

<b>Delegated Report (Members' Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>15/03/2012</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>24/02/2012</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Rob Tulloch				2012/0389/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
6 NORTH END LONDON NW3 7HL				See 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>							
Extension and excavation to provide new basement level, including installation of two front lightwells to dwelling house (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Grant Planning Permission</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Householder Application</b>					
<b>Conditions:</b>		<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>13</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>Site notice 30/01/2012 – 20/02/2012 Press advert 02/02/2012 – 23/02/2012</p> <p>6A North End objects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of adequate Basement Impact Assessment</li> <li>• Harm to trees</li> <li>• would harm the structural integrity of their building due to the difference in depth of the two properties creating a hard spot</li> <li>• Adjacent basements should be taken into consideration</li> <li>• The basement should be set back by 1m from the party wall</li> <li>• A condition should be added to require transition stools to support no. 6A</li> </ul> <p>Officer comment: The applicant declined to reduce the footprint of the basement, but submitted a revised Basement Impact Assessment and Arboricultural report/method statement see paras 3 &amp; 4.</p>					

**CAAC/Local group comments:**

**Hampstead CAAC** object in principle to the proposal and how it will affect the stability of neighbouring properties.

**English Heritage GLAAS** respond that the proposals are not considered to have an affect on any significant archaeological remains and advise that any requirement for an assessment of archaeological interest can be waived.

## Site Description

North End is a loose cluster of houses lying to the east of the Hampstead Heath Extension. The application site is a two storey dwelling connected at the rear to no. 6A North End, which itself is connected to no 8 forming a horseshoe arrangement of three houses. The site lies within the Hampstead Conservation Area and no. 6 is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The site is also within the Hampstead Archaeological Priority Area.

## Relevant History

2011/5245/P Extension and excavation to provide new basement level, including installation of 2 front lightwells to dwelling house (Class C3). Withdrawn 21/12/2011 due to inadequate Basement Impact Assessment.

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS11 Promoting sustainable and efficient travel

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS15 Open space and biodiversity

DP16 The Transport Implications of Development

DP17 Walking, Cycling and Public Transport

DP18 Parking Standards and Limiting the Availability of Car Parking

DP19 Managing the Impact of Parking

DP20 Movement of Goods and Materials

DP21 Development Connecting to the Highway Network

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

### Camden Planning Guidance 2011

### Hampstead Conservation Area Statement

### NPPF 2012

## Assessment

### 1 Proposal

1.1 The proposal is for a single storey basement with front lightwells under the footprint of the house to provide additional residential floorspace. During the course of the application process the applicant has submitted an arboricultural report and a revised Basement Impact Assessment. The main issues are:

- Design
- Basement impact
- Trees
- transport
- neighbour amenity

## **2 Design**

- 2.1 The basement would be single storey and, other than two front lightwells, would not extend beyond the footprint of the existing house. The additional floorspace would be approximately 85sqm, the lightwells would measure 1.2m x 1m and 1.7m x 1m and be covered by metal grilles. The house is on a slope and the area in front of the house is 1.5m higher than the pavement level and the house is bordered by a 1.8m high boundary wall so the lightwells would not be readily visible from the street. As the lightwells are the only external manifestation of the proposal, the proposed works are not considered to harm the appearance of the host building, street scene or wider conservation area. As such the proposal is considered to comply with policies CS14, DP24, DP25 and DP27 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance.

## **3 Basement impact**

- 3.1 The house is attached via its rear wall to no. 6A North End, forming a group of three connected houses. The proposed basement would be under the footprint of no. 6 and extend to an external depth of 4m. Groundwater has been located at a depth of 5.4m. In line with policy DP27 the applicants have submitted a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) and associated Hydrogeological Report and Basement Engineering Method Statement.

### *Land stability*

- 3.2 The site is on land with a gradient of less than 1:8 and the proposal would not re-profile the landscaping of the site. There are no tunnels or railway cuttings nearby, nor is the site within 100m of a watercourse or within 50m of the Hampstead pond chain. The basement would not be within 5m of the public highway.
- 3.3 The geological survey and borehole data identify the shallowest underlying strata as the Bagshot Formation comprising fine grained sand with thin clay beds and extending down to a level of 5.2m below ground level. Beneath this, the BIA indicates that the next stratum is the Claygate Member.
- 3.4 The house shares a party wall with no. 6A North End and they have expressed concern that the proposal has the potential to cause structural damage to their property. Camden Planning Guidance notes that the sides of excavation always move to some extent no matter how they are supported and that mitigation measures should be incorporated where the predicted structural damage is identified as being greater than 2 (slight) on the Burland Category. The Burland Category is a way to measure the extent of structural damage and rates damage on a scale from level 0 (negligible) to 5 (very severe) with level 0 being the least concern.
- 3.5 No. 6A has asked that their property be permanently underpinned to prevent structural problems arising, but the BIA indicates that maximum vertical settlements at the party wall are not anticipated to exceed 5mm, with lateral movement calculated to be less than 1mm. The BIA states that with such movement, damage to adjacent structures is likely to be no worse than Category 1 (very slight). A level of 1 is described as fine cracks measuring less than 1mm that can easily be treated during normal decoration and are not an indicator of structural problems. However, it is considered reasonable to attach a condition requiring the proposed development to be overseen by a relevantly qualified engineer.

### *Groundwater (subterranean) flow*

- 3.6 A hydrogeological assessment has been carried out by Geotechnical Consulting Group. The BIA considers that the basement will not encounter any more than slight groundwater seepages. As the basement would be under the footprint of the house, and the proposal would not increase

the amount of hard surfacing on the site, the BIA suggests that the proposal would have a negligible impact on surface water infiltrating the soil around the property. As groundwater is anticipated at 5.4m below ground level (mbgl) and the basement extends downwards to a level of 4mbgl, the BIA anticipates that groundwater will be able to freely flow beneath and around the basement perimeter in the relatively permeable Bagshot Formation. The BIA also refers to nearby basements and anticipates that as these are not interconnected, groundwater will continue to flow under and around them, and the proposal will not create an impermeable barrier to groundwater flow.

- 3.7 The BIA has also identified a risk of running sands, an unstable mixture of sand and water, as potentially being generated at a depth of 3.8mbgl. If this occurs, a contingency plan in the form of a temporary shoring system and pumping strategy will be put into place.

#### *Surface water*

- 3.8 The site has not suffered a previous flood event. As the basement is under the footprint of the existing house, and there is to be no increase in the amount of hard surfaces across the site, surface water conditions are not anticipated to be materially different.
- 3.9 The Basement Impact Assessment concludes that the proposed basement would have a negligible affect on groundwater, surface water and flooding. There is potential for running sands, and the BIA has indicated a robust and effective contingency plan will need to implemented should running sands be encountered. The basement will generate minimal ground movements, and appropriate construction techniques should limit damage to adjacent buildings to no worse than Category 1 (Very slight) on the Burland Scale. As the BIA has been prepared by relevantly qualified professionals, and does not indicate that the proposal will harm the local environment, it is considered that the proposal complies with the requirements of policies DP23, DP27 and Camden Planning Guidance.

## **4 Trees**

- 4.1 The development site has two mature Horse Chestnuts in the front garden. Both are former pollards and have subsequently re-grown full crowns and been managed by regular reduction. The trees both provide a visual amenity within the street scene and are considered positive contributors to the character of the area.
- 4.2 An arboricultural report has been provided and highlights these trees for retention. The proposed basement extends into the root protection area (RPA) of both trees, but apart from the new light wells it does not extend beyond the existing footprint of the building and it is not considered that it is likely to impact upon the trees.
- 4.3 The tree protection plan is considered to be acceptable and a condition will be added to any approval requiring that the tree protection measures are implemented and signed off by a Council tree officer prior to the commencement of works on site.
- 4.4 As the proposed basement is within the existing footprint of the building it is not considered that there are any landscape implications and it is considered to be acceptable in this regard.

## **5 Transport**

- 5.1 The site is located on the south side of North End, near the junction with North End Way. There is currently vehicular access to the site in the form of a driveway from North End. The site is located in the North End controlled parking zone (CPZ). The ratio of parking permits to parking spaces in the North End CPZ is 0.58 which suggests that parking stress is not a significant local issue.

- 5.2 The applicant has provided a design and access statement and a construction method statement (CMS) in support of the application. The CMS acknowledges that various licences will need to be granted by Camden in order to facilitate the proposed works including parking bay suspension licence, a hoarding licence, and a skip licence. However, the CMS lacks information on the likely duration of the proposed basement excavation works. It also lacks information on traffic movements associated with the delivery of materials and removal of excavated material from the site during the proposed works.
- 5.3 The footway outside the property is approximately 1.8 metres wide and has some wooden posts located at the kerbside. The CMS suggests that the footway would need to be temporarily narrowed to 1.2 metres wide during the proposed works in order to facilitate a temporary structure above the footway, but it will be suggested that the proposed arrangement be modified so that the existing footway width does not need to be amended. Due to the scale and type of this development, and the likely method of construction, a full Construction Management Plan is not required. However, in order to mitigate any adverse impacts on the public highway, a Construction Management Statement (CMS) will be secured via a condition. This will outline how construction work will be carried out and how this work will be serviced (e.g. delivery of materials, set down and collection of skips, removal of excavated materials etc), with the objective of minimising traffic disruption and avoiding dangerous situations for pedestrians and other road users.

## **6 Amenity**

- 6.1 Light and ventilation would be provided to the basement by two lightwells at the front of the property. One lightwell measuring 1.2m x 1m would provide light to a bedroom and another measuring 1.7m x 1m would provide light to a lounge. Both rooms would have French doors opening into the lightwells and as the basement would not provide self-contained accommodation the light and ventilation to these rooms is considered acceptable.
- 6.2 The impact of construction on the neighbours will be controlled by a Construction Management Statement covering traffic disruption and pedestrian safety, and Environment Health legislation which will control noise, dust and hours of operation. The proposed basement is not considered to cause any issues for neighbouring residents in terms of loss of amenity. As such the proposal is considered to comply with policies CS5 and DP26 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance.

## **7 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

- 7.1 As the extension is under 100sqm the proposal would not be liable for a CIL contribution.

## **8 Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission**

### **DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 6<sup>th</sup> August 2012. For further information please click [here](#).