Number 48 directly. But no work has been carried out to ascertain the state of our foundations or other aspects of the structure of our house. In fact, the section diagram 046CO-A-05-102 explicitly says 'Nr 48, neighbouring property not surveyed.'

In addition to potentially compromising the stability of the building, any shift in the ground, which the impact assessment says in section 7.5 is 'unavoidable,' could cause damage such as cracks to wall plaster and ceilings. This risk is already inherent in an area built on wet clay and will be worsened by excavating a basement. Cracks in plasterwork and ceilings may not be integral to the structure of the house, but they would still be expensive to put right and entail lots of disruption.

The lack of information about how the stability of the building will be preserved is particularly alarming given the concerns raised by Crash about the history of extensive damage to houses in the area caused by basement excavations in neighbouring properties owing to factors such as the high water table and buried rivers.

I note that the Basement Impact Assessment finds there is a negligible risk of both surface water and groundwater flooding.) I have no expertise to contradict this, but I would point out that the investigation was carried out in July during a hot summer. In addition, Section 7.2 of the Assessment, titled Past Flooding, is

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

misleading. It says the nearest surface-water flooding occurred in Fairhazel Gardens in 2002, affecting two properties. This is incorrect. In July, 2021, approximately 115 properties in the area were affected by flooding on Goldhurst Terrace, Fairhazel Gardens, Belsize Road, Priory Road and Priory Terrace. Around 23 basements were flooded. Mott MacDonalds London Flooding Review, provided to Thames Water in April 2022, says this was the result of sewers not being able to cope with sudden flash floods from storms, the run-off then flowed into basements in the area.

The flooding aspects of the Impact Assessment should be revised to take full account of the floods that have taken place locally, the high water table and the possible presence of underground watercourses.

The other required information about how stability is assured -- as specified in the Impact Assessment -- needs to be provided before a decision can be made on the application.

5.Boundary wall: risk of undermining, no consideration given.

The boundary between our gardens consists of an attractive brick wall dating from when the houses were originally built in the 1880s-90s. It is an important part of the character of the gardens. The proposed access steps to the basement extend the footprint of Number 46 by digging tight up against this wall and risk undermining its foundations. I am concerned that no consideration has been given to this risk in the designs. There is nothing that says how the applicant would ensure the stability of this ageing wall -- to the extent that the rear-view drawings 046CO-A-07-003 and 046CO-A-07-004 incorrectly show a wooden fence rather than a brick wall along the boundary. These drawings also show a concrete or stone parapet next to the access stairs. The parapet is fixed to the boundary. But the Impact Assessment, Appendix 2, sketch TP1—Garden Wall (west), shows the foundations of the existing wall protruding by 9cm into the proposed location of this parapet. So if the parapet were installed as pictured, it would entail slicing away the foundations.

The inconsistency of the designs with the inspection-pit investigations suggests insufficient thought has been given to these important points.

I realise party-wall rules require that developments ensure the stability of boundaries, but it would surely be more prudent from the start to set the steps back from the boundary to preserve the wall -- as the Camden Planning Guidance on basements says should happen anyway when the footprint of a building is being extended.

6.Proposals for further concreting over at front of property.

My main comment on the proposals for the front of the house is that, looking at drawing 046CO-A-02-101, the proposed bin shed appears to cover over a substantial part of the existing large flowerbed, which is the only green space remaining at the front of the property. The lightwell for the new basement would require removing more of the flowerbed, the remaining section of which would be overshadowed on all four sides, so not much would be able to grow in it.

If my interpretation is right, this would be another unfortunate case of the concrete creep that has destroyed so many front gardens and detracted from the greenness of the area, it would also worsen surface water run-off.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>There is plenty of existing paved space at the front where the bin shed could be placed without concreting over more of the flowerbed. This may seem a small matter, but I do not believe it is consistent with the architect's assertion in paragraph 5.4 of their report that the plans for the front garden ensure the serene, leafy character of the conservation area.)</p> <p>This is perhaps outside the scope of the current decision, but consideration could be given to replacing the ugly metal window frames at the front of the house, which presumably were installed before the conservation area rules came in and obviously long before the applicant acquired the property. This would enhance the character of the area. The proposal to reinstate the double-height window at the front is a definite plus point of the proposals.</p> <p>7. Unexplained cross-boundary protrusion in plans. Drawing 046CO-A-05-102 shows at bottom left a protrusion from the new basement that goes beneath our house. It is not clear what this is, but it goes without saying that any new construction could not intrude across the boundary.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 09/12/2022 09:10:09
2022/3837/P	Jack Grimston	09/12/2022 07:15:43	OBJ	<p>I own and live in the first-floor flat at 48 Compayne Gardens, the neighbouring house to 46 Compayne Gardens.</p> <p>My comments on the application cover the following points</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.General: Lack of information.</li> <li>2.No consultation.</li> <li>3.Unacceptable [REDACTED] from proposed glass-sided extension.</li> <li>4.Overall stability of our house: no assessment carried out.</li> <li>5.Boundary wall: risk of undermining, no consideration given.</li> <li>6.Proposals for further concreting over at front of property.</li> <li>7. Unexplained cross-boundary protrusion in plans.</li> </ol> <p>1.General: Lack of information.</p> <p>My comments are confined to a few specific areas of the application. I welcome the applicants intention to refurbish the house, but I do object to approval of the plans on the current basis. The information in this application does not provide any explanation of how the proposed conversion of the cellar into a full basement will be carried out in a way that protects the stability of our house and of the garden boundary wall between the two properties. I ask that the council require the applicant to provide the missing information before making a decision.</p> <p>2.No consultation.</p> <p>I am concerned and disappointed by the failure to provide any information or consult me or the other owners and residents of Number 48. This is despite a previous assurance that we would be kept informed of all planned works.</p> <p>It was only by chance we became aware that application had even been submitted. If one of the residents of our house had not happened to notice a small plastic sign dangling from a nearby lamppost, it is quite possible the application would have gone past the deadline for comments without our even knowing about it. We received no paper through the door or email from Camden council, the applicant or anyone else.</p> <p>The lack of consultation is particularly concerning given that this is an explicit requirement of the Camden Planning Guidance for Basements, 2021, and is highlighted to the applicant in the Jomas Ground Investigation and Basement Impact Assessment, which I note was prepared as far back as July 2022, providing plenty of opportunity for early consultation. The requirement for consultation with neighbours is emphasised numerous times in this report, see for example paragraph 2.2.12.</p> <p>3. [REDACTED] from proposed glass-sided extension.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.12 of the architects report by UPP says that the extension proposals 'integrate large levels of glazing in the rear and side elevation facing the boundary with No.48.1 The side of the existing extension is brick without any windows. It looks down the garden of Number 46 without intruding on the neighbouring houses. The proposed glass-sided extension, by contrast, would look straight into my bedroom window on the first floor from a short distance. This can be seen clearly from the rear-view sketches 046CO-A-07-003 and 046CO-A-07-004. The bedroom window in question is the first-floor window on the right that is closest to 46 Compayne Gardens.</p>	

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

The loss of privacy is worsened by the proposal to raise the extension up on a platform and by the fact that a kitchen, unlike a garden, is likely to have people in it year-round at any time of the day and evening.

This is an unacceptable level of [REDACTED] and it should be a condition of any permission for the new extension that it has no side window. The proposed glazed rear to the extension would provide plenty of light.

I would also comment that the bare aluminium frames proposed for the extension are out of keeping with the character of the rest of the houses in the conservation area.

I do not object to the idea of a green roof, but they do tend to die off in a dry summer, leaving an unsightly brown mess.

4. Overall stability of our house: no assessment carried out.

The Basement Impact Assessment, for example in paragraph 2.2.12, says the applicant should provide materials including plans and sections to show foundation details of adjacent structures; programme for enabling works; construction sequence methodology; proposals for monitoring during construction; ground movement assessment; drainage assessment.)

The Impact Assessment also says at paragraph 7.5.4 that the applicant should undertake pre-condition surveys of adjacent structures.)

I am concerned that little of this information has been provided.

Our house is not simply an adjacent structure,) it is a semi-detached part of the same structure, so anything that affects the stability of Number 48 affects Number 48 directly. But no work has been carried out to ascertain the state of our foundations or other aspects of the structure of our house. In fact, the section diagram 046CO-A-05-102 explicitly says 'Nr 48, neighbouring property not surveyed.)

In addition to potentially compromising the stability of the building, any shift in the ground, which the impact assessment says in section 7.5 is unavoidable,) could cause damage such as cracks to wall plaster and ceilings. This risk is already inherent in an area built on wet clay and will be worsened by excavating a basement. Cracks in plasterwork and ceilings may not be integral to the structure of the house, but they would still be expensive to put right and entail lots of disruption.

The lack of information about how the stability of the building will be preserved is particularly alarming given the concerns raised by Crash about the history of extensive damage to houses in the area caused by basement excavations in neighbouring properties owing to factors such as the high water table and buried rivers.

I note that the Basement Impact Assessment finds there is a negligible risk of both surface water and groundwater flooding.) I have no expertise to contradict this, but I would point out that the investigation was carried out in July during a hot summer. In addition, Section 7.2 of the Assessment, titled Past Flooding, is

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

misleading. It says the nearest surface-water flooding occurred in Fairhazel Gardens in 2002, affecting two properties. This is incorrect. In July, 2021, approximately 115 properties in the area were affected by flooding on Goldhurst Terrace, Fairhazel Gardens, Belsize Road, Priory Road and Priory Terrace. Around 23 basements were flooded. Mott MacDonalds London Flooding Review, provided to Thames Water in April 2022, says this was the result of sewers not being able to cope with sudden flash floods from storms, the run-off then flowed into basements in the area.

The flooding aspects of the Impact Assessment should be revised to take full account of the floods that have taken place locally, the high water table and the possible presence of underground watercourses.

The other required information about how stability is assured -- as specified in the Impact Assessment -- needs to be provided before a decision can be made on the application.

5.Boundary wall: risk of undermining, no consideration given.

The boundary between our gardens consists of an attractive brick wall dating from when the houses were originally built in the 1880s-90s. It is an important part of the character of the gardens. The proposed access steps to the basement extend the footprint of Number 46 by digging tight up against this wall and risk undermining its foundations. I am concerned that no consideration has been given to this risk in the designs. There is nothing that says how the applicant would ensure the stability of this ageing wall -- to the extent that the rear-view drawings 046CO-A-07-003 and 046CO-A-07-004 incorrectly show a wooden fence rather than a brick wall along the boundary. These drawings also show a concrete or stone parapet next to the access stairs. The parapet is fixed to the boundary. But the Impact Assessment, Appendix 2, sketch TP1--Garden Wall (west), shows the foundations of the existing wall protruding by 9cm into the proposed location of this parapet. So if the parapet were installed as pictured, it would entail slicing away the foundations.

The inconsistency of the designs with the inspection-pit investigations suggests insufficient thought has been given to these important points.

I realise party-wall rules require that developments ensure the stability of boundaries, but it would surely be more prudent from the start to set the steps back from the boundary to preserve the wall -- as the Camden Planning Guidance on basements says should happen anyway when the footprint of a building is being extended.

6.Proposals for further concreting over at front of property.

My main comment on the proposals for the front of the house is that, looking at drawing 046CO-A-02-101, the proposed bin shed appears to cover over a substantial part of the existing large flowerbed, which is the only green space remaining at the front of the property. The lightwell for the new basement would require removing more of the flowerbed, the remaining section of which would be overshadowed on all four sides, so not much would be able to grow in it.

If my interpretation is right, this would be another unfortunate case of the concrete creep that has destroyed so many front gardens and detracted from the greenness of the area, it would also worsen surface water run-off.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>There is plenty of existing paved space at the front where the bin shed could be placed without concreting over more of the flowerbed. This may seem a small matter, but I do not believe it is consistent with the architect's assertion in paragraph 5.4 of their report that the plans for the front garden ensure the serene, leafy character of the conservation area.)</p> <p>This is perhaps outside the scope of the current decision, but consideration could be given to replacing the ugly metal window frames at the front of the house, which presumably were installed before the conservation area rules came in and obviously long before the applicant acquired the property. This would enhance the character of the area. The proposal to reinstate the double-height window at the front is a definite plus point of the proposals.</p> <p>7. Unexplained cross-boundary protrusion in plans. Drawing 046CO-A-05-102 shows at bottom left a protrusion from the new basement that goes beneath our house. It is not clear what this is, but it goes without saying that any new construction could not intrude across the boundary.</p>

---



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3837/P	Dan Roman	08/12/2022 12:26:27	OBJ	<p>As the owner occupier of the ground floor flat at 48 Compayne Gardens which is the adjoining semi-detached property and thus part of the same structure, I object to the plans for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed window on the side elevation of the rear ground floor extension will undermine the privacy of my property as it will look straight into my kitchen/living area (through the side and centre panels of the original full height bay window/glass patio doors). There is currently no window on the side elevation of the existing extension at no. 46, presumably for this very reason, and this should remain the position. As both properties are elevated (from ground level) the garden wall and trellis will not provide adequate (or indeed, any) privacy. Furthermore, the proposed use of aluminium framed windows anywhere in the structure will be unsightly and entirely out of keeping with traditional hardwood sash windows required to be maintained throughout the Conservation Area. (See also point 3 below).</li> <li>2. The rear lightwell appears to be situated right up against the boundary with no. 48 and no comment is made, or assurance offered, in relation to the preservation of the existing shared brick garden wall between the properties.</li> <li>3. The existing aluminium window frames to the front of the property are amongst the least slightly in the entire Conservation Area. Similarly, the front garden is one of the least verdant. Permission for a development of such a significant nature should be contingent on replacing the existing windows with hardwood sash windows (as are now required to be preserved throughout the Conservation Area) and increasing the leafy character of the front garden. At a minimum, there is plenty of space for bin and bike storage on the already paved areas of the front garden (i.e. to the side of the drive) and under no circumstances should any such structures be allowed to reduce existing (or indeed potential) green space.</li> <li>4. The application does not include any development plans showing, inter alia, existing and proposed foundation details. No development should be permitted which constitutes a trespass on land owned by no 48 or which might prejudice future (equivalent) basement excavations by no. 48.</li> <li>5. The application does not include a Ground Movement Assessment or address the need for assurances re likely damage to the adjoining structure (i.e. no 48) arising from the inevitable ground movement identified.</li> <li>6. The application does not address the risk of (and provide associated assurances re) any longer term increased risk of movement to the structure (which is shared with no 48) arising as a direct consequence of the construction of a basement under only one half of the structure (i.e. no. 46).</li> <li>7. Disappointingly, there has been no communication between the Applicant and any of the owners of the shared structure (i.e. no 48) re the plans.</li> <li>8. No notification (from either the Applicant or LB Camden) about the planning application has to date been received by either the freehold company or the individual flat owners at no 48. This cannot be procedurally correct.</li> </ol>