

<b>Address:</b>	23 Ravenshaw Street London NW6 1NP	
<b>Application Number:</b>	2017/0911/P	<b>Officer: Rob Tulloch</b>
<b>Ward:</b>	Fortune Green	
<b>Date Received:</b>	15/02/2017	
<b>Proposal:</b> Erection of a three storey plus basement building comprising 8x flats (4 x 3-bed units and 4 x 2-bed units) following the demolition of the existing house.		
<b>Background Papers, Supporting Documents and Drawing Numbers:</b> Site Location Plan; Existing Plans: 01 Rev 11/02/17; 02 Rev 11/02/17; 03 Rev 11/02/17; 04 Rev 11/02/17; 05 Rev 11/02/17; 06 Rev 11/02/17; 07 Rev 11/02/17; Proposed Plans: 01 Rev 15/02/17; 02 Rev 15/02/17; 03 Rev 15/02/17; 04 Rev 15/02/17; 05 15/02/17; 06 15/02/17; 07 15/02/17; 08 Rev 11/02/17; 09 Rev 11/02/17; 10 Rev 11/02/17; 11 Rev 11/02/17; 12 Rev 11/02/17; 13 Rev 11/02/17; 14 Rev 11/02/17; 17B Rev 19/04/17; 21 Rev 1/02/17; 22 rev 11/02/17; 23 Rev 11/02/17; 24B Rev 19/04/17; 25 Rev 26/05/17 Green Roof Details; 25 Rev 21/04/17; 26 Rev 21/04/17; 27 Rev 21/04/17; 28 Rev 21/04/17; 29 Rev 24/05/17; 30 Rev 24/05/17; 31 Rev 24/05/17; SD-61; SL-50; Planning Statement by Mr C Taylor; Design and Access Statement by Mr C Taylor; Basement Method Statement Rev 2 by Croft Structural Engineers dated 11/07/2017; Structural Monitoring Statement Rev 1 by Croft Structural Engineers dated 06/07/2017; Structural Calculations by Croft Structural Engineers dated 06/07/2017; BIA Hydrogeology, Hydrology and Land Stability Report Rev 1 by Maund Geo-Consulting dated 07/07/2017; Daylight & Sunlight Impact Assessment & Technical Note & Summary by Space Strategy dated March 2016; Sustainability Statement Rev 2 by C80 Solutions dated July 2017; Energy Assessment by C80 Solutions Rev 3 dated July 2017; Retention vs Replacement Statement by NDM Health Ltd dated April 2017; Water Efficiency Calculation by C80 Solutions dated 14/02/2017; Draft Construction Management Plan by G2 Planning Solutions dated February 2017; Lifetime Homes Statement; Tree Survey by Tree Reports Ltd dated 04/02/2014; Air Quality Assessment by Air Quality Assessments Ltd dated 25/02/2017; Acoustic Report by KP Acoustics dated 19/01/2015; Ecological Appraisal by Urban Edge dated February 2015; Flood Report by Homecheck dated 05/05/2017; Drain Survey; Flood Risk Assessment by Groundsure dated 05/05/17		
<b>RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant Conditional Planning Permission Subject to Section 106 Legal Agreement</b>		
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Agent:</b>	
Flat A 23 Ravenshaw Street LONDON NW6 1NP		

**ANALYSIS INFORMATION****Land Use Details:**

	Use Class	Use Description	Floorspace (GIA)
Existing	<i>C3 Residential</i>		<i>744sqm</i>
Proposed	<i>C3 Residential</i>		<i>162sqm</i>

**Residential Use Details:**

	Residential Type	No. of Bedrooms per Unit								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+
Existing	<i>Flat/Maisonette</i>		<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>						
Proposed	<i>Flat/Maisonette</i>		<i>4</i>	<i>4</i>						

**Parking Details:**

	Parking Spaces (General)	Parking Spaces (Disabled)
Existing	<i>5</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Proposed	<i>0</i>	<i>n/a</i>



## **OFFICERS' REPORT**

**Reason for Referral to Committee:** The application involves the making of an obligation or agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that secures more than £50,000 of financial contributions [Clause 3(IV)]

### **1. SITE**

- 1.1 The proposal relates to a two storey house which has been extended and converted into 2x flats. The flats are adjacent to a large car park which was formerly a builder's yard and now forms part of the site. The site lies at the bottom of a bend in Ravenshaw Street and backs on to a railway line. The area between the railway line and the site is a site of nature conservation importance. Ravenshaw Street, and the surrounding area, is predominantly residential, comprising mainly two storey dwellings. The site is not within a conservation area, but does lie within the Fortune Green/West Hampstead Neighbourhood Area.

### **2. THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 Consent is sought for demolition of the existing house and erection of three story plus basement level 8 unit apartment block comprising 4 x 3 bed units and 4 x 2 bed units.

#### **Revisions**

- 2.2 The application has been revised to better relate to the existing context: the use of brick slips as a facing material has been omitted and the building will be constructed from traditional brick with the colour muted to reflect neighbouring buildings. The entrance door has been made more robust, windows to the front elevation have been redesigned and the bike store has been improved.

### **3. RELEVANT HISTORY**

- 3.1 8905200 The erection of a single storey rear extension. Granted 11/10/1989
- 3.2 Although in separate ownership, the site has previously been included in applications relating to 7 Lakis Close (referred to as land adjacent to 3 Streatley Place). The following permissions were granted although neither were implemented.
- 3.3 20351 Change of use to 2 self-contained dwelling units involving construction of a two storey extension at rear, a roof extension at the side and dormer windows. Granted 06/06/1975
- 3.4 5107 The erection of a concrete garage at the side. Granted 19/06/1968

### **4. CONSULTATIONS**



## **Statutory Consultees**

4.1 n/a

## **Local Groups**

4.2 Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Forum object: Overdevelopment likely to cause harm and disruption to the amenity and quality of life of neighbouring residents. No history of basement development in the area and area is a flood risk. Likely to cause serious structural problems for neighbouring properties which have shallow foundations. Front and rear elevations are blocky, ugly and out of step with the character of the local area. The proposed frontage is an abrupt and unwelcome interruption to the rhythm and style of Ravenshaw Street. The proposal is in clear breach of Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2 (Design & Character). A new system of waste collections is about to come into effect in this area, and insufficient space is provided to store two weeks worth of waste. The applicant has made no reference to the adopted Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan

## **Ward members**

4.3 Cllr Russell objects: Height, mass and scale, would be an over-dominant development that would have a negative impact on residents in neighbouring properties, effectively turning a single dwelling and a driveway into eight flats. This is absolutely disproportional, and would be far too dense for the space. Little consideration seems to have been given to the parking and waste storage requirements of the extra residents. Demolition, and its associated construction work, would cause undue distress to residents. Threat subsidence is very real; some properties in Ravenshaw Street already have cracks in their walls without being next door to a basement. Excavating a basement on the site would add extra undue pressure onto the walls of the properties next door. Not aware of any existing basements in Ravenshaw Street, and there is certainly no precedent for basements in this area. Most of the houses Ravenshaw Street are attractive Victorian architecture. However, the proposed development is 'clunky' and out of step with the character of the local area, particularly the frontage which does not seem to mirror any of the features of the current houses on Ravenshaw Street. No other house in the street is designed in this way the proposed development would cause harm to the street scene and negatively impact on residents' views.

## **Adjoining Occupiers**

<i>Number of letters sent</i>	0
<i>Total number of responses received</i>	12
<i>Number in support</i>	0
<i>Number of objections</i>	12

4.4 A site notices was displayed on 24/02/2017 expiring on 17/03/2017.

4.5 12 objections were received from the following residents:



4, 20, 29, 31, 34, 40, 47, 49, 95 Ravenshaw Street  
15 Dornfell Street  
5 Sington House  
2 Glastonbury Street

#### Land use

- Would provide flats in area Camden favours retaining houses, not splitting houses into flats
- Existing house could be adapted
- The scale of the proposed property is not in keeping with the rest of the street.
- Most of the houses are single dwellings, with a few being split into two flats. There are no single properties on Ravenshaw Street which house more than 2 separate flats and to have 20 new bedrooms created in one new property is over development on such a constrained site.
- Not in compliance with the neighbourhood plan

#### Design

- Demolition of a perfectly good house cannot be justified and is not sustainable
- No concession to surrounding architecture
- Not in keeping with the houses in the rear of the road
- Angle of bend implies the buildings are squeezed together
- Does not appear developer is aware of the Neighbourhood Plan
- The Victorian houses in the street retain all detailing and decoration and the overall the terraces contribute positively to the character and appearance of the street
- NPPF paragraph 131 advises local planning authorities that when determining planning applications that they "should take account of the positive contribution that a heritage asset can make to sustainable communities". Number 23 Ravenshaw Street continues to provide such a contribution by virtue of its appearance and its continued viable use.
- The architectural design of the new development relates very poorly to the context of the street. The street is characterised with yellow or red facing bricks with slate roofs and rectangular sash windows in portrait proportions.
- Elevation to the street makes no attempt to acknowledge the context of the local materials by virtue of the elevation being made up of multi-tone glazed bricks slips, metal cladding to window aprons and heads and metal sheeting to the sloping roofs. Moreover, the existing rhythm of the canted window bays of the terrace have been ignored by presenting a uniform flat elevation to the street. The window fenestration again ignores the local context by virtue of the square or long rectangular appearance of the proposed centre pivot window
- Cheap design and unfriendly appearance
- Roofs and facade design break from design of neighbouring houses
- The scale of the proposed property is not in keeping with the rest of the street.
- Most of the houses are single dwellings, with a few being split into two flats.

#### Amenity

- Strange bin area which will not meet Camden's bin policy
- Insufficient bin storage
- Noise and disturbance from construction



- New flats in Ravenshaw Streets have already harmed amenity in terms of refuse and traffic congestion
- Disruption from construction would affect local school
- This street is a play street. It is known for its particular community character
- Lack of privacy and loss of light for neighbours

#### Basement

- Huge basement could cause subsidence and affect underground streams
- Concerns about flooding
- BIA does not take into account the railway at the rear
- Existing impact from freight trains means displacement of soil is likely to cause permanent structural issues for nos. 21 and 25

#### Transport

- Increased parking
- Suspension of 5x bays for construction will create greater parking stress, and lead to congestion and potential danger for residents, schoolchildren and parents

#### Sustainability

- Not sustainable
- Better to keep/adapt existing building
- Any proposal for its demolition and replacement with another building will generate thousands of more tons of CO2 by virtue of its new energy intensive building materials, eg metal and concrete, construction process, road journeys and disposal of the original building materials.

## **5. POLICIES**

### **National Planning Policy Framework 2012**

### **London Plan 2016**

#### **Camden Local Plan 2016**

H1 maximising housing supply  
 H3 Protecting existing homes  
 H4 Maximising the supply of affordable housing  
 H6 Housing choice and mix  
 H7 Large and small homes  
 A1 Managing the impact of development  
 A2 Open space  
 A3 Biodiversity  
 A5 Basements  
 CC1 Climate change mitigation  
 CC2 Adapting to climate change  
 CC3 Water and flooding  
 CC5 Waste  
 D1 Design  
 T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport

T2 Car-free development and limiting the availability of parking  
DM1 Delivery and monitoring

### **Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015**

Policy 1 Housing  
Policy 2 Design and character  
Policy 8 Cycling  
Policy 16 Local Green Space  
Policy 18 Trees

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

#### **Camden Planning Guidance (CPG)**

CPG1 (Design) 2015  
CPG2 (Housing) 2016  
CPG3 (Sustainability) 2015  
CPG4 (Basements) 2015  
CPG6 (Amenity) 2011  
CPG7 (Transport) 2011  
CPG8 (Planning Obligations)

#### **Hampstead Conservation Area Statement 2002**

## **6. ASSESSMENT**

- 6.1 Consent is sought for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a three storey plus basement building to provide 8x flats.
- 6.2 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:
- Land use
  - Design
  - Residential development standards
  - Amenity
  - Basement
  - Sustainability
  - Transport
  - Community Infrastructure Levy

### **Land use**

- 6.3 Housing is regarded as the priority land-use of the Local Plan and the provision of additional residential floorspace on the site is welcomed in line with policy H1 (Maximising housing supply), but must also take into account accessibility, the character and built form of the surroundings, and protecting the amenity of occupiers and neighbours. Policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure that residential development provides a range of housing types, to meet a range of needs, as appropriate, and related to the scale of the development.



- 6.4 The Dwelling Size Priorities Table within Policy H7 (Large and small homes) seeks to ensure that all housing development contributes to meeting the priorities of the Dwelling Size Priorities Table by including a mix of large and small homes. The proposal would provide 4x 3-bed units and 4x 2-bed units, for market housing, two and three bedroom dwellings are both identified as high priority.
- 6.5 Policy H7 defines large homes as homes with three bedrooms or more and small homes as units of less than three bedrooms. The largest units would be 3-bed/6 person flats with floorspace in excess of 100sqm, and the smallest unit a 2-bed/3 person flat of 59sqm. As such, the proposal would meet the requirement of policy H7.
- 6.6 The whole site covers approximately 493sqm and proposes 8x units providing a total of 28 habitable rooms, which would equate to an average of 3.5 habitable rooms per unit. Ravenshaw Street has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) ranging from 2 – 4. Based on the London Plan's density matrix for an urban location, this would give a density range of 200-700 habitable rooms per hectare (200-450 PTAL 2-3/200-700 PTAL 4-6) and 55-225 units per hectare (55-145 PTAL 2-3/55-225 PTAL: 4-6). The proposal would equate to 568 habitable rooms per hectare and 162 units per hectare, thus in line with the London Plan guidance.

#### Affordable housing

- 6.7 In line with policy H4, all new residential development consisting of one or more additional units and an increase in residential floorspace of more than 100sqm is expected to make a contribution to affordable housing. The contribution is calculated using the target floorspace multiplied by £2,650 per sqm (the level of contribution per sqm described in Camden Planning Guidance – CPG2 and CPG8).
- 6.8 Policy H4 uses a sliding scale to calculate the target floorspace which starts at 2% for the first 100sqm of floorspace (Gross Internal Area – GIA), which is considered to be capacity for one additional home. This increases on a 'straight-line' basis with each additional 100sqm (i.e capacity for a further additional dwelling) increasing the target by 2%.
- 6.9 In this instance, the proposal is assessed to have capacity for an additional 6x dwellings (744sqm proposed GIA less 162sqm existing GIA = 582sqm GIA) or 600sqm rounded to the nearest 100sqm. So the target for the scheme would be 12% of the proposed floorspace.
- 6.10 The final calculation relies on CPG8, whereby the target percentage is applied to Gross External Area (GEA) as opposed to Gross Internal Area. So in this instance the target floorspace would be 12% of 611sqm (GEA) (805sqm proposed GEA minus 194sqm existing GEA = 611sqm) or 73sqm. Policy H4 acknowledges that smaller schemes, usually under 10x units, which cannot provide the target floorspace on site can provide a payment in lieu, which in this instance would be £193,450 (73sqm x £2,650). The applicant has agreed to the affordable housing contribution and this will be secured as part of the section 106 agreement.

#### **Design**



- 6.11 Local Plan policy D1 (Design) states that the Council will seek to secure high quality design in development, requiring among other things that development: respects local context and character; is sustainable in design and construction, and comprises details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character;
- 6.12 Policy 2 (Design and character) of the Neighbourhood Plan requires all development to be of a high quality design which compliments and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead.
- 6.13 The context of Ravenshaw Street is two storey late Victorian terraced houses. There is variety in the facing and roofing materials, some of which have been altered in a piecemeal fashion, and in some of the elevational detailing, but unifying aspects can be found in the visible, steeply pitched roofs, and the use of one- or two- storey canted bays. The houses step down to follow the topography of the street, and the rear of the site backs onto the railway line.
- 6.14 The site sits on a bend in the street, and the Victorian part of the existing building on the site is narrower than its neighbours. There is a large gap between the building on the site and its neighbour to the south, which previously gave access to a working yard behind, but offers no particular visual benefit in the streetscape. The principle of filling in the gap between the houses is therefore considered acceptable.
- 6.15 At the front, the proposed building seeks to respond to the Victorian terrace context but in a contemporary, simplified form. The position of the proposed building on the site reads as two houses, which suits the width of the overall site, and the height, elevation position, roof form, and stepping down of the building successfully respond to the streetscene. It is not proposed to incorporate bays, but the window heights and proportions respond to the bay form, which is considered appropriate. Following officers' concerns, the windows to the front elevation have been redesigned to give them a more vertical emphasis and the tilting opening method omitted. The originally proposed glazed front door has been replaced by a more solid version which alludes to a more traditional design with fanlight and porch. The utilitarian timber bike/bin store door has also been replaced.
- 6.16 As the proposed building would match the height of the existing buildings in the street and refer to the local typography the appearance of the proposed building is considered to complement the street scene and comply with the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan which expects new development to be human in scale in order to maintain and create a positive relationship between buildings and street level activity, have regard to the form, function, structure and heritage of its context, and be sensitive to the height of existing buildings in their vicinity and setting
- 6.17 To the rear, the site widens considerably. In flat elevation the proposal appears rather bulky at the rear, but on plan, it is shown to follow the angle of the bend in the street and seeks to respond to the respective building lines on each side, forming a splayed rear elevation, which mitigates any perceived bulk. The rear of



the site backs onto the railway line and is not readily visible from any public viewpoints.

- 6.18 The Neighbourhood Plan has a presumption in favour of a colour palate which reflects, or is in harmony with, the materials of its context. The proposed materials palette is simple and restrained, with brickwork, a dark zinc roof, dark PPC aluminium window frames and sliding louvred screens to the rear. The successful use of a sheet roof covering in this context (rather than e.g. slate) depends on its colour and finish – typical bright silver zinc is not considered appropriate here, but a darker shade and more matte finish is considered to integrate successfully within the terrace.
- 6.19 It is accepted that basements are not characteristic of the area, but this does not preclude developments that incorporate basements. The lightwells would largely be screened by the boundary walls and planting and would only be apparent from the footway directly in front of the site and therefore would have limited impact on the streetscene.
- 6.20 In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed would provide a new building that sites well in the street scene and has been carefully design to respect the character and appearance of the terrace in terms of height, materials and colour, as such the design is considered to comply with the requirement of policy D1 of the Local Plan and policy 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Details of all facing materials will be secured by condition.

#### **Residential development standards**

- 6.21 All flats would have a regular layout with reasonably sized rooms and good access to daylight and natural ventilation. All flats, except for Flat H, would meet the DCLG space standards for bedrooms and overall floorspace. Flat H would be a 2-bed/3 person unit with a floorspace of 59sqm, which is slightly under the DCLG standard of 61sqm, however this does not include approximately 10sqm of storage space below 1.5m in height and the unit also has external amenity space in the form of a balcony of 6sqm.
- 6.23 All units would have external amenity space in the form of balconies, or patio gardens for the lower flats (A, B & C). The development would also have a communal rear garden of approximately 65sqm.

Flat	Bedrooms/persons	Floorspace	DCLG standard	Amenity space
A	3-bed/6 person	105sqm	95sqm	24sqm
B	3-bed/6 person	109sqm	95sqm	27sqm
C	2-bed/4 person	79sqm	70sqm	21sqm
D	2-bed/4 person	75sqm	70sqm	6sqm
E	3-bed/4 person	80sqm	74sqm	6sqm
F	3-bed/5 person	90sqm	86sqm	6sqm
G	2-bed/3 person	61sqm	61sqm	6sqm
H	2-bed/3 person	59sqm	61sqm	6sqm



- 6.24 Flats A and B would have their own cycle storage with communal cycle storage at basement and ground floor levels. A dedicated cycle/refuse store is proposed at ground floor level with its own access from the street. The store would provide storage for 8x 240ltr wheelie bins with food waste storage above. Environmental Services advise that this provides adequate refuse storage provision which would be easily accessible for collection crews. Their only concern is that food waste containers may not be easy to reach for some service users as they are placed above the wheelie bins, but that it would be possible to swap one of the wheelie bins for a single food waste bin or have a 140 litre bin instead of the smaller containers on the shelf. As such, a condition will require detail of revised refuse storage to be submitted and approved.

## **Amenity**

### Daylight/sunlight

- 6.25 The applicant has submitted a sunlight/ daylight assessment. For daylight, the report assesses the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) to no. 21 Ravenshaw Street. British Research Establishment (BRE) guidance advises that for good daylighting VSC should exceed 27%. If, as a result of development, VSC is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. a loss of 20%) daylight may be significantly affected. For sunlight, the guidelines recommend habitable rooms receive at least 25% Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH), with at least 5% during winter. If, as a result of development, a window receives less than this, less than 0.8 times its former sunlight hours, and a reduction over the whole year of greater than 4%, sunlight may be adversely affected.
- 6.26 No. 21 to the north has ground and first floor windows facing the site, including a ground floor living room window. These windows already face the one and two storey elements of the exiting building and the proposed building steps back from them at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level to minimise the impact on these windows. The ground floor element would be set further back from the boundary, but extend deeper into the rear garden than existing. At first floor level the rear of the proposed building would be closer to the boundary and extend further into the garden. The applicant's daylight assessment indicates that existing VSC levels for no. 21 are generally below 27% at ground floor level, but none of the windows assessed would see a loss of more than 20% of their former values. For sunlight, all assessed living rooms would see a minimal loss of sunlight and continue to receive in excess of 25% APSH overall, including at least 5% in the winter months.
- 6.27 The proposed building would largely abut the flank wall of no. 25 and extend no further to the rear than existing which is level with the adjacent closet wing, however the top floor would rise above the closet wing and rear roof slope of its neighbour. There is a rooflight and small dormer in the roofslope of no. 25 and a first floor window to the rear elevation, but the centre of these windows would not fall within a 45° angle in elevation which the BRE guidelines suggest as having a limited impact on daylight. As such, no 25 has not been assessed for daylight and the report refers to the BRE guidelines which state that loss of light need not be assessed if a development does not subtend an angle of 25° drawn from the centre of any existing window perpendicular to the existing building. As there are no



windows to no. 25 facing the site within 90° of due south, the proposed building is not considered to affect sunlight to this property.

#### Overlooking

- 6.28 The windows to the new development are located at the front and rear, with no windows directly facing adjoining properties and no windows to the sides. The proposed balconies are also to the rear, as such it is not considered that adjoining occupiers would suffer a loss of privacy from overlooking.

#### Noise

- 6.29 The proposal would introduce 8x flats where only two currently exist, however, in line with the London Plan, the proposal is not considered overdevelopment and is in line with the density matrix. The communal garden is not much larger than neighbouring gardens and located at the rear of the site furthest away from neighbouring properties.

#### **Basement**

- 6.30 The proposed basement would take up most of the proposed site, with lightwells at the front and patios at the rear. The footprint of the basement would be approximately 336sqm with an external depth of approximately 3.5m bgl. The site is not within an area of constraint for land stability, surface water or groundwater, but the site does back onto railway land with tracks approximately 16m away from the site and a slope of 12°. The underlying strata is made ground above London Clay, the site investigation indicates groundwater is likely to be encountered.
- 6.31 Policy A5 (Basements) requires applicants to demonstrate that a proposal will not harm the built or natural environment, principally by way of a Basement Impact Assessment. Campbell Reith have reviewed the applicant's BIA and following a review of further information advise that the structural scheme and temporary works proposals appear adequate. The retaining walls will be formed by underpinning, where excavations are required below Party Walls, and reinforced concrete walls will be formed in short sections in an 'underpinning' sequence to the front and rear of the site. Damage impacts to neighbours are predicted to be within Category 1 (Very Slight) of the Burland Scale.
- 6.32 Ravenshaw Street is within the designated 'Sumatra Road' Local Flood Risk Zone and within a Critical Drainage Area. In the revised submissions, further assessment was reviewed and Campbell Reith accept that the proposed development is a very low risk of flooding from all sources. An attenuation drainage scheme is proposed that will reduce the surface water run off rate by up to 70% of the existing condition. This should provide an improvement to the current site conditions and betterment to the wider hydrological environment and Campbell Reith advise that the proposed development will not impact the wider hydrogeological environment
- 6.33 Additionally, correspondence with Thames Water has been presented confirming that a relief sewer in the area is now operational, easing the demand on local drainage and reducing the likelihood of surface water flooding. Standard mitigation



measures such as elevated thresholds to entrances and lightwells, the use of non-return valves and appropriate drainage should be adopted in the final construction. Network Rail has been consulted regarding the adjacent railway cutting to the southwest of the site, and raise no objection but have requested a condition securing asset protection measures.

- 6.34 Policy A5 also sets limits for the size of proposed basements to ensure that they are subordinate to the building being extended. In this instance the proposed basement is an integral part of the new development, but would still be considered as being subordinate as the basement, other than the lightwells, is entirely under the footprint of the proposed building. The proposed basement is also considered to comply with parts f-m which restricts basements to 1.5 times the footprint of the host building, and basement lengths compared to the length of the host building and depth of the garden.
- 6.35 As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the relevant parts of policy A5 and Campbell Reith advise that the submitted information demonstrates that the proposal would not harm the natural or built environment. A Basement Construction Plan has not been recommended by Campbell Reith and a condition will ensure detail of a relevantly qualified engineer to oversee the basement works are submitted to and approved by the Council.

### **Sustainability**

- 6.36 In line with policies CC1 and CC2 the Council will require development to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures. All new-build minor residential development is required to submit a sustainability statement showing that the development can follow the hierarchy of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies set out in the London Plan to secure a minimum 19% reduction in regulated CO2 emissions below the maximum threshold allowed under Part L 2013.
- 6.37 The applicant has submitted sustainability and energy plans which indicate that the cooling hierarchy has been followed with high thermal mass, green infrastructure provision, external shutters, and no mechanical cooling proposed. The proposal also includes a communal gas boiler, 100% low energy lighting, energy efficient appliances (A- or AA rated fridges and freezers or fridge-freezers, and washing machines), and solar panels on flat and rear roofs. Water efficient fixtures and fittings and mitigation measures include 98sqm of fully permeable garden area and 34sqm of semi-permeable garden paving along with rainwater harvesting in the form of a 7,500L tank to be located in the garden. A green wall (Approx. 97sqm) is also proposed for the rear boundary.
- 6.39 Overall the proposal would reduce carbon emission by up to 54% including at 20% through renewable technologies. The Council's sustainability officer has reviewed the submitted plans and considers the proposal to be compliant with policies CC1, CC2 and CC3, with conditions securing details of the PVs, green wall and rainwater harvesting, and clauses in the section 106 agreement to ensure that the development is implemented in accordance with the submitted energy and



sustainability statements, that evidence is provided that the proposed water usage is achieved.

## **Biodiversity**

- 6.40 The area between the railway line and the site is a site of nature conservation importance and identified in the Neighbourhood Plan as designated Local Green Space.
- 6.41 The applicant has submitted an ecological survey which indicates that no harm would be caused to the biodiversity interest of the site. The London Wildlife Trust have commented on behalf of Camden Nature Conservation Service. and raise no objection, but advise that the preliminary Ecological Appraisal is now out of date so prior to any internal or external demolition of buildings or any site clearance, including tree removal, an updated bat survey should be submitted detailing the methods and results of survey work to determine the presence or absence of roosting or foraging bats at this site.
- 6.42 They also recommend conditions ensuring site clearance and demolition be undertaken outside the bird nesting season, prior to clearance suitable habitats are hand searched and dismantled for reptiles by a suitably qualified ecologist, and that as the site and its surroundings provide potential habitats for a number of protected species, measures to protect wildlife should also be secured including bird boxes and insect/reptile/amphibian bricks.
- 6.43 Only one tree occupies the site, a category C Bay Laurel at the rear. Due to its low quality and lack of amenity value there is no objection to its removal. The site is not within a conservation area and the tree could be removed at any time without the need for permission or consultation, and the Neighbourhood Plan only seeks to protect trees in good health that contribute to the character of the area, streetscapes and green spaces. There is a row of Poplars alongside the railway track, but these are at a sufficient distance not to be affected by the proposal.

## **Transport**

### Car free

- 6.44 The nearest stations are Kilburn (Jubilee Line) and the West Hampstead stations, whilst the nearest bus stops are located on Mill Lane, Shoot-up Hill and West End Lane. Transport for London's PTAL website suggests that the site has a PTAL score of between 2 and 4.
- 6.45 The site is located within the Fortune Green West Controlled Parking Zone CA-P(c), which operates from Monday to Friday 10am - 12noon. In accordance with policy T2, the property would be designated as car free (i.e. the future occupants will be unable to obtain parking permits from the Council) and secured as such via a section 106 planning obligation if planning permission is granted.

### Construction Management



- 6.46 Local Plan Policy A5 states that Construction Management Plans should be secured to demonstrate how developments will minimise impacts from the movement of goods and materials during the construction process (including any demolition works). For some developments this may require control over how the development is implemented (including demolition and construction) through a Construction Management Plan (CMP).
- 6.47 The applicant has submitted a draft CMP which acknowledges that Beckford Primary School is close to the site and proposes to bypass Dornfell Street, which is the main entrance to the school, using Glastonbury Street instead, and restrict deliveries to between 9.30am and 3pm on weekdays during term time and between 8am and 1pm on Saturdays. The CMP will have to take the movement of schoolchildren and parents into account as well as the general transport environment. Glastonbury Street is a play street and the CMP will also need to acknowledge this. There may be little impact on using Glastonbury Street during school hours, but on Saturdays deliveries will have to use Dornfell Street or bypass both streets. Transport Officers consider the draft CMP to be appropriate for this stage of the application. If the application is granted a more detailed CMP will be secured as part of a section 106 agreement. An Implementation Support Contribution would also need to be secured.

#### Approval in Principle (AIP)

- 6.48 Due to the proximity of the basement lightwells to the public highway, an AIP, and associated fee, would be required to demonstrate that the basement works would not harm the structural integrity of the public highway.

#### Highway works

- 6.49 The Council will expect works affecting Highways to repair any construction damage to transport infrastructure or landscaping and reinstate all affected transport network links and road and footway surfaces following development in line with policy A1.
- 6.50 The proposal could lead to significant levels of damage to the public highway directly adjacent to the site on Streatley Place. The Council would need to repair any such damage (e.g. repaving of the paving slabs along the footpath) and to remove the crossover. The highway works would also ensure that the proposed development interfaces seamlessly with the adjacent public highway.
- 6.51 The highway works described above relate to land within the public highway and would be designed and constructed by Camden and a cost estimate is being prepared. A highways contribution would therefore be secured via a section 106 planning obligation if planning permission is granted.

#### Cycle storage

- 6.52 The proposed plans indicate space for 8x cycles in the rear lightwells of flats A and B, and in a communal area in the lightwell. Due to its location at basement level the plans have been revised to include a cycle wheel ramp to facilitate access.



Storage for a further 8x cycles would be provided in the form of a Josta rack in a dedicated secure cycle store at ground floor level.

- 6.53 The cycle storage would meet the requirement of the London Plan and a condition will ensure that the provision is implemented in line with the submitted plans and permanently retained.

### **Community Infrastructure Levy**

- 6.54 The proposal would be liable for both the Mayor of London's CIL and the Camden CIL as the proposals are for additional units of residential accommodation. Based on the charging schedules and the information given on the plans, if the application were acceptable the charge is likely to be £29,100 (Mayoral) and £291,000 (Camden) based on an uplift of 582sqm (GIA).

## **7. Conclusion**

- 7.1 The proposal would provide eight new flats which would provide a good standard of accommodation, and housing is the priority of the development plan. The proposal would also provide a well designed, sustainable building that would sit comfortably within its setting. The proposal is not considered to have a significant impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers in terms of light, overlooking or noise, and the construction management plan, although still in draft form, is considered to be appropriate for this stage.
- 7.2 Conditional planning permission is recommended subject to a section 106 agreement containing the following heads of terms:
- Affordable Housing Contribution (£193,450)
  - Highways Contribution (tbc)
  - Construction Management Plan (CMP)
  - CMP Implementation Support Contribution
  - Approval in Principle
  - Sustainability Plan
  - Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy Plan

## **8. LEGAL COMMENTS**

- 8.1 Members are referred to the note from the Legal Division at the start of the Agenda.



## **Appendix A: Planning Committee's Terms of Reference with proposed changes**

### **Planning Committee Terms of Reference Oct 2018**

#### **Matters delegated and reserved to the Planning Committee**

1. Authorisation of service of any notice relating to planning, listed building, conservation area and advertisement control which in the view of the Director of Regeneration and Planning should be considered by the committee.
2. Authorisation of any legal or other action or proceedings relating to planning, listed building conservation area and advertisement control which in the view of the Director of Regeneration and Planning should be considered by the Committee.
3. Consideration of the following categories of application **recommended for approval**:
  - i) major development where this involves the construction, extension or conversion of floorspace for 10 or more new dwellings or more than 1000 sq. mtrs of non-residential floorspace;
  - ii) minor development where this involves the construction of either 5 or more five single dwelling houses or upwards of 500 sq. mtrs of non-residential floorspace;
  - iii) involving any demolition (other than minor demolition) of any listed building (including locally listed buildings) and buildings considered to make a positive contribution to a conservation area;
  - iv) which involve the making of an obligation or agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or other legislation ("the obligation") that secures more than £50,000 of financial contributions or other public benefits of estimated capital value unless;
    - The terms of the obligation are not materially different from any previous obligation approved by the committee in relation to the same site;
    - The obligation is required in connection with the presentation of the Council's case in a planning appeal;
    - The obligation is in respect of a standard financial contribution calculated in line with policy.
  - v) involving a significant departure from policy;
  - vi) submitted by or on behalf of a member of the Council (or their spouse or partner) or any Council employee (or their spouse or partner);
  - vii) where the Director of Regeneration and Planning has referred the application for consideration after briefing members; and



- viii) applications submitted by or on behalf of a Council department for Council's own development save for applications for minor development.
4. Consideration of any other application which, in the view of the Director of Regeneration and Planning, should be considered by the Committee.
  5. Decisions on any matter relating to the functions of this Committee referred by the Director of Regeneration and Planning.
  6. Responses to consultation by adjoining authorities on applications with significant cross borough impacts.
  7. Consideration and the submission of recommendations to the Cabinet on the Council's Development Plan review of planning policies, draft Supplementary Guidance, and on proposed responses to consultation on proposed changes to Government Planning Policy affecting development control.
  8. To receive performance monitoring information on matters within the remit of the Committee.

#### **Delegation in respect of conditions and reasons**

Authority is delegated to the Head of Development Management to, subsequent to any meeting and in line with the Committee's general decision and direction, finalise the wording and reasons of:

- Conditions added or amended conditions;
- Approvals or refusals contrary to the officer's recommendation;
- Additional reasons for refusal or approval where not set out in the officer's report.

The delegation will apply unless the Committee specifies otherwise as part of its decision.



## **Appendix B: Additional wording for the Committee's Guidance Note on Procedures**

*The following wording is proposed to be inserted at the end of the 'How decisions are taken at the meeting' section in the Committee's Guidance Note on Procedures.*

The Committee has agreed a general delegation to the Head of Development Management to, subsequent to the meeting and in line with the Committee's general decision and direction, finalise the wording and reasons of:

- Additional or amended conditions;
- Approvals or refusals contrary to the officer's recommendation;
- Additional reasons for refusal or approval where not set out in the officer's report.

The Committee will as a general practice confirm this delegation as part of its decision-making on applications where appropriate and may choose not to give this delegation if it considers it appropriate for it to agree the final wording and reasons itself and therefore ask for the matter to come back to Committee.