

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>21/08/2012</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>09/08/2012</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Elaine Quigley				2012/2538/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
58 Goldhurst Terrace London NW6 3HT				See draft decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Excavation of enlarged basement with front and rear lightwells, erection of rear ground floor level extension with terrace over at first floor level, replacement of window with door at rear first floor level all in connection with existing flats (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant conditional permission subject to conditions					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>18</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		A site notice was displayed on 16/07/2012 (expired 06/08/2012) and a press notice was published on 19/07/2012 (expired 09/08/2012). No letters of representation received as a result of this consultation process.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify		None received					

## Site Description

The application site comprises a three-storey with mansard roof mid terrace property situated on the west side of Goldhurst Terrace. The building has been subdivided into three flats. The proposal relates to the ground and first floor flat of the building that is currently vacant.

The site is located within the South Hampstead Conservation Area. The site is also identified as being within an area of surface water flow and flooding.

## Relevant History

### Application site

Planning permission was **refused** on 24/05/2011 for alterations including extension of existing basement, enlargement of lightwell to front and creation of lightwell to rear both with steel grille covers to create a self contained flat (Class C3) (2011/1474/P).

Planning permission was **granted** on 26/08/2011 for the enlargement of basement including creation front and rear lightwells both with steel grille covers to provide additional habitable floorspace to existing basement / ground floor self contained flat (Class C3) (2011/3403/P).

### 60 Goldhurst Terrace

A certificate of lawfulness was granted on 28/02/2006 for the erection of a single storey ground floor extension to the rear of the single family dwelling house (2006/0138/P).

Planning permission was granted on 02/10/2007 for the installation of railings and privacy screening to rear ground floor level flat to facilitate its use as a terrace in connection with the existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3) (2007/1671/P).

### 62 Goldhurst Terrace

Certificate of lawfulness was granted on 31/08/2006 for erection of a full-width single-storey rear ground floor level extension (following demolition of existing single-storey rear extension) to single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3) (2006/2889/P). This projected out 3.7m in to the garden. The roof included timber decking and new French doors on the first floor rear elevation. It would appear that this area is being used as a roof terrace.

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

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 and encouraging biodiversity)

DP16 (The transport implications of development)  
DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking)  
DP20 (Movement of goods and materials)  
DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network)  
DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)  
DP23 (Water)  
DP24 (Securing High Quality Design)  
DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)  
DP26 (Managing the impact of the development on occupiers and neighbours)  
DP27 (Basements and Lightwells)  
DP32 (Air quality and Camden's Clear Zone)

### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 – Design  
CPG2 – Housing  
CPG4 – Basements and Lightwells  
CPG6 – Amenity  
CPG7 – Transport

South Hampstead Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011)

## Assessment

### Proposal

Planning permission is sought for excavation of enlarged basement with front and rear lightwells, erection of rear ground floor level extension with terrace over at first floor level, replacement of window with door at rear first floor level all in connection with existing flats (Class C3).

A very similar scheme was approved for the basement works in 26/08/2011. During the site visit to the property excavation works had already commenced on site. The main changes between the approved application and the current application are as follows:

- Erection of a rear ground floor level extension with terrace over at first floor level
- Enlargement of the basement area underneath the proposed rear ground floor level extension and creation of lightwell to the rear of the proposed single storey full width rear extension

The basement would extend approximately 2.8m below the ground floor level of the existing building. This is a similar depth as the previously approved scheme.

The main considerations as part of the proposal are:

- Basement works
- Design
- Amenity
- Transport
- CIL

## Assessment

### Basement works

#### Visual impact

Policy DP27 states that the Council will consider whether schemes that include a basement level will lead to the loss of open space or trees of townscape or amenity value; or harm the appearance or setting of the surrounding area.

The application property is set back by approximately 6m from the pavement. The basement would include a lightwell at the front of the building that would extend out 2m from the main front elevation of the building and 0.835 beyond the existing bay window. This would not result in a significant reduction of open space to the front patio area and would be considered acceptable. The use of the grilles over the lightwells helps to minimise the visual impact of the proposal on the street scene and the conservation area. The proposed materials for the windows, doors and grille are similar to the existing windows and door treatment and are considered acceptable. It is considered that the lightwell would not appear visually intrusive or harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The size and design of the front lightwell remains unaltered from the previously approved planning permission.

The rear lightwell would project out 1.2m from the main rear elevation of the new single storey rear extension. The proposal would not result in a loss of soft landscaped garden. The lightwell would not be visible from neighbouring properties due to its modest length and would be covered by a flush steel grill. It would not appear prominent and would not be considered to harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

An arboricultural report has been submitted in support of the application. It identified two trees in the front garden T1 (Lime) and T2 (Lime) and a tree in the front garden of the neighbouring property T3 (Lime). The excavation for the front lightwell will slightly encroach into the root protection area of the trees, however as they are relatively small and managed as pollards, their longer term health should not be detrimentally affected. In order to ensure the trees to be retained are protected during construction a method statement for the protection of trees to be retained will be required to be secured by condition as part of any permission.

#### Groundwater flow, land stability and surface flow and flooding

Policy DP27 and CPG4 state that developers will be required to demonstrate with methodologies appropriate to the site that schemes maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties; avoid adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment; and avoid

cumulative impact upon structural stability or water environment in the local area.

A basement impact assessment (BIA) has been submitted in the form of a Basement Impact Assessment Screening document and Flood Risk Assessment and Hydrological Assessment produced by Enzygo Environmental Consultants dated August 2012. This has been prepared by a Chartered Structural Engineer and Charter Geologist who has the relevant qualifications in line with those identified in CPG4.

**(i) Ground water**

The BIA confirms that no significant shallow ground water resources are identified and the underlying London Clay is considered to be a low permeability un-productive aquifer. As such the basement would not be considered to have any significance on shallow groundwater flow as there are no identified shallow groundwater resources.

No significant groundwater ingress is likely based on the geological and hydrogeological information provided. The BIA confirms that any minor seepage that may occur from silty partings within the London Clay would be mitigated through the tanking of the basement and through appropriate SUDS techniques to attenuate the surface water runoff. No details of the SUDS techniques have been provided as part of the application therefore a condition would be attached to request these to be submitted and approved in writing by the Council.

**(ii) Land stability**

The document advises that the desk top assessment of the area confirms the ground conditions to comprise topsoil over stiff silty clay that is consistent with London Clay. Deepening the foundations would increase the bearing capacity of the soils as these become stiffer with depth and also there is greater restoring moments on the foundations from the overlying soils. Bearing pressures would not be expected to increase as the additional wall loading from the basement would be off-set by the net stress reduction of the clay removed by the underpinning process.

The report confirms that several matters of concern need to be taken through to the scoping stage in relation to the temporary stability of the excavations and the existing foundations. The report advises that a methodology should be prepared for undertaking the underpinning works, including assessment and mitigation measures such as temporary support. It also recommends that an assessment of the existing foundations and their ability to carry the structural loads prior to the underpin sections being cast and cured be carried out. It suggests that these works could be undertaken by a structural engineer. It would therefore be considered necessary to attach a condition to any permission requiring a suitably qualified structural engineer to oversee the temporary and permanent works.

The report confirms that the construction of the basement would maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties providing the recommended approach is taken.

**(iii) Surface flow and flooding**

The application property is located in a street which flooded in both 2002 and 1975. Therefore, as stated in the subtext of Policy DP23, it is especially important for development within this area to be designed to cope with being flooded without placing additional pressure on adjoining sites and on the combined sewer system. The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment and Hydrology Assessment which sets out how flood risk can be managed and mitigated. The submitted document advises that the main flood risk posed to the site is from sewer flooding (as confirmed by North London Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)). The report suggests that a storage tank has since been constructed to manage and mitigate the effects of sewer flooding. However no details have been provided by the agent to confirm its location and size. The report does however advise that a sump and small capacity automatic pump would be installed in the basement to help with the draining process. It also recommends that appropriate SUDS techniques should be included to attenuate the surface water run-off. Providing the mitigation measures that are detailed in the report are provided it is considered that the proposal will not increase pressure on the combined sewer network through the increase of surface water drainage.

Policy DP27 states that the Council will not allow habitable rooms and other sensitive uses in area at risk of flooding. The proposal includes two bedrooms at basement level. It is acknowledged that there will be three means of escape from the basement the primary escape being the staircase which leads to ground floor level. There is also a step ladder on the wall of the front and rear lightwells and a mechanism which will ensure the lightwell grills would open in the event of an emergency. Given the means of escape provided is considered acceptable to have habitable rooms at basement level.

**Residential Development Standards** -The minimum residential development standards contained in the CPG2 (Housing) require new basements to have a room height of 2.3 metres and that adequate natural light is provided to habitable rooms. Two bedrooms are proposed in the basement, one at the rear of the flat and one at the front of the flat. To ensure adequate light is provided to habitable rooms walls or structures should not obstruct window by being within 3 metres of them, Where this is not achievable it is advised that the glazed area should total not less than 10% of the floor area of the room. Glazing allowable in this calculation is that which is above the point on the window/s from which a line can be drawn upwards at a vertical angle of 30 degrees with the horizontal to pass the top of the obstruction.

The proposed basement would have a room height of 2.4 metres. The rear lightwell has a depth of 0.8 metres and the rear elevation of the basement would comprise glazed folding doors measuring 3.1m in width. The glazed doors would be obstructed by the wall of the lightwell therefore it is necessary for the non-obstructed glazed area to total 10% of the floor area of the room. The non-obscured glazed area is less than 10% of the floor area. Other parts of the dwelling at ground floor level already receive ample light and it is considered not to harm the amenity of the occupiers. The outlook from the bedroom would be mainly onto the rear lightwell. This is considered acceptable given that there is sufficient outlook for other parts of the flat at ground floor level. The other rooms at basement level are not habitable rooms.

The outlook from the bedrooms at basement level would be poor. From the front windows and doors the outlook would be a blank wall at a distance of between 0.85-1.7 metres away and the window in the rear elevation would look out onto a blank wall 0.8m away. Whilst this is not ideal considering that the occupiers of the flat would benefit from the outlook of the rear garden from the main living area the poor outlook at basement level will not significantly harm the amenity of the occupiers.

## **Design**

### **Single storey rear extension**

The proposal would include the removal of part of the existing single storey rear extension and erection of a single storey rear extension that would measure 3.6m (length) by 6.6m (width) by 3.2m (height). CPG1 (Design) provides a number of criteria that should be considered when designing rear extensions including that rear extensions should be designed to be secondary to the building being extension, should respect and preserve original design and proportions of the building and historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area including the ratio of built to unbuilt space.

The size and scale of the extension would not be considered to be dominant when viewed against the original building that is three storey's in height. The extension would be constructed using materials that match the existing building and would be considered acceptable.

The neighbouring properties at nos. 56 and 60 have similar full width single storey rear extensions of a similar height and detailed design. Taking this into consideration the proposal would respect the established pattern of development within this part of the terrace of properties along this side of Goldhurst Terrace and would be considered acceptable.

### **Roof terrace**

The works to form the roof terrace would involve the installation of French doors at rear first floor level and erection of metal railings measuring 0.9m around the parameter of the single storey rear extension.

The principle of a roof terrace in this location has already been established. There is a terrace in a similar location at no. 60, 62 and 64. The design of the proposed balustrading is considered to be acceptable subject to other planning considerations (see amenity section below). The railings are of a simple design and it is considered that they will not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

## **Amenity**

### **Basement**

The front and rear lightwells would not result in any undue impact to the amenity of surrounding residential properties. Given their location at lower ground level, overlooking would be contained and the proposed basement would not have any implications with regard to loss of sunlight or daylight to neighbouring properties.

It is considered that given the lightwells position at lower level and the presence of the walkable grilles there would not be a significant increase in light pollution levels to neighbouring properties.

### Single storey rear extension

The proposed single storey rear extension would project out a similar depth as the neighbouring extensions at no. 56 and 60. There would be no loss of daylight, sunlight, privacy or sense of enclosure to these neighbouring properties.

### Roof terrace on the roof of the single storey rear extension

It must be noted that as part of the permission for the roof terrace at no. 60 a condition was attached requiring the installation of a 1.8m high obscure glazed privacy screen on the southwest and northeast elevations of the roof terrace. This has not been erected and only the railings are in place. It is not clear when the works were completed however given that the permission was granted nearly 5 years ago it may be exempt from any enforcement action.

The proposed terrace without screening would be unacceptable as there would be views from the amenity space into habitable windows of both No. 56 and 60. No screening has been shown on the drawings. To overcome any concerns regarding overlooking it is considered that it would be necessary to install a 1.8m high privacy screen along both elevations of the roof terrace for its entire length to ensure that there is no overlooking into the existing roof terrace at no. 60 and the upper floor windows of the neighbouring properties.

It is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of daylight and sunlight subject to necessary conditions and would be considered acceptable.

## **Transport**

### Cycle Parking

DP18 requires development to sufficiently provide for the needs of cyclists, which are contained in Appendix 2 of the Development Policies document. The London Plan also provides guidance on cycle parking standards these are outlined in Table 6.3 of The London Plan 2011.

Camden's Parking Standards for cycles states that one storage or parking space is required per residential unit, however for larger residential units (3+ beds), The London Plan requires two cycle parking spaces per unit. The proposal is for the enlargement of the ground floor residential unit consisting of 3 bedrooms. The applicant has not included any provision for cycle parking spaces. However, the plans identify that the rooms are of a size that it would be possible to store a cycle. Therefore, the requirement for separate cycle storage can be waived in this instance.

### Construction Management Plan (CMP)

DP21 seeks to protect the safety and operation of the highway network. For some development this may require control over how the development is implemented (including demolition and construction) through a Construction Management Plan (CMP) secured via S106.

Although, the proposals involve a significant basement extension which will require a large amount of earth excavation, the existing building is being retained and the existing house will have to be underpinned. As these excavations will have to be largely done by hand; the daily limit of material excavated will not be large. Construction work with such a development also tends to be slow, due to the time required for concrete to harden, which is poured in sections to maintain the structural integrity of the building. Therefore construction is likely to take a longer period of time, and hence the number of construction vehicles going to and from the site on a weekly basis will not be large. Given this 'spreading of the load' on the transport network, it is considered that a construction management plan will not be necessary.

However, any occupation of the highway, such as for hoarding, skips or storage of materials, will require a licence from Highways Management and this, along with the existing on-street waiting and loading controls, should be sufficient to ensure the work is carried out in such a way as to not adversely affecting the safety or operation of the public highway.

## **CIL**

The proposal would create an additional residential floor area of approximately 69 sq. m. This would not exceed the 100 sq. m floor area requirement to trigger a CIL requirement.

## **Conclusion**

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of structural stability and hydrology, visual impact, amenity and transportation.

**Recommendation:** Grant conditional permission.

**Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444***