

Delegated Report (Members' Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	23/07/2012
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	28/06/2012
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Tania Skelli-Yaoz			2012/2712/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
20 Glenmore Road London NW3 4DB			See draft decision notice.		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
		Antonia Powell			
Proposal(s)					
Excavation to create enlarged basement with alterations to front lightwell, erection of single-storey infill extension at rear ground floor level (adjacent to closet wing) and single-storey conservatory all in connection with existing dwellinghouse (Class C3).					
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional permission subject to section 106 agreement			
Application Type:		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	14	No. of responses	08	No. of objections	08
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Neighbours were consulted by letter, a site notice was displayed outside the property on the 31st May 2012 for three weeks and a press notice was published on the 7th June 2012.</p> <p><u>Councillor Bucknell</u>: Objection on grounds of extent of proposal.</p> <p>7 letters of objection were received from the occupiers of 16, 14 (flat 1), 18 and 49 Glenmore Road, 27 Glenloch Road and 28A Glenilla Road. The concerns raised were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Harm to the conservation area;• structural damage and drainage issues from basement works;• bulk of conservatory;• loss of rear brick arch;• loss of symmetry between houses;• impact on trees and loss of garden;• overdevelopment;• gap insert at front wall harms CA;• disturbance during construction; and• loss of sunlight and privacy to no. 18.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p><u>Belsize CAAC</u>: No objection.</p> <p><u>Belsize Residents Association</u>: Objection/Comment. Concerns over light pollution from conservatory, basement beyond footprint of house, basement excavation impact on trees.</p>					

Site Description

The application site is located on the west side of the street, north of its junction with Glenilla Road. The building is mid-terrace and comprises basement, ground, first floor and roof storey. The property is currently vacant but it appears was last used as a single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3). The building is not listed, but is situated within the Belsize Park Conservation Area.

Relevant History

No relevant planning history in relation to the application site, but relevant history on neighbouring properties.

16 Glenmore Road

PWX0002892 GRANTED 26/02/2001 Erection of a conservatory at rear.

18 Glenmore Road

2011/1436/P GRANTED 31/05/2011 Additions and alterations to dwelling house at basement level including deepening of front lightwell.

49 Glenmore Road

2006/3675/P GRANTED Excavation to create enlarged basement with window at front basement level, plus an enlarged front basement lightwell with staircase, to provide additional residential floorspace to existing dwellinghouse.

51 Glenmore Road

2012/0964/P GRANTED 02/04/2012 Excavation of enlarged basement including enlargement of front basement lightwell and installation of staircase from lightwell to ground floor level all in connection with existing dwellinghouse (Class C3).

63 Glenmore Road

2010/2382/P GRANTED 28/09/2010 Retention of basement extension including new rear lightwell, enlargement of existing front lightwell, alterations to front basement elevation and associated re-landscaping to existing single dwelling house (Class C3).

2011/2370/P Granted 04/07/2011 Amendments to window and door at front basement level pursuant to planning permission dated 28/9/2010 (ref. 2010/2382/P) for the retention of basement extension including new rear lightwell, enlargement of existing front lightwell, alterations to front basement elevation and associated re-landscaping to existing single dwelling house (Class C3).

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The London Plan (2011)

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

- CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development
- CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
- CS15 Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity
- DP20 Movement of Goods and Materials
- DP23 Water
- DP24 High quality design
- DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage
- DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours
- DP27 Basements and light wells

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG 1) - Design (2011)

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG 2) – Housing (2011)

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG 4) – Basements (2011)

Belsize Park Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to carry out the following works:

- Excavation to create an enlarged basement for use as a family room, storage room and bedroom to front;
- Alterations to front basement lightwell including relocation of staircase and binstore;
- Installation of new windows and door at front basement level;
- Erection of a single-storey rear conservatory extension;
- Erection of single-storey infill extension at rear ground floor level (adjacent to closet wing); and
- The proposal will provide some 70sqm of additional residential floorspace to the existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3).

Revisions: The rear conservatory extension has been amended so that it is set 2.7m from the boundary with No. 18 and 0.8m from the boundary with No. 20. The conservatory height has been revised to 3.0m so that it meets the rear façade above the brick arch. The existing opening at rear ground floor level and the decorative arch above is to be retained.

Design

Basement: The proposed excavation work does not manifest itself externally to the rear. The property already benefits from a front lightwell and a part basement at the front area of the property. More details regarding the basement extension follow below.

Lightwell: The treatment of the front garden areas along Glenmore Road is varied. There are a number of properties which have no lightwell. The majority of properties have partial excavation with a small lightwell being created adjacent to the front building line and an area retained behind the front boundary wall for the storage of bins. No. 49 is an example of a lightwell which has fully excavated the front garden, the Council's records indicate that this was approved in 2006. The northern end of the street is larger blocks of flats, but that opposite largely replicates the style of houses on the western side of the street.

The applicant has omitted excavation under the entrance step which is not a feature (other than at no. 49) of this street and would result in a large highly visible open lightwell to the front of the property. It is considered that given that there is no uniformity in treatment of the front garden area it would be difficult to resist the extent of alterations now proposed, as the proposal now largely complies with CPG 4.

The applicant has confirmed that the front hedge is to be replanted, most likely with 'Privet'. This is considered acceptable.

The applicant has also revised the fenestration to the front to re-instate the front two sash windows and re-positioned the front door to the lightwell side elevation. This is in accordance with the Belsize Park CA Statement and a welcomed improvement to this frontage.

The Belsize Park CA Statement also states that *'The consistent use of 'lava' bricks to form the frontage boundaries is characteristic of these streets and forms a distinctive edge. This is lost where frontage walls have been removed'*. Ideally, the creation of an additional opening, such as for the new access to the basement area, should therefore be resisted. However, a similar opening for bin storage has recently been allowed at no. 51 Glenmore Road. The applicant has kept the opening to a minimum. It is therefore considered that this element would not be detrimental to the appearance of this frontage.

As the drawings do not detail the proposed material for the staircase it is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring the staircase within the front basement lightwell to be black painted metal and maintained as such thereafter.

Rear extension: The proposal is for a 3.0m (h) x 3.5m (w) single-storey structural glass conservatory to be set around the existing brick arch. The conservatory is to be set-in away from the side boundaries with the

neighbours and does not extend beyond the line of the existing rear wing. The proposed conservatory is a modest scale lightweight addition to the buildings which would appear subordinate to the existing building. It has been designed in a manner which allows the existing decorative features on the rear elevation and the symmetry between this and the neighbouring property to be retained.

Side rear infill extension: The current side area is part-built up with various small extensions. The proposal is to infill this area to match that at neighbouring no.18. While no. 20 sits lower than no. 18 and forms a pair with no. 22 it is considered that the lowering of this side extension to reflect this would outweigh the benefit of the symmetry achieved by matching the roof line with that of the infill extension at no. 18. This is therefore considered acceptable.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed external alterations to the front and rear of the building area are acceptable and do not harm the character and appearance of the streetscene and the Belsize Park CA at large. The proposal complies with policies DP24 and DP25.

Amenity

Standards of accommodation: The proposed basement is to be used to provide additional accommodation for a family as part of this single dwelling-house. The front bedroom will be illuminated by the windows on the front elevation, however, they face into a lightwell, the front wall of which will provide an obstruction to light entering the basement. The amount of the light entering the basement is below what we would normally require and as detailed in the SPG. However, as the basement is to be used to provide additional floorspace to an existing single-family dwellinghouse, the remainder of which is adequately illuminated, and is an enlargement to an existing basement room, the proposal is considered to be acceptable on the grounds of proportionality.

Daylight and sunlight: Concerns were raised over the loss of sunlight to no. 18. No. 18 lies to the north-east of the property. The applicant has lowered the height of the conservatory and set it further away from the boundary with No. 18, albeit it closer to No. 20. Given the height and depth (3.2m) of the proposed extension it would not impact on daylight or sunlight to neighbouring properties.

Garden space: the proposal includes a modest rear extension which is considered to be proportionate to the original size of the house and does not occupy a significant proportion of the rear garden area. Thereby protecting the amenity of the future residents as well as biodiversity objectives.

Overlooking: concerns were raised regarding overlooking to the neighbouring properties. By virtue of the height of the existing boundary walls and the eye level of people within the proposed conservatory there would be no views into neighbouring windows.

Trees: There is no proposal to remove trees on site and any disturbance during construction should be controlled under the Basement's assigned engineer's methods of protection. See below.

Basement issues

Structural and groundwater considerations:

It is proposed to enlarge the existing basement by extending towards the rear and increasing its depth from 2.3 metres to 3.4 metres. This will increase the basement by some 75%, and will cover the complete footprint of the building, including the area below the rear extension. While the CPG recommends that basement excavations should not be larger than the footprint of the building, it is considered that the proposal to extend this below the proposed enlarged footprint of the building has been justified as acceptable within the submitted BIA, as follows;

The information submitted includes a Basement Impact Assessment – Screening and Scoping Report, prepared by Geotechnical & Environmental Associates. This document has been prepared in accordance with policies DP27, DP23 and CPG4. the applicants have submitted information in respect of the basement excavation and the anticipated impacts on drainage, flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability.

The screening undertaken on the proposed development highlights items with regards to slope stability which are to be addressed in the design, detailing and construction methods of the project. Underpinning, where required to the internal and external walls (to the lightwell) will be undertaken as per the specification of the report. The lightwell wall is also to be designed to retain an appropriate highway loading.

The site is on London Clay, a non-aquifer and as such will have no effect on subterranean water flows. The existing basement extends the full width of the property, which with its terraced neighbours' similar basements

present the same conditions to surface flows as the extended basement front and back, with no change in surface conditions.

The Basement impact Assessment concludes that there are no negative impacts anticipated in this basement proposal on the hydro-geological and hydrological conditions of the local environment.

In overall terms it is considered that the level of information provided for the scale and nature of the proposed basement is sufficient to accord with the relevant LDF policies and accompanying CPG4 2011. Based on the information provided and the size of the proposed basement, it is considered necessary for a condition denoting that a chartered surveyor shall supervise the works to be added in this instance.

Housing issue

The submitted existing drawings illustrate what could easily be read as the previous presence of three separate self-contained flats. There are no clear separate entrances shown. On site several door entrance bells exist at the front. No additional gas meters were present. The house has been stripped of all internal fixtures and this has been confirmed to have been carried out in early 2012.

A concern was raised over the loss of two homes on this site, which would be contrary to policy, however, the applicant has confirmed that under no circumstances was the house formally used as separate dwellings. He states that the history is not full and that what most likely happened was that the previous family chose to live under the same roof in separate arrangements, thereby installing separate facilities but still occupying the house as one family. The door bells are argued to be installed to deter burglars by creating a false impression that more people maybe on site.

Council tax records show that the house is listed as a single dwelling house. No other records relevant to this issue are made available. It is therefore considered that in all probability the house was used as a single dwelling house in the last 4-years and is considered as such in this assessment.

Transport

2 other basement schemes on this street have recently been approved and are under construction. Given the scale of works proposed and the likely cumulative impact of the works on this street, it is considered necessary to secure a Construction Management Plan (CMP) through S106 legal agreement. The applicant has provided a CMP as part of the application which has been agreed by the Council's highways team.

CiL: The extent of floorspace increase would not trigger the requirement for a contribution towards the Mayors CiL.

Recommendation: Grant conditional permission subject to S106 legal agreement.

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