Address:	**Flat 1 50 Canfield Gardens London NW6 3EB**	
Application Number:	2012/2812/P	**Officer: Conor McDonagh**
Ward:	Swiss Cottage	
Date Received:	**29/05/2012**	
Proposal: Excavation of basement with rear lightwells and erection of single-storey rear ground floor level extension (following demolition of existing ground floor rear extension) all in connection with existing ground floor residential flat (Class C3).		
Drawing Numbers: Site Location Plan; (Prefix TCC/125/) X1; X2; X3; X4; X5; OD1 Rev B; OD2 Rev B; OD3 Rev B; OD4 Rev A; OD5 Rev D; OD6 Rev D; OD7; OD8 Rev B; OD9; (Prefix 1418) 01; 02; 03 and 04. **Documents:** Basement Impact Assessment by Land Science dated 28/05/2012; Basement Impact Assessment Response to Arup BIA Audit dated 20/12/2012; Basement Impact Assessment Supplementary Report by Enzygo Dec. 2012; Heritage and Design & Access Statement by Nicola Hicks Designs; and Arboricultural Survey by Indigo Surveys dated March 2012.		
RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant conditional permission		
Applicant:	**Agent:**	
Mr & Mrs Thomas Castaignede 51 Compayne Gardens London NW6 3DB	Nicola Hicks Designs 28 Woodside Wimbledon London SW19 7AW	

OFFICERS' REPORT

Reason for Referral to Committee:

The application was reported to Member's Briefing on 23/07/2012 and Members advised that the application should be reported to Committee.

The application was reported to Committee on 20/09/2012. Members requested that the item be deferred to allow independent assessment of the applicant's Basement Impact Assessment. Consequently, this report is largely the same as that in the earlier agenda with exception of section 6.4, which has been updated to include the details of the independent assessment that has been carried out.

1. SITE

1.1 The application site relates to the ground floor flat at No. 50 Canfield Gardens. No. 50 Canfield Gardens is a 3-storey semi-detached property with basement on the north side of Canfield Gardens, approximately 70m from the junction with Fairhazel Gardens. The property currently comprises 4 self contained flats and has a substantial rear garden (25m deep x 11.3m wide) with a small single storey extension to the rear. The existing basement measures 2.6m by 5.9m and has a

depth of 2.1m. It is located centrally within the building's footprint and does not manifest itself externally.

1.2 The building is located in the South Hampstead Conservation Area and is identified as a positive contributor in the Conservation Area Statement.

2. THE PROPOSAL

Basement extension

2.1 The proposed basement would be 3m deep with an internal ceiling height of 2.6m. Under the building's footprint, the basement would be full width and set back by 5.5m from the building's front elevation. To the rear, the basement would extend beyond the building line by approximately 8.3m; however 6.465m of this would be beneath a proposed rear extension at ground level and it would be less than the width of the host building, with a small 0.8 x 2.1m lightwell serving its rear. A larger lightwell extending 3m from the existing rear bay feature would accommodate the remaining width of the building. The basement would have a gross internal area of 113.22sqm, and comprise 3 bedrooms and a media room.

Rear extension

2.2 The proposed single storey rear extension at ground level would measure 6m in depth with a width of 6.465m, to match the basement width below. It would have a flat roof measuring 3.672m above ground level. The ground floor level would comprise 2 bedrooms to the front and kitchen / dining / family living area to the rear.

2.3 Other alterations involve a raised patio comprising of timber decking to the rear of the proposed single storey extension. There would be steps to provide access to the garden.

Revisions and background

2.4 Following concerns raised at Member's Briefing on 23 July 2012 regarding the light received by the basement bedroom No. 3, revisions were made to increase the size of the lightwell in order to comply with the provisions of the Camden Planning Guidance (CPG2 – Housing).

2.5 The application was subsequently reported to Committee on 20 September 2012. The Committee indicated that the rear extension was acceptable in design and amenity terms. With regard to the basement extension, the Committee also indicated acceptance of its size and form. The Committee raised concern about the conclusions of the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA), in particular the impact potential for flooding and water perching.

2.6 Consequently the Committee unanimously voted to defer the application so that the BIA could be independently verified. The application would then be reported back to Committee once any concerns or recommendations, highlighted by the independent verification, have been appropriately addressed by the applicant.

2.7 The council instructed Arup to independently verify the BIA on 8 October 2012 and Arup's verification report was received on 28 October 2012. This report contained recommendations and was passed to the applicant. In response to Arup's recommendations, the applicant submitted a BIA Supplementary Report (by Enzygo) and a BIA Response to the Arup BIA Audit (by Maxtrix 24) on 2 January 2012. The contents of these revised BIA documents are considered in detail within the basement section of this report.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

Application site

3.1 **8905866** - Change of use and works of conversion to the second floor and to roof space to form one self-contained flat and one maisonette – **Granted** on 14/03/1990.

3.2 **PW9802164R1** - Enlargement of an existing single storey flat roof rear extension – **Granted** on 29/05/1998.

3.3 **PW9802462R1** - Enclosure of existing roof and the formation of a new roof terrace – **Granted** on 26/10/1998.

Neighbouring properties

3.4 **44 Canfield Gardens: 2010/3616/P** - Conversion of an existing residential premises (Class C3) from 1 x 2-bedroom and 2 x 3-bedroom flats to 1 x 1-bedroom and 1 x 6-bedroom flats; associated works include basement excavation, erection of new single storey rear ground floor extension following the demolition of an existing single storey addition, a glass balustrade and privacy screen associated with the use of the roof of the extension as a terrace, two rear dormers, 4 velux roof lights to the front,1 to the side and 3 on the main flat roof, alterations to fenestration, including the infill of 2 window openings to the side, a new entrance door to replace existing to the side and front boundary treatment – **Granted** on 23/11/2010.

3.5 **84 Canfield Gardens: 2007/4701/P and 2010/5552/P** - Excavation of basement level with two lightwells on the front elevation and erection of rear extension at basement and ground floor level in connection with existing ground floor level flats – **Granted** on 13/11/2007 and again on 30/12/2010.

3.6 **71 Canfield Gardens: 2008/4166/P** - Conversion of three flats into single dwelling over five floors and a basement flat, including the extension of the existing basement with grille covered lightwell to front, new single storey rear extension with roof terrace on top and alterations to the roof including a rear dormer extension, rear roof terrace and the insertion of rooflights – **Granted** on 11/11/2008.

3.7 **80 Canfield Gardens: 2007/4702/P & 2008/1740/P** - Extension to the existing 2x residential flats at ground and first floor levels by excavating a basement level with

two front lightwells and erection of a rear extension at basement level with terrace above – **Granted** on 15/11/2007 and 06/06/2008.

3.8 **90 Canfield Gardens: 2006/3868/P** - Excavation to create enlarged basement including addition of glazing at rear basement level, erection of a single-storey rear conservatory and single-storey extension to accommodate a garage both at ground floor level, installation of a glass canopy over the front door, erection of a balcony at rear ground floor and alterations to fenestration of the existing dwellinghouse – **Granted** on 31/10/2006.

3.9 **95 Canfield Gardens: 2006/0380/P** - Extensions and alterations to single dwelling house including reinstatement of front bay window, erection of a basement and ground floor rear extension and minor alterations to fenestration – **Granted** on 28/03/2006.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbouring Occupiers

	Original	**Revised**
Number of letters sent	21	56
Total number of responses received	23	14
Number in support	0	0
Number of objections	23	14
Number of general comment	2	0

Original

4.1 A total of 21 individual letters were posted to neighbouring properties on 07/06/2012. A site notice was displayed from 14/06/2012 until 05/07/2012 and an advert was placed in the Ham and High Newspaper on 21/06/2012.

23 objections were received in respect of the following:

- The area suffers from unstable ground conditions and basement excavations will cause structural damage and result in flooding issues;
- Canfield Gardens is on the list of Camden's most vulnerable roads for flooding;
- The application site and adjoining buildings have a history of being unstable;
- There are issues with subsidence in the area;
- There are protected trees in the front garden;
- The development will cause serious damage to neighbouring properties;
- There is a storm relief sewer running underneath Nos. 48 and 50 Canfield Gardens;
- The BIA by Land Science omits key factors;
- Due to the basement construction and underpinning at No. 50, No. 48 will eventually suffer from structural damage;
- Development out of keeping with character of the conservation area;
- The combined impact of many basement extensions in this area will be harmful to other properties;

- The development would not preserve the historic character and will cause harm to long term residence;
- The precedent set by previous developments should not influence current decision making;
- The BIA soil tests were undertaken during exceptionally dry times;
- Damages to the underlying water table;
- Noise and disturbance as a result of construction works;
- Disruption to streets, traffic and pedestrians;
- Parking issues; and
- The proposal would cause damage to the fabric and appearance of the building.

4.2 A letter from MP Glenda Jackson dated 27/06/2012 was also received stating that the Council should take into account the concerns raised by the resident of No. 48.

Local Groups

4.3 Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead (CRASH) objects for the following reasons:

- There 5 Lime trees in the front of the house should not be harmed;
- Excavations may well have an adverse impact on flooding to the site and its neighbours.

Revised (new BIA provided following Arup's Report)

4.4 A total of 56 individual letters were posted on 04/01/2012 to neighbouring properties. This is higher than the original due to the number of unsolicited letters received, and individual persons from the same household sending separate responses. A site notice was re-displayed from 10/01/2013 until 31/01/2013 and an advert was placed in the Ham and High Newspaper on 17/01/2013.

14 objections were received which repeat the concerns already expressed above, however in direct response to the revised BIA the following comments are made.

- The Arup report supports the neighbouring concerns in that the knock-on effects could well be considerable but hard to predict;
- The host building has already been underpinned on several occasions, which indicates its already unstable;
- If the Enzygo BIA supplementary reports are not referred back to Arup for verification how will Councillor's be in a position to take a view that the outstanding points have been addressed?;
- The existing basement has a water pump, which shows that the property already suffers flooding;
- The stand pipe has been flooded most recently in December 2012, which shows there is a problem;
- Arup's question as to causes of previous flooding has been ignored by Enzygo and not answered;
- The Enzygo BIA does not deal adequately with flooding risk to neighbours, the onsite attenuation measures would only mitigate the applicant site;

- The Thames Water relief sewer chamber which was excavated at the site in 1993 has been overlooked in the Enzygo BIA;
- In times of very heavy down pour the manhole of the relief sewer has been dislodged by water pressure beneath;
- Camden Council should automatically refuse any basement applications in an areas prone to flooding;
- The response by Enzygo inadequately deals with the Arup review;
- There has been much rain since the single monitoring of the standpipe since spring 2012, resulting in rear gardens having been flooded several times;
- The Enzygo BIA report actually acknowledges that that the current surface water poses a problem to the host property and neighbours;
- The proposed tanking of water would only divert the groundwater flow to neighbouring properties;
- It is clear from external evidence that the damage from basement excavations in this area are more than 'slight' or 'anecdotal';
- Many front gardens have already been paved over reducing surface water drainage, and this will only be exacerbated by basement extensions;
- The works would at the least require redecoration of the flats above as cracks will appear on the internal walls.

Local Groups

4.5 Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead (CRASH) objects for the following reasons:

- The Enzygo BIA report recommends mitigation measures to safeguard the proposed site, which is of little remedy or consolation to the neighbouring houses;
- Tanking invariably leads to groundwater being diverted and neighbouring cellars being flooded;
- The original standpipe installed by Land Science in spring 2012 has been inspected as 'flooded' in December 2012 by Enzygo, since this inspection further persistent rain has waterlogged no. 50's garden and the neighbouring gardens, yet plans for more hard surfacing will increase the water table;
- Enzygo suggests that any ground settlement and consolidation will have occurred as the building is over 100 years old, however the property has a long history of destabilisation and has been underpinned a number times, and was damaged further in 1993 when the North Western Storm Relief sewer was excavated immediately beneath the host building. It should now be considered previously worked ground;
- Other recently excavated basements in the conservation area have caused serious structural damage, not only 'anecdotal evidence' as the applicant's Matrix Report suggests;
- No more basements should be allowed in this conservation area until further expert information on the cumulative impact on the water table is undertaken and full surveys are conducted in every instance of damage that has occurred.

5. POLICIES

5.1 NPPF (2012)

5.2 London Plan (2011)

5.3 **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

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)
DP20 (Movement of goods and materials)
DP27 (Basements and lightwells)

5.4 **Supplementary Planning Policies**

Camden Planning Guidance 2011
CPG 1 (Design)
CPG4 (Basements and lightwells)
CPG 6 (Amenity)

South Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal (February 2011)

6. ASSESSMENT

6.1 **Land use**

6.1.1 The principle of extending a residential property is acceptable subject to an appropriate design and protection of neighbouring amenity.

6.2 **Design**

6.2.1 Policy DP25 of the LDF requires that all alterations and extensions within designated conservation areas preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area.

Basement

6.2.2 The proposed basement extension would only manifest itself at the rear in the form of two external lightwells, which would not be visible from any public realm. Similar developments have been granted and constructed to properties along Canfield Gardens, and the site benefits from a substantial rear garden so that the lightwells would not affect the soft landscaping to an unacceptable degree. The basement and lightwells would preserve the character and appearance of the South Hampstead Conservation Area.

Rear extension

6.2.3 The extension was subject to pre-application discussions and is the result of the advice given by the Council's design advisors, having been reduced in size from 8m to 6m in depth with a width of 6.465m. Being less than full width positively preserves the existing bay window architectural feature. The scale of the extension is subservient to the large host building and would sit comfortably within the context of a substantial 25m deep rear garden. It was noted during the site inspection that substantial rear extensions of various sizes and design have been constructed to neighbouring properties, the most recent being in 2010 at 44 Canfield Gardens. The extension would be of a contemporary appearance with a flat roof and include materials that match the host building which is considered appropriate in the conservation area.

6.2.6 The raised patio and lightwells at the rear would not significantly reduce the amount of soft landscaping in the rear garden. A large area of grass and landscaping is retained, which preserves the conservation area.

6.3 **Neighbouring residential amenity**

Overshadowing

6.3.1 The proposed rear extension would extend by an additional 2m to what exists at present (4m deep to 6m), with the 1m separation to the common boundary with No. 52 maintained. This coupled with No. 52 having a rear extension of a similar depth to that proposed and there being a 1.8m boundary treatment it would result in no amenity harm to No. 52. The significant separation distance from the boundary of No. 48 is maintained, so there will be no impact. The proposal is acceptable in this respect.

Privacy / Overlooking:

6.3.3 Being single storey in height with no windows in the side elevation, there is no overlooking to No. 52. The proposal is a sufficient distance from the neighbour at No. 48 and would have no impact on the amenities of this neighbour.

6.3.6 The flat at first floor level is in different ownership and the extension's flat roof can therefore not be used as a terrace. Notwithstanding, a planning condition is imposed to prevent the flat roof from being used as a terrace.

Noise during construction:

6.3.7 Construction noise would be temporary and should only take place during the hours enforced by Environmental Health which is between 8am and 6pm Mondays to Fridays, between 8am and 1pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays, Bank and Public holidays. The standard informative has been added to the decision notice to remind the applicant of these restrictions. A Construction Management Plan would also be secured by condition, following the request of the previous Committee. In light of a s106 not being required for any other term, the Transport Officer confirms that it would be appropriate to secure a CMP by condition in this instance.

6.4 **Basement Impact Assessment:**

6.4.1 Policy DP27 states that the most appropriate type of basement development should 'not extend beyond the footprint of the original building' and be 'no deeper than one full storey below ground'. This policy is supplemented by the CPG4 (Basements and Lightwells). The basement extension would comply with this guidance in respect of not extending deeper than one storey below ground, however whilst the basement would not extend the full footprint of the existing building (set back 5.5m from front elevation), it would extend 8.3m beyond the original rear wall. Consequently a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) was necessary to demonstrate that the excavation would:
a) maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbours,
b) avoid adverse impact on drainage and run-off, and
c) avoid cumulative impact on the water environment in the local area.

6.4.2 Accordingly a BIA by Land Science was submitted. The BIA followed the guidance of CPG4, with regards to undertaking screening, scoping and site investigation stages. In accordance with policy DP27 the level of information provided in the BIA was deemed 'commensurate with the scale and location of the scheme' and it was reasonable for officers to accept the findings of the BIA, and the subsequent recommendations and mitigation measures proposed, by the qualified engineers who produced the BIA. Moreover the standard basement condition, to secure the presence of a qualified engineer on site during basement excavation and construction works, was also included.

6.4.3 The extent of the basement and the general detail of the BIA was subsequently reported to Committee, and whilst the Committee purported to accept the principle of the basement's size and location, the Committee was not satisfied that the BIA properly addressed the basement's impact upon the water environment. The concerns of the local community with regards to basement and rear garden flooding and water perching needed further investigation. As such the Committee requested that the Land Science BIA be independently verified. Any issues or recommendations as a result of the verification were to be considered by the applicant in a revised BIA and reported back to Committee. As such, in response to the Committee's request, the following paragraphs of this report will focus on the concerns raised by Arup in their independent verification and the applicant's response in the revised BIA documents by Matrix 24 and Enzygo.

<u>Summary of the independent verification</u>

6.4.4 Before the applicant's revised BIA is considered, it is appropriate to summarise Arup's findings. Arup considered that several components of CPG4 were not satisfactorily addressed by the applicant's BIA, produced by Land Science. This included a lack of a desk study for a site known to be at risk from flooding, no detail of neighbouring basement or ground levels, no calculations to support the lateral stability of walls (existing, proposed and party walls), lack of basement construction sequence, no assessment of ground movements, no proposal for monitoring movements, no supporting evidence for the Burland damage assessment of 'slight', causes of previous flooding or perched water not properly considered and no risk mitigation measures indicated. The applicant's response to Arup's concerns have been considered in revised BIA material, and discussed below.

Desk study, drawings and further information

6.4.5 In response to Arup, the applicant commissioned Enzygo to undertake a full desk study and provide topographical survey drawings to support the existing intrusive ground investigation that formed part of the Land Science BIA. Drawings to show the precise areas of underpinning in relation to neighbouring party walls and foundations, and any neighbouring basements, have now also been provided. Enzygo have also provided details of all services near the property including water mains and storm water drains. Officer's are satisfied that the revised BIA has provided the additional information Arup requested in order to allow a more robust assessment of the site's physical conditions in accommodating a basement excavation. Each physical condition is considered separately below.

Ground movements and impact on neighbouring structures

6.4.6 Arup advised that calculations be submitted to support the structural and geotechnical lateral stability of the existing brick wall footing that will sit above the new reinforced concrete wall (which is to act as a retaining wall) and calculations of the interaction between both these walls. A calculation of the load bearing pressures beneath underpins, in particular along party walls, and the likely long term settlements were also sought.

6.4.7 The revised BIA includes the aforementioned calculations. The calculations demonstrate that a minimum foundation width of 0.5m and a proposed underpinning depth of 3m below ground level would have a differential settlement and heave of less than 5mm between No. 50 and 52, and 3mm below the basement itself. This would indicate that there would at worst be Burland Scale 'slight' damage to the adjacent structures, which is accepted by CPG4. Officer's have no valid reason to dispute these calculation findings.

Construction sequence

6.4.8 Arup advised that further clarification on the excavation support and control measures should be provided. This includes a sequence of underpinning and mitigation methods against water seepage affecting pin works, and how the basement slab construction and propping arrangements would be managed.

6.4.9 The original drawings clearly show all walls to be underpinned. The base of the underpin excavations will be kept dry by localised pumping and dry packing will take place a minimum of 48 hours after the pouring of the concrete for the pins. This allows the concrete to cure properly and thereby stabilise. The methods of propping and construction are detailed in the BIA as per normal construction practises and officers have no reason to question this. The standard basement condition is secured so all construction sequence are monitored on-site by a qualified engineer.

Surface water and groundwater flows

6.4.10 Arup state that because of the low permeability of the London Clay, groundwater is restricted to high level seepages and perched water within the near surface overlying deposits of soil and made ground. Accordingly Arup agree with the screening stage within the original Land Science BIA in that the basement will have

no significant impact upon ground water flow in the London Clay and no issues need to be taken for further scoping or investigations.

6.4.11 However, Arup do consider the screening assessment with regard to surface water and flooding too brief and a desktop study and further monitoring data is necessary. In response Enzygo's desk top study acknowledges that 'there is potential risk from surface flooding and sewer flooding which can not be screened out and will require mitigation'. Enzygo also recognises that the current surface water runoff rate is un-attenuated and uncontrolled and therefore poses a risk to the site and neighbours. Officers welcome this recognition as it confirms that the applicant is better responding to the neighbouring concerns with regard to existing conditions and thereby if a new basement is to be granted, significant and likely expensive mitigation measures will have to be incorporated to ensure the situation does not worsen for neighbours. In this regard, Enzygo suggests a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDs) be incorporated. This may include water butts, living roof to the extension, cellular storage, oversized pipes and rainwater harvesting. It is the intention that any SuDs system will achieve a 1 in 2 year Greenfield runoff rate, which would actually improve the current runoff rate to the site, and not have any adverse impact to neighbouring gardens.

6.4.12 A SuDs is also suggested in the Arup verification report and Arup also recognise that the exact volume and pathways of near surface water flow can only investigated during detailed design stage. It would not be practical or reasonable to seek a fully worked up SuDs as part of a planning application, nor does policy require this. Accordingly, in line with the Arup recommendation, a condition requiring SuDs is imposed for this particular development, the details of which will be agreed with Thames Water and the Environment Agency prior to any excavation works commencing. A condition will also be included seeking the incorporation of a living roof to the extension.

Flood risk to proposed basement

6.4.13 The principle of a basement comprising living accommodation is acceptable in this instance as the accommodation would form part of the same residential flat at ground floor. Only a self contained basement unit would be considered unacceptable in an area at risk from flooding. Nonetheless, the occurrence of a flood should be low considering the securing of a SuDs to the site. Further protective measures include designing the lightwells with a sump level that is lower than the internal floor level and the use of hardwood windows and doors with waterproof seal surrounds would provide further protection against flooding.

Response to neighbouring objections (with regard to flooding)

6.4.14 Considering the desktop studies, site investigations and Arup recommendations it has become clear that the existing surface flooding and water perching of gardens is a result of poor surface runoff rates in the area. Arup also confirm that a basement construction within impermeable London Clay would have no harm to groundwater flow and thereby not increase surface flooding, subject to the incorporation of a SuDs on the currently un-mitigated land. The SuDs should help lessen the potential for flooding to at the site and thereby not increase risk neighbouring basements or gardens. It is likely that the current water perching, experienced by neighbours, would only be resolved if each individual plot was

mitigated by their own SuDs. The fact the area does suffer from poor runoff rates should not preclude the addition of a basement at the applicant site, particularly as SuDs will also be secured.

Basement conclusion

6.4.15 The applicant's BIA by Land Science has been subject to an independent verification. The verification concludes that the basement would not impact on existing groundwater flows and recommends SuDs to mitigate near surface flow. The incorporation of SuDs on a currently un-mitigated site should at the very least improve the run-off rate on the site and would not increase flooding risk or water perching to neighbouring gardens over that which exists at present. Calculations with regards to land and structural stability have also been provided to better demonstrate that damage would be no more than 'slight' on the Burland scale. Accordingly the extensive BIA scrutiny and subsequent revision is more than 'commensurate with the scale and location' of this single storey basement in compliance with policy DP27. Robust conditions, with regard to works monitoring by an engineer and securing a detailed SuDs provides additional comfort that the built and natural environment should be protected during the works.

6.5 **Trees**

6.5.1 There are three trees in the rear garden that are listed to be removed to facilitate the development; an Apple designated T1 a Lilac T2 and an Elder T7. The Council's Tree Officer confirmed that none of these are considered to be of sufficient quality to warrant modification of the proposal. The report also recommends the heavy reduction of a part decayed Elder, (T6) this is considered to be acceptable. The tree protection method statement submitted is in line with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design demolition and construction, however no tree protection plan has been submitted. It is recommended that this is submitted prior to implementation of the scheme and would be required by condition.

6.5.2 Neighbouring concerns have been raised about the impact of the development on the Lime trees to the front of the house. These trees are not to be touched and the Tree Officer has also recommended the standard tree protection condition to ensure they remained unharmed during the works.

6.6 **Highway considerations:**

6.6.1 The proposal involves a large amount of earth excavation works in close proximity to neighbouring residences and therefore a Construction Management Plan is secured by condition in compliance with policy DP20.

6.7 **Community Infrastructure Levy:**

6.7.1 The proposed rear extension would create 15.6sq.m additional gross internal floorspace and the basement extension an additional 113.22sq.m, resulting in a total increase in floorspace of 128.82sq.m. As such, the proposal would be liable to contribute towards the Mayor's CIL. At £50/sq.m the amount is likely to be £6441.

7. RECOMMENDATION

7.1 Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions.

8. LEGAL COMMENTS

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