

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		29/07/2013	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		28/06/2013	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Christopher Heather				2013/2958/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
58D King Henrys Road London NW3 3RP				See draft decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Excavation to provide basement level, erection of two storey rear extension at basement and ground floor level, installation of a lightwell and alterations to the front elevation at ground floor level including the conversion of the garage to a habitable room (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional planning permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	02	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00	
			No. electronic	00			
Summary of consultation responses:		N/A					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		N/A					

Site Description

The site is a single family dwellinghouse on the northern side of King Henry's Road near to the junction with Primrose Hill Road. It is part of a wider terrace of 11 properties which date back to the early 1960s and which back onto the railway line. They are all constructed of yellow London stock bricks with horizontal timber slats. They were constructed with integral garages, although a number of them have now been altered. The site itself currently has a ground floor, first floor and second floor, with a small crawl space at basement level.

The site is not a listed building and is not within a conservation area. Elsewhere in King Henry's Road there is a mix of architectural styles including more traditional terraced and semi-detached properties, blocks of flats, and low density modern buildings.

Relevant History

July 2003: Planning permission (Ref: 2003/0902/P) granted for "The retention of existing railings to the extension at rear first floor level and the erection of a new trellis to each side".

August 2002: Planning permission (Ref: PEX0200643) granted for "Certificate of Lawfulness for Existing single storey rear extension at ground floor level to a single-family dwelling".

November 2007: Certificate of lawfulness (Ref: 2007/4507/P) granted for "Erection of two-storey rear extension at basement and ground floor level in connection with existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3)" at **58 King Henry's Road**.

September 2008: Planning permission (Ref:2008/4216/P) granted for "Erection of a new 2 storey plus basement dwelling house with rear terrace at second floor level on land adjacent to 58D King Henry's Road" at **58E King Henry's Road**.

March 2010: Planning permission (Ref: 2010/1438/P) granted for "Excavation of basement and erection of a two storey rear extension at basement and ground floor level to dwelling house (Class C3)" at **58A King Henry's Road**.

October 2011: Planning permission (Ref: 2011/3800/P) granted for "Erection of 3-storey building with lower ground floor level for use as a single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3)" at Land adjacent to **58D King Henry's Road**.

December 2012: Planning permission (Ref: 2012/6456/P) granted for "Excavation of basement and rear extension at lower ground and ground floor levels and alterations to hard standing including bin and cycle store to the front of existing dwelling (Class C3)" at **58B King Henry's Road**.

May 2013: Planning application (Ref: 2013/1639/P) submitted for "Erection of basement and rear extensions, alterations to front elevation, and alterations to the rear including replacement railings and staircase to garden, in connection with a change of use from single dwelling to two flats (Class C3)" at **56D King Henry's Road**. As of 29 August 2013 it had not been determined but is on the agenda for the Members' Briefing on 2 September 2013 with a recommendation of approval.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 (Distribution of growth)
CS4 (Areas of limited change)
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)
CS18 (Dealing with our waste and encouraging recycling)

DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking)
DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)

DP23 (Water)
DP24 (Securing high quality design)
DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)
DP27 (Basements and lightwells)
DP28 (Noise and vibration)

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 (Design)
CPG4 (Basements and lightwells)
CPG6 (Amenity)
CPG8 (Planning obligations)

London Plan (2011)

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Assessment

Proposal and background

The proposal is for the excavation of a basement underneath the existing dwellinghouse. It would extend forward underneath the front driveway by 4.55m, underneath the footprint of the existing building and out to the rear by 1.85m from the existing rear building line. The basement would be 3.5m in depth from the existing floor level of the ground floor, which provides a floor to ceiling height for the basement floor of 3m. It would contain a large living/kitchen/dining room which to the rear has large glass doors opening out onto the garden area, and a utility area, WC and plant room to the rear. There would be small glass rooflight to the rear to provide light to the front part of the basement. Overall, it would be 76.5sqm when measured externally, and 64.8sqm internally.

The rear projection of the basement is part of a two storey rear extension which includes the ground floor, where a living area and bedroom would be provided. Above this are a further 3 bedrooms at first and second floors which are unchanged externally. To the front the existing garage door, windows and door at ground floor are to be removed and replaced with more modern glazed windows and doors. A bin store and a cycling store would be provided to the front area.

Design

Policies CS14 and DP24 are of relevance, as is CPG1. The building is relatively recent, and whilst proportioned appropriately for the immediate area it has little design merit beyond this. Other properties in the terrace have been altered over time at both front and rear. Some of the original integral garages have been made into rooms with associated external alterations, including at this property even though the garage door remains. What is currently in place is acceptable and appears to be original but there is not considered to be a justification for preserving it: the lack of uniformity at ground floor level means that the proposed alterations would not look out of place. The small glass rooflight (which is viewed as a floorlight from outside) would be discrete and as the front areas of these properties are used for car parking it would hardly be visible. The replacement door and window would be modern and have thinner profiles than what is there now. This would improve the appearance as it would better match the more regular pattern of windows above. The refuse and cycle stores would be relatively small in the context of the appearance of the front of the building. They would sit against the wall of 58 King Henry's Road which extends forward of the predominant building line, so minimising their impact.

To the rear is a similar lack of uniformity with many of the properties nearby having been extended, including some at basement level. In addition, with the site backing onto the railway line visibility is practically nil. Immediately opposite is a nature reserve and although there would be some views from Blashford House they would be some distance away and seen in the context of the wider terrace. A staircase and balcony would be removed to accommodate the extension but this is of little merit and not considered worthy of retention. There is evidence from the approved drawings for that the balcony only came into existence when a rear extension (which appears to have been quite ramshackle) was removed. With the site sloping down the basement would not be very visible. It would have slimline metal doors opening out onto the garden, and some excavation of the garden would be required in front of the extension. Above this the ground floor extension would match the basement extension in appearance, with windows to match. Views from either side would be limited because of the shallow depth of the rear gardens, and the lack of vantage points for the whole rear is such that it is difficult to object to it on visual amenity grounds. The extension would be brick to match the existing brickwork and this is acceptable.

Quality of the resulting residential accommodation

The proposal would provide for greater internal space, which would suggest an improvement to the unit. Amenity space is an important consideration and a factor in providing quality homes as required by policy CS6. The proposal would result in the loss of some space to the rear and a small terrace at first floor level which currently allows for some amenity space, but is in a poor state of repair. The rear is a concrete slab which was presumably part of the original construction as it is difficult to see how it was added retrospectively. It ends before the main retaining wall of the railway leaving a gap which currently has no protection around it. It is a very low quality space, and it is difficult to imagine it being pleasant to use, but also how it could be made so. The proposal would result in only 7.3sqm, which is well below what would normally be expected for a unit of this size. However, a judgement needs to be made on how likely it is that the current poor space can/will be upgraded, and it is considered that it is unlikely. Therefore, there are considered to be exceptional circumstances why the loss of the outdoor space is acceptable. Bespoke cycling and refuse storage is an improvement on the existing situation, even though it is not a strict requirement of a householder application (hence why no condition is imposed to require them to implement this aspect of the development). There would be a small loss of space to the front as a result, but the what remains would be large enough to accommodate two cars, which is important so as not to put further pressure on the existing on-street parking in accordance with DP16.

Neighbouring amenity

Policies CS5 and DP26 are of relevance, as is CPG6. There are no residential units to the rear which would be affected as the railway line is in the way. To the front are properties on the opposite side of the road but the alterations to the front would not change the relationship with them. To the west is a newly built property. The extension would be to a similar extent and there would be no impact on the amenity of this neighbour by virtue of daylight, sunlight or overlooking. To the other side the extension would project out further than the existing rear of this property. There would be no overlooking issues and no loss of sunlight due to the rear of these properties facing the north. There would be an impact on the daylight received, and referring to the BRE guidelines it is marginal as to whether or not this is acceptable. On balance, it is considered that it is, as the windows affected are relatively large.

Construction Management Plans (CMP) are often required for basement excavations, to mitigate any impacts on neighbours during the construction phase. The level of excavation is not considered to be so great as to warrant this, and the front driveway does allow for some of the impacts to be contained on site. The applicant has submitted a construction management statement and so there is some indication that they have considered construction issues.

Basement

Policy DP27 concerns basements, and CPG4 provides the methodology for assessing them and their impacts. The consultant also worked on the basements construction at 58e which is nearing completion. Stage 1 (Screening) does not identify any issues to do with subterranean groundwater: it is not above an aquifer, or near to any watercourses, well or spring line. The water table is below the lowest point of the basement. There are no issues of surface flow and flooding raised: the existing surface flows would not be altered, and the proportion of hardstanding would remain unchanged. In terms of slope stability some issues are raised: the railway land drops off very near to the end of the basement, the site is in an area of previously worked land. It is also within 5m of a highway. The road is not susceptible to flooding.

In response to this the issues are explored further in stage 2 (Scoping). The applicant has advised that there is no risk to the existing stability of the slope and adjacent Network Rail retaining wall. This is because the existing loading pattern on the retaining wall and or the load on the ground/soil strata would be unchanged: the existing house is founded on piles which extend 10m into the London Clay strata below. The basement would be founded solely within the made ground and will not impact on the London Clay, and would be independent of the wall. Liaison with Network Rail would be required as it was for 58e, which was successful. The house is 4.65m from the public highway, and although the basement would extend nearly up to it, it would not extend underneath and there would be no impact on pedestrians and no discernable impact on surface flow and flooding.

The applicant has relied on the site investigation carried out for the basement development for the new dwelling next door and the recent excavation of 58b. This made ground is 4.5m deep. Below this a weak layer of

concrete of 20cm, and below this to a depth of approximately 10m is London Clay. Although not on the site itself this is considered so close as to not be relevant. The investigation did not find any water. To construct the basement the applicant would excavate beneath the existing ground level. The reinforced concrete walls would also act as a retaining wall to the driveway. The applicant has advised that there is existing capacity within the public sewer system, and because the extent of hardstanding would not increase the area of rainfall is unchanged.

Overall, the applicant is considered to have satisfied the requirements of CPG4 and DP27.

CIL

The proposal would not result in an increase in floorspace greater than 100sqm, and so there would be no requirement for a contribution towards the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy.

Other matters

In the rear garden there are no trees, and there are not considered to be any particular issues of sustainability given that this is a householder application.

Conclusion

The existing building is not considered to have particular design merit and the properties in the terrace have been altered. Therefore, the alterations to the front and rear are considered acceptable, with the rear extension being visible from very few vantage points. The proposal would generally improve the quality of the space, and although there is a degree of concern about the loss of amenity space the poor quality of what is there now is a factor in considering this loss acceptable. The impact on neighbours is considered minimal, except for the impact on the property to the west where the impact is, on balance, acceptable. The applicant has demonstrated that the impact of the basement has been considered thoroughly and that there are no issues expected to arise, and there are no other issues which are considered to indicate that planning permission should not be granted.

Recommendation: Grant conditional planning permission.