

<b>Address:</b>	63 Frognal London NW3 6YA	
<b>Application Number:</b>	2013/0825/P	<b>Officer:</b> Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin
<b>Ward:</b>	Frognal & Fitzjohns	
<b>Date Received:</b>	07/02/2013	
<b>Proposal:</b> Excavation of basement level with two side lightwells and rear sunken garden, erection of wrap around single storey rear and side extension at ground floor level and part two part single storey side extension at ground and upper ground floor levels, remodelling of rear elevation, alterations to side elevations, two new rooflights on crown top, erection of one rear dormer, installation of air conditioning units into proposed side lightwells and re-landscaping (following substantial demolition of existing building) to existing dwelling house (Class C3).		
<b>Drawing Numbers:</b> (Prefix: 236_) EX.000 (Site Location Plan); EX.001 P; EX.002 P; EX.003 P; EX.004 P; EX.005 P; EX.006 P; EX.007 P; EX.008 P; EX.009 P; GA.100B P-B; GA.101A P-A; GA.102B P-B; GA.103 P2; 104 P-A; GA.105 P; GA.106B P-B; GA.107 P; GA.108A P-A; GA.109 P; GA.110C P-C; GA.111 P; GA.112 P; GA.113B P-B; GA.114A P-A; GA.115A P-A; GA.116 P1; GA.117B P-B; and GA.118B P-B.		
<b>Supporting Documents:</b> Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report dated 21 <sup>st</sup> January 2013 by Landmark Trees; Desk Study and Ground Investigation Report dated January 2013 by Conisbee; Draft Construction Management Strategy dated February 2013 by Gregory Phillips Architects; Planning Application Structural Report (including Construction Method Statement) dated February 2013 by Conisbee; Background Noise Level (noise report) dated February 2013 by Tim Lewers Acoustics; and e-mail from Katharina Uberschar at Gregory Architects (agent) dated 10/07/2013.		
<b>RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant Conditional Permission subject to S106</b>		
<b>Related Application</b>	<b>Conservation Area Consent</b>	
<b>Date of Application:</b>	07/02/2013	
<b>Application Number:</b>	2013/1118/C	
<b>Proposal:</b> Substantial demolition of existing building associated with proposed alterations and extensions (under planning application ref: 2013/0825/P).		
Drawing numbers: (Prefix: 236_) EX.000 (Site Location Plan); EX.001 P; EX.002 P; EX.003 P; EX.004 P; EX.005 P; EX.006 P; EX.007 P; EX.008 P; and EX.009 P.		
<b>RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant Conditional Conservation Area Consent subject to S106</b>		
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Agent:</b>	

Ms Leighann Heron Gregory Phillips Architects 17 Savile Row London W1S 3PN	Gregory Phillips Architects 17 Savile Row London W1S 3PN
--	---

**ANALYSIS INFORMATION**

Land Use Details:			
	Use Class	Use Description	Floorspace
Existing	C3 Dwelling House		562m <sup>2</sup>
Proposed	C3 Dwelling House		862m <sup>2</sup>

Residential Use Details:										
	Residential Type	No. of Bedrooms per Unit								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+
Existing	Single family house						1			
Proposed	Single family house									1

Parking Details:		
	Parking Spaces (General)	Parking Spaces (Disabled)
Existing	1	
Proposed	1	

## **OFFICERS' REPORT**

**Reason for Referral to Committee:**     **The proposal involves substantial demolition of a building within a conservation area [Clause 3(v)].**

### **1. SITE**

- 1.1 The application site is located on the western side of Frogna1. The property in question is a large, detached two-storey single family dwelling house, with a converted attic and a single-storey double garage on its western flank. The property occupies a large square footprint but is situated in generous grounds, typical of this part of the street, and surrounding properties are similarly sized. The property dates from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and adheres to a neo-Georgian style as found elsewhere in the vicinity.
- 1.2 It is constructed from red brick with a plain clay tile hipped roof (with a flat top), is fenestrated by white-painted sash windows with small panes, and is characterised by tall brick chimneys. At some time early in its history the property was extended to the rear on the north-west corner with a two-storey rear addition. The front of the property is bounded by a high brick boundary wall giving the site a high level of privacy.
- 1.3 The site is situated within Sub Area 5 (Frogna1) of the Hampstead Conservation Area, and is noted as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in the Conservation Area Statement. It should be noted that the elevations of the property facing the public highway (in this case the front façade) are protected by an Article 4 Direction.

### **2. THE PROPOSAL**

#### **Original**

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the excavation of a basement level with two side lightwells (close to the front building line), the erection of a wrap-around single-storey rear and side extension at ground-floor level and a part two part single storey side extension at ground and upper ground floor levels replacing the existing side garage), the remodelling of the rear elevation, alterations to the side elevations, alterations to roof profile involving an additional rear dormer and installation of two new rooflights on the crown top and installation of an air conditioning unit into each of the proposed side lightwells. The proposal also comprises re-landscaping works including a rear sunken garden.
- 2.2 The proposed basement level would be immediately adjacent to the shared boundary with 61 Frogna1 and 1.6m from the shared boundary with 65 Frogna1. It would have a floor area of 288sqm providing home office space, leisure facilities, family living room and bedrooms and storage spaces. The proposed lightwells positioned on either side of the existing house would serve the proposed basement level. The proposed lightwell on the south side would be covered with horizontal

grilles. The proposed lightwell on the north side elevation would be secured by metal railings.

- 2.3 The proposed sunken garden would be 12.5m by 4.5m and would have a cascaded planting beds covering approximately one third of it.
- 2.4 The proposed side and rear extensions would have modern fenestration detailing with largely glazed openings and they would be one storey below the eaves height of the existing house.
- 2.5 The proposed rear dormer would be positioned between the existing rear dormer windows and would be identical to them in terms of its size and detailed design. Four of the existing small rooflights on the crown top would be removed and replaced with two rooflights (1.8m x 2.7m and 1.7m x 4m). The existing rear dormers would also be replaced with like-for-like ones.
- 2.6 The proposed alterations to side elevations would involve removal of existing doors and windows and installation of new windows and doors.
- 2.7 The main rear elevation (excluding the proposed rear extension) would be reconstructed with windows and doors matching the style and materials of the existing ones.
- 2.8 Works of demolition involve removal of the rear main wall (except the roof), total demolition of existing two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, garage on side and side wall to the driveway.

### **Revisions**

- 2.8 Since submission of the current application the following amendments have been made to improve the design and appearance of the proposed scheme:
  - The replacement of rear dormers with roof terraces have been omitted;
  - The dark brickwork to be used on the proposed extensions was replaced with matching brickwork to the existing.
  - The railings around the south side lightwell was replaced with a horizontal grille cover;
  - The rear elevation of basement level was revised to include more solid elements; and
  - The depth of the proposed sunken garden was reduced by approximately 2m.

## **3. RELEVANT HISTORY**

### **3.1 Application property:**

2011/6217/P – Planning permission was granted on 21/02/2012 for the erection of first floor extension over garage, two-storey link between main building and garage and elevational changes to garage all in connection with conversion of existing 2 car garage to 1 car garage and creation of a 'granny annex' to the existing dwellinghouse (Class C3). This permission has not been implemented yet and expires on 21/02/2015. The proposal is identical to the scheme which was granted permission in 2007 (Ref: 2007/3451/P).

2007/3451/P – Planning permission was granted on 26/09/2007 for the erection of a first floor extension and a two storey link in association with the conversion of existing 2 car garage into 1 car garage and a granny flat to the existing dwellinghouse. This permission has not been implemented.

2005/2748/P – Planning permission was granted on 15/09/2005 for the demolition of existing front boundary dwarf brick wall and steps, and erection of a new brick boundary wall with 2x pedestrian gates and double vehicular gates for the single-family dwellinghouse.

PWX0002784 – Planning permission was granted on 11/12/2000 for the formation of two front and two rear dormer windows in connection with the creation of additional habitable space in the roof.

### 3.2 62 Frognal:

2006/0918/P – Planning permission was granted on 16/05/2006 for the remodelling of dwellinghouse, including erection of 2 storey plus basement and attic side extension, erection of single storey rear extension, and alterations to front facade and roof including front, side and rear dormer windows, plus installation of front garden car deck access to basement garage and of rear garden rooflights to basement room.

### 3.3 61 Frognal:

9501806R2 – Planning permission was granted on 10/05/1996 for the enlargement of house including extensions to roof, rear and sides, new gable and entrance porch at front, and Velux windows in rear roof slope, plus the enlargement of the vehicular entrance off Frognal.

9560203R2 – Conservation area consent was granted on 10/05/1996 for the partial demolition of front and rear walls and roof, in connection with proposed extensions to the house.

PWX0103780 – Planning permission was granted on 08/04/2002 for the remodelling of the rear elevation, including the replacement of a large bay window at ground level with a conservatory, the erection of a first floor rear extension and the replacement of two rooflights on the rear elevation with a dormer.

### 3.4 59 Frognal:

2005/2711/P – Planning permission was granted on 24/04/2006 for the demolition of existing building and the erection of 2 x 2-storey plus basement semi-detached houses with integral garages.

2005/2719/C – Conservation Area consent was granted on 23/01/2006 for the demolition of existing building.

2006/5798/P – Planning permission was granted on 12/02/2007 for the amendment to planning permission dated 24/04/2006 (2005/2711), namely additional

excavation to create deeper basement to provide plunge pools and allow provision of greywater storage tanks.

#### 4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 **Hampstead Conservation Area Advisory Committee** did not object to the proposal but made the following comments:

- The design of the rear extensions (looking like boxes) on the rear seem incongruous and the loss of detail regrettable.
- The proposed rear sunken garden should be planted and maintained as such.

4.2 **Heath and Hampstead Society** objected to the proposal and raised the following concerns:

- The extent and scale of the proposed side extensions are damaging to the architecture and character of the house (in particular due to their excessive height of 3.5m). The blank walls of the proposed side extensions facing onto both of the adjoining houses are particularly unpleasant.
- The design of the extensions with enormous windows as seen from the garden detracts from the character of the Conservation Area.
- Two of the proposed three bedrooms in the new basement would have no natural light or ventilation.
- It is unclear where the proposed a/c plant would be located. Noise arising from it is dealt with in a cursory fashion and it justifies much closer scrutiny.
- There are important trees close to site boundaries and on the pavement in Frognaal. Protection of these trees is vital during construction.
- The proposed construction management provision is unacceptable due to lack of detailing on number of delivery vehicles to the site, potential damage to the front boundary wall and protection of a large tree near the site entrance and the proposed closure of several residents parking bays and closure of pavement across the site.

#### 4.3 Adjoining Occupiers

	Original
<i>Number of letters sent</i>	10
<i>Total number of responses received</i>	2
<i>Number of electronic responses</i>	2
<i>Number in support</i>	0
<i>Number of objections</i>	0

A site notice was displayed from 06/03/2013 to 27/03/2013 and the application was also advertised in the Ham and High on 04/04/2013. The occupiers of two neighbouring properties raised concerns over the noise and damage to the neighbouring properties during construction, the proposed landscape design and impact of the basement excavation on nearby trees and in summary, they made the following comments:

- Noise levels during construction should be minimised between the hours of 1pm and 3pm; and

- Vibration levels should be monitored closely so no damage is caused to the fabric of surrounding properties (There were significant vibration levels during a recent test drilling session).
- Too many trees in the vicinity have already been lost through the creation of new basements and other landscape interventions. The mitigation measures for the projection of trees identified as 2, 3 and 4 (close to rear boundary) in the Arboricultural statement (submitted with the application) are insufficient therefore the mitigation measures should either be agreed prior to any determination or at least a condition prior to commencement of works.

## 5. **POLICIES**

### 5.1 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)**

### 5.2 **The London Plan (2011)**

### 5.3 **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies (2010)**

#### **Camden Core Strategy**

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS11 – Promoting sustainable and efficient travel

CS13 - Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards)

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS15 – Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces & encouraging biodiversity

CS19 – Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy

#### **Camden Development Policies**

DP16 – The transport implications of development

DP17 – Walking, cycling and public transport

DP20 – Movement of goods and materials

DP22 - Promoting sustainable design and construction

DP23 – Water

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden’s heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

DP27 – Basements and lightwells

DP28 – Noise and Vibration

### 5.4 **Supplementary Planning Policies**

#### **Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

CPG1 – Design (Sections 2, 4, 5 and 6)

CPG 4 - Basements and lightwells (Section 2)

CPG 6 – Amenity (Sections 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8)

### 5.5 **Hampstead Conservation Area Statement 2001**

## 6. ASSESSMENT

6.1 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Substantial demolition;
- Design of the proposed extensions;
- Basement Impact; and
- Introduction of rear sunken garden.

### 6.2 Substantial Demolition

6.2.1 Policy CS14 seeks to ensure preservation and enhancement of Camden's heritage assets and their settings. In that respect policy DP25 aims to prevent the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

6.2.2 The principle parts of the house which are most visible from the street and contribute most to the character and appearance of the wider conservation area would be retained. The demolition comprises removal of the unsightly two-storey rear extension, the associated one-storey side extension, the non-original standalone single storey garage with a flat roof on the south side, the main rear wall and a rear bay window at ground floor level. The demolition works will also remove a number of internal structural walls and small sections of the main roof.

6.2.3 The most significant element of the proposed demolition works would be the loss of the attractive rear bay window which is likely to be an original feature. As the demolition of the rear bay window on its own would fall under permitted development works, refusal of conservation area consent on those grounds would not be justifiable. It should be noted that the substantial part of the proposed demolition works would involve demolition of the unsightly existing extensions. Overall the works of demolition would not cause significant harm to the building or the Conservation Area.

6.2.4 Subject to the design quality of the proposed scheme the proposed demolition works should be considered as acceptable in principle.

### 6.3 Design and Appearance

6.3.1 Policy DP25 states that the Council will only permit development within conservation areas which preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area. In addition policy DP24 states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to be of the highest standard of design and respect the character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties and the character and proportions of the existing building.

6.3.2 The properties on Frognaal are diverse in scale and character, ranging from modest 18<sup>th</sup> century houses to the 20<sup>th</sup> century houses (predominantly neo-Georgian). Many of the neighbouring properties in the vicinity have been altered at roof level by dormer windows and roof lights and have various rear extensions and



alterations. The application property has had rooflights and dormers added and been extended to the rear and sides.

- 6.3.3 Alterations to roof profile: CPG1 for roof alterations states that the Council will seek to ensure that roof alterations are sympathetic and do not harm the character and appearance of the buildings and the wider townscape in the borough. Following the concerns of the Council's design officer over the originally proposed rear dormers with recessed balconies and canopies, the design of rear dormers has been kept traditional. The proposed rear dormers would have timber casement windows with small panes, as currently exist on the existing rear dormers. The dormers would be positioned in accordance with the Council's guidance detailed in section 5 of CPG1. The proposed rooflights would not be visible from the streetscenes or have any impact on the elevations of the house as they would be located on the proposed crown top. The proposed alterations to the roof profile would be subordinate to the existing roof profile and are acceptable in design terms.
- 6.3.4 Rear and side extensions: The proposed above-ground extensions will take on a contemporary architectural form which is considered acceptable in design terms, as they will not be highly visible from the street, will complement the existing neo-Georgian architecture in terms of materials (predominantly brick), scale and form, and will read as subordinate and new additions to the host building (such as employing lightweight glazing to distance themselves from the original brick facades).
- 6.3.5 The footprint of the proposed extensions would be similar to the existing extensions. In terms of their height, the proposed extensions would be one storey below the eaves of the existing house in accordance with the guidance given in section 4 of CPG1. The height of the proposed rear extension would be one storey below the existing rear extension. Although the associated side extension would be 1.3m above the height of the eaves on the existing side extension, this additional height would not compromise the architectural composition of the building as seen from the street. It should also be noted that the proposed side extension would only be 0.4m above the shared boundary with no 65.
- 6.3.6 The proposed side garage which would replace the existing garage would be 1.3m higher than is presently the case but would be lower than the recently approved first floor addition to the existing garage (ref: 2011/6217/P). This is not problematic as the increase in height of the garage, would be embodied in a pitched roof as seen from the street. The proposed garage is considered acceptable and would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 6.3.7 Alterations to fenestrations: Elsewhere, minor changes to fenestration are considered acceptable as the changes would not impact on principal elevations of the building. The wholesale replacement of all traditional windows with double-glazed replicas in timber is also acceptable.
- 6.3.8 Proposed side lightwells: According to paragraph H10 of the Conservation Area Statement proposals should respect the original style of boundary and particular care should be taken to preserve the green character of the Conservation area. The proposed lightwells would be close to the front building line but they would not

be directly visible from the public realm, and would have minimal impact on the conservation area, due to the presence of high boundary walls and generous existing planting on the front garden. Following the advice from the Council's design officer the proposed balustrading around the south side lightwell which is next to the front building line was replaced with horizontal grille cover to avoid impact on the setting of the front elevation of the existing house. Due to the set back from the front building line the impact of the proposed north side lightwell which would be secured by metal balustrade on the front elevation of the building would not be significant. The proposed lightwells are considered to be acceptable in design terms.

- 6.3.9 Sunken Garden: The proposed sunken garden would serve the rear rooms on the proposed basement level and would take up less than one quarter of the existing rear garden space. Including the planting beds it would be 4.5m (depth) by 10.4 (width). The sunken garden would not be visible from the street and the planting beds would help to minimise the exposure of the basement level on the rear elevation. The proposed sunken garden is considered not to have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the existing house and the Hampstead Conservation Area.
- 6.3.10 Conclusion: The proposed alterations and extensions to rear and side elevation would improve the appearance of the existing house. The proposal would not harm the principle elevation of the building. Overall the combination of demolition and rebuild is considered to produce a scheme that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area.

#### 6.4 **Impact on Trees and Landscaping**

- 6.4.1 There are mature trees on the application and adjoining sites. The applicants submitted an Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report in respect of the proposed scheme. According to the report the proposal would have a minimum impact on the nearby trees with amenity value and subject to precautionary measures the potential impacts on the nearby trees can be mitigated. The report also makes reference to the potential impact of the excavation of the garden and driveway to resolve level differences (outside the footprint of the proposed basement) being similar to the similar works proposed under planning permission ref: 2006/5828/P.
- 6.4.2 In the light of the submitted arboricultural report the Council's landscape and tree officer considers that the minimal impact on the trees caused by the proposal is highly unlikely to harm their long term viability and the proposed landscaping to be acceptable.
- 6.4.3 Subject to a safeguarding condition for further details of tree protection measures the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

#### 6.5 **Basement Impact**

- 6.5.1 The proposal would involve a substantial basement excavation works totalling to a volume of approximately 1150 m<sup>3</sup>. The proposed basement level would extend to a maximum depth of 4.5m below the existing ground level. The footprint of the

proposed basement would be mainly contained under the footprint of the building except the sunken garden.

- 6.5.2 Policy DP27 states that the Council will only permit basement and other underground development that does not cause harm to the built and natural environment and local amenity and does not result in flooding or ground instability. The applicants submitted a Basement Impact Assessment Report which covers screening, scoping, site investigation, impact assessment and recommendations to address policy DP27.
- 6.5.3 The application site is not identified among the streets at risk of surface flooding on page 29 of CPG4. The site is underlain by the Claygate Member of the London Clay Formation which is designated as Secondary Aquifer by the Environmental Agency.
- 6.5.4 Three cable percussion boreholes to depths of 10.m, 15m and 20m, four drive-in window sampler boreholes with a maximum depth of 5.5m and seven trail pits with depths of between 0.2 and 1.65m were dug for the site investigation. These were monitored over a period of roughly five weeks. The investigation confirmed the presence of a moderate thickness of made ground (with depths of between 0.15m and 1.5m) and the Claygate Member beneath it. Ground water was encountered within the Claygate member at depths of between 0.25m and 0.70m.
- 6.5.5 On the basis of the investigation the report recommends some form of groundwater control for basement excavation and provision of temporary support to maintain stability of the excavation and surrounding structures at all times and underpinning of the existing foundations prior the construction of the basement or supporting the existing foundations by new retaining walls. The preferred method of using sheet piles as a permanent retaining wall is also considered to be a suitable option in the report. The agent's e-mail dated 03/07/2013 also confirms that the design of the propped sheet pile will ensure movement is limited such that a Burland category 0-1 (negligible) is achieved. A full condition survey is expected to be carried out prior to the works taking place and the contractor will design and monitor the temporary works to the property to limit deflections and risk of cracking to 63 Frogal.
- 6.5.6 The proposed basement would not significantly extend to the garden. It is proposed to direct the site drainage to the public sewer as ground conditions would not be suitable for a soakway or similar SUDs based system. However, a rainwater harvesting tank for watering the garden is proposed to be incorporated to the proposed scheme. The proposal is acceptable in terms of policy DP23.
- 6.5.7 The Building Regulations 2010 Part A requires that details of the temporary support to maintain stability of the adjoining properties and pile foundations be reviewed prior to construction and retaining walls of the proposed basement level be examined on site. However, in addition it is considered appropriate to include a condition for a qualified Chartered Engineer to inspect both the permanent and temporary basement construction works due to the nature of the basement works and necessary measures to control groundwater and ground movements.

- 6.5.8 The reports relating to basement impact and ground investigation are considered to address policy DP27 as they cover all the stages set out in CPG4. It is considered that the proposed basement could be constructed without harming the water environment and structural stability of the adjoining properties.
- 6.5.9 Contamination testing on site has revealed elevated concentrations of lead, total PAH including benzo(a)pyrene. A condition for further soil and ground water contamination and details of mitigation measures (if necessary) is recommended.

## 6.6 **Standards of Basement Level Accommodation**

- 6.6.1 All the habitable rooms on the proposed basement level except the front bedroom would be well lit and ventilated. The proposed front room would be served by a window which would be served by a 1.5m by 4m lightwell on the south side. This window would not have an adequate allowable window area not blocked by walls within 30° in accordance with the Council's standards (shown on Figure 10 of CPG2). Given the rest of the house has good access the natural light and the layout of the proposed basement level could be changed without needing planning permission the refusal of this application on this ground would be difficult to justify.

## 6.7 **Neighbouring Amenity**

- 6.7.1 Policy DP26 aims to protect the quality of life of neighbours that might be affected by developments. The proposal would not be likely to worsen the existing situation in terms of loss of daylight, outlook or privacy to the neighbouring properties as the proposed extensions would not be significantly higher than the ground floor level and no side windows above the ground floor level within close proximity to the flank windows of the neighbouring properties are proposed.
- 6.7.2 The site is located on a quiet residential road and the proposal includes air conditioning units within the proposed side lightwells. Policy DP28 seeks to ensure that noise and vibration is controlled and managed and will not grant planning permission for development likely to generate noise pollution; or development sensitive to noise in locations with noise pollution, unless appropriate attenuation measures are provided. The Noise and Vibration Thresholds set out in Table E of this policy need to be complied in this case.
- 6.7.3 The applicants submitted a noise impact assessment to establish the impact of the proposed a/c units on the background noise level around the site. The closest noise sensitive facades are the south side elevation of no 65 and north side elevation of no 61. The lowest background noise level as measured from the front garden of the application property is 35 dBA. The noise levels from the proposed a/c units at 1m from the nearest noise sensitive windows would be between 24dBA and 27dBA. Therefore the proposed units would be capable of meeting the Council's criterion of the maximum permitted additional level of 30dBA.
- 6.7.4 The submitted noise report is considered to sufficiently demonstrate that the proposed a/c units would not be likely to cause noise nuisance to the neighbouring occupiers. The Council's Environmental Health officer is also satisfied that the

proposed a/c units would achieve the Council's noise criteria and recommends the Council's standard condition for plant noise levels.

## **6.8 Transport**

- 6.8.1 There is an existing vehicular crossover access to the site, and access to public transport is good (PTAL3). The proposal would not result in additional on-site parking space as the landscaping of the proposed garden would not be significantly different than the existing. However the proposal would involve in a substantial basement excavation and construction works for the proposed extensions and alterations therefore a detailed Construction Management Plan in accordance with the requirements of section 8 of CPG6 needs to be secured via S106 legal agreement.
- 6.8.2 Policy DP21 seeks to protect the safety and operation of the highway network. It is considered the proposed works would result in a large number of construction vehicle movements to and from the site, which will doubtless have a significant impact on the local transport network. The applicant has provided a Draft Construction Management Statement which requires further details of the number and type of vehicles to the site on a daily basis, amounts of dirt or dust that may be spread onto the public highway and any occupation of the highway, such as for hoarding, skips or storage of materials etc. These details will ensure compliance with policies CS5, CS11, DP20 and DP26.
- 6.8.3 In order to mitigate the impact of the increase in trips this development would generate, and to tie the development into the surrounding urban environment, a financial contribution should be required to repave the footway adjacent to the site. This work and any other work that needs to be undertaken within the highway reservation will need to be secured through a Section 106 Agreement with the Council.
- 6.8.4 Subject to a S106 agreement for a detailed Construction Management Plan and financial contribution towards highway works the proposal is considered to be acceptable in transport terms.

## **6.9 CIL**

- 6.9.1 This proposal will be liable for the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the additional floorspace exceeds 100sqm GIA. Based on the Mayor's CIL charging schedule and the information given on the plans, the charge is likely to be £15,000. This does not include any surcharges or indexation which may be applied to a CIL payment.

## 6.10 Sustainability

6.10.1 Policy DP22 requires developments to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures. The proposed scheme would add approx 299sqm of floorspace to the building and would include substantial basement excavation. The applicants have indicated that they are willing to achieve BREEAM rating of 'Very Good' throughout the refurbishment scheme. The proposed sustainability measures would include rainwater harvesting tank; improving the thermal performance of existing house; use of energy efficient lighting and heating system; use of water efficient products, use of materials that are responsibly sourced; recycling construction waste where possible; and use of contractor as part of 'Considerate Constructors Scheme'. The proposed sustainability measures are welcomed and would be secured by condition.

## 7. CONCLUSION

7.1 The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in design terms as the proposed extensions and alterations would not compromise the architectural composition of the existing building or harm the character and appearance of the wider conservation area. The proposed basement excavation would be carried out without harming the trees and neighbouring structures subject to appropriate care. The proposal would also not be likely to harm the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties.

7.2 Planning Permission is recommended subject to a S106 Legal Agreement covering the following Heads of Terms:

- Construction Management Plan (to be approved prior to any works starting on site and the approved plan shall be followed); and
- Financial contribution towards highway works (amount to be calculated by Highways Design Team).

## 8. LEGAL COMMENTS

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