

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	07/12/2011
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	07/11/2011
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Nicola Tulley			2011/5127/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
11 Templewood Avenue London NW3 7UY			Refer to draft decision notice.		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s) Enlargement of basement including creation of two rear lightwells, erection of extensions at rear ground and part first floor level, erection of dormer in rear roofslope, installation of rooflights, alterations to front boundary wall and installation of 2 x air condenser units within acoustic enclosure in rear garden.					
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional permission subject to S106 agreement			
Application Type:		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	04	No. of responses	07	No. of objections	04
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 21/10/2011 to 11/11/2011 and the application was advertised in the Ham & High on 27/10/2011.</p> <p>Four letters of objection were received from the occupiers and freeholder of 9 Templewood Avenue, they have raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The roof of the conservatory would make a noticeable difference to the appearance of the building and street outlook but also darken the narrow passageway.• Extending the rear of the property would significantly take away from privacy and light to passageway and gardens of 9 Templewood Avenue.• The side of the extension would reduce lighting into bedroom areas of 9 Templewood Avenue.• The noise and nuisance created by the building works would be disruptive to living conditions. Particularly the impacts upon health given the occupants have asthma and have recovered from cancer.• The basement work may create subsidence.• The preliminary construction management plan is inadequate, it gives limits for dust, noise, vibration but there is no indication of how these limits are to be met.• The raised parapet on the flank wall would be in close proximity to bedroom windows. The sunlight and daylight report states that this will result in a significant loss of daylight, but this is disregarded. This would turn one of the three bedrooms into a 'dungeon'.• Effect of the new basement to the foundations of 9 Templewood Avenue: The measurements for groundwater were taken in August when the levels were likely to be low, seasonal and longer term variations in groundwater level can be significant.• There is no indication in the CMP of the level of vibration that will be generated by the piling operations. A full survey should be undertaken to determine the effect on No. 9. <p>Three letters of support have been received from: 12 Templewood Avenue; 3 Grange Gardens; and 26 Ferncroft Avenue. The following comment was raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposals are for sensitive alterations, extensions and improvements to the dwelling-house. The proposals are of high quality design and respectful of the local environment.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>Redington and Frogna! CAAC</p> <p>Object to the basement extending beyond the footprint of the building and the loss of trees.</p>					

Site Description

The application site is a large two-storey detached dwelling-house, neo-Georgian in design, located centrally on Templewood Avenue and within Redington/Frognal conservation area. The subject site is noted as making a positive contribution to the conservation area and is located adjacent to a Grade II Listed Building at No. 15 Templewood Avenue. The surrounding area is predominately residential in character featuring large detached dwellinghouses with mature front gardens and trees.

Relevant History

There is no relevant planning history at the subject site however reference should be noted to basement applications decided in the immediate locality:

4 Templewood Avenue

2011/1710/P: Granted excavation and enlargement of existing basement to provide a new swimming pool, gym, utility spaces and associated light wells; erection of a ground floor rear extension, new terraces at ground and first floor levels, new replacement roof, works to chimneys, new dormer windows, new entrance gates and associated external alterations and landscaping to single dwelling house (Class C3) following works of demolition to dwelling.

2010/5119/P: Refused excavation and enlargement of existing basement to provide a new swimming pool, gym, utility spaces and associated light wells; erection of a ground floor rear extension, new terraces at ground and first floor levels, new replacement roof, works to chimneys, new dormer windows, new entrance gates and associated external alterations and landscaping to single dwelling house (Class C3).

An appeal was submitted and was dismissed by the Inspectorate on the grounds that the basement was unacceptable by reason of the inclusion of habitable rooms in a location which is prone to surface water flooding and without clear measures in place to substantially reduce the risk of flooding of the basement.

12 Templewood Avenue

2007/1575/P: Granted erection of a new 2 storey plus attic side wing extension with hipped roof, dormers and rooflights to provide additional habitable accommodation for the dwelling house; a new 1 storey plus attic side extension over existing tennis courts to provide garages for 3 cars and an ancillary one bedroom staff flat above; a rear extension to existing basement swimming pool with enlarged roof terrace and privacy screens above; erection of new projecting entrance porch; and alterations to front boundary railings and gates in association with creation of relocated vehicular entrance and new pedestrian entrance.

6 Templewood Avenue

2010/0834/P: Granted conversion of garage and alterations to the rear with extension to the basement of a dwelling house (Class C3).

2007/5596/P: Refused excavation of basement accommodation under rear garden, erection of single-storey rear ground floor level glazed extension to link new basement to existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3).

The removal of a Cedar and Sycamore tree was considered detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Relevant policies

The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

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

CS16 Improving Camden's health and well-being

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 development on occupiers and neighbours
DP27 Basements and lightwells
DP28 Noise and Vibration
DP32 Air quality.

Camden Planning Guidance (2011)

CPG 1 Design
CPG 4 Basements

Redington/Frognaal conservation area appraisal and management plan

Assessment

A site visit was carried out on 11/11/11.

Planning permission is sought for the following works:

- Enlargement of basement & the creation of two rear lightwells;
- Erection of single storey rear extension;
- Erection of two-storey rear extension;
- Erection of rear dormer window and rooflights;
- Alterations to front boundary wall;
- Alterations to windows/doors; and
- Installation of two condenser units with acoustic enclosure in rear garden.

Amendments:

The proposed central basement lightwell was considered too prominent at the rear elevation of the dwelling-house and would serve to detract from the rear façade of the existing building. Amendments were received 22nd November 2011 which reduced the area of the sunken terrace so that it sits within the limits of the existing rockery and ensures that it is subservient to the main building.

Enlargement of basement and creation of rear lightwells

The basement as existing is confined to either side of the dwelling-house occupying approximately 32% of the original built footprint. The proposed enlargement encompasses the entire built footprint of the original dwelling-house and beneath the proposed extensions, with an additional rear projection beyond each wing, between 1.3m and 2.8m. The proposal also includes excavation to provide an external lightwell at the lower ground floor to provide daylight and outlook to the basement level with a stairwell leading into the rear garden. An additional external lightwell and staircase is sited to the west wing of the property 1.7m in depth. Two rear rooflights are proposed within the areas that protrude beyond the built footprint of the dwelling-house sited at each side wing dimensions, 0.45m x 3.7m and 0.45m x 3.3m. The lightwells are not considered to have an adverse impact on the appearance of the property nor the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The ground naturally slopes southwards (towards the front of the property) and the existing dwelling features two small high level windows in the front elevation providing daylight into the existing lower ground laundry room. The basement development would excavate the existing ground level at this section by an average of 1.2m to increase the size of these window openings. This opening would be screened from the public highway through the addition of a 3 course brick high wall with landscaping behind, as demonstrated by plan: 1004-AP13. The alteration to the front elevation of the dwelling-house would not be visually obtrusive nor impact the character and appearance of the existing dwelling-house and is therefore considered acceptable.

Development Policy DP27 'Basements and lightwells' seeks to ensure that basement development does not prejudice the structural stability; drainage; and character and appearance of the existing property within the locality. In addition CPG4 'Basements and lightwells' provides more detailed design guidance in respect of basement development. The applicant has submitted a structural stability report and Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) produced by ARUP. It should be noted that the site is located within an area prone to surface water flooding and therefore habitable rooms will not be acceptable at basement floors.

Structural Stability

A structural stability report has been produced by Greig-Ling for the works proposed at the subject property. The basement will require an excavation of 3.0m depth from the current underfloor void and it is proposed to install 2.5m deep mass concrete underpins along the length of the side and front elevations. The suspended ground floor will be replaced with a reinforced concrete flat slab supported on a grid of reinforced concrete columns. The full perimeter of the new slab would be supported on a continuous 200mm thick reinforced concrete liner wall and will be reinforced to resist lateral pressures on the underpins. A new basement slab will be supported on a regular spacing of piles and will be designed to resist any heave and uplift. A contiguous piled wall with reinforced concrete capping will act as temporary support to the retained garden.

The full extent of the basement at 9 Templewood Avenue is not known and until further information becomes available a conservative assessment of the existing foundation depths has been made. The depth of the new underpins projects by only a nominal amount into the 45° zone of influence of the adjacent foundations. Underpinning notes have been provided on proposed drawings; the potential ground movements associated with this technique are negligible and well within acceptable levels.

A contiguous piled retaining wall, in conjunction with capping beams and steel whaling will be constructed to provide restraint during the construction stage. In the permanent case an additional reinforced concrete full height retaining wall will be used to ensure overall stability.

Geology

Made ground was encountered at 2 of the 3 boreholes that were carried out at the front of the property, this consisted of brick paving overlying a sub-base of sand and gravel with silty sandy clay with concrete and brick fragments. Below the made ground was the Claygate Member of the London Clay formation which was encountered at all 3 boreholes and the unit became stiffer at depth. Below is the London Clay formation at a depth of 25m and described as stiff and closely fissured, slightly sandy clay with pockets of silt.

Hydrology

Drainage: Due to urbanisation of the area over 100 years ago, the amount of natural drainage has been reduced and a large proportion of surface water drainage now takes place through storm sewers and/or runs beneath the surface rather than infiltrating to groundwater. Drainage and runoff are largely controlled by topography, which does not change as a result of the culverting of watercourses however, hard surfacing has the effect of changing the timing of run-off and somewhat reduces the proportion of rainfall which infiltrates the water-table. Historical maps show the southern side of the Heath to be drained from three lost rivers 'Fleet; Tyburn; Westbourne'. A 1920's Geological map shows a tributary of the Westbourne passing close to the east of the property, approximately coincident with the alignment of Templewood Avenue.

Rainfall and runoff: The average rainfall for the locality is low in comparison with the national average (1971-2000).

Flooding: A flood susceptibility report was obtained for the site which suggests that the site is not at risk from defended, undefended, pluvial and minor river floods. The report submitted by the applicant suggest that surface water and sewer flooding are not considered to pose a risk to the site due to its upslope location, however, Templewood Avenue is a road which has been affected by surface water flooding in the past (2002).

Hydrogeology: The Claygate beds underlying the site are classified as Secondary A aquifers, these are permeable layers capable of supporting water supplies at a local rather than strategic scale. Groundwater levels were monitored weekly for a 4 week period following the ground investigation.

Assessment of Impacts

The screening checklists for surface water flow and flooding noted that the additional impermeable ground and hard landscaping may result to changes in the quantity and timing of surface water run-off and change of the inflows of surface water being received by adjacent properties or downstream watercourses. However, the proposed basement would not affect the likelihood that the property and adjoining properties be subject to surface water flooding due to flooding in the wider area. A SUDS design has been proposed to mitigate impacts and this suggests that there will be an overall net reduction in impermeable surface and provided that adequate attenuation capacity and hydrobrake system is implemented (SUDS design) the development will not increase the flood risk in the locality. The proposed SUDs system, outlined in the FRA (Flood Risk Assessment) shall be conditioned.

The screening checklists for subterranean flow identified: that the site is located above an aquifer and that the proposed basement may extend below the water table; and that the site is within 100m of a potential spring line. Groundwater levels are currently 0.24m below the level of the proposed basement, however the retaining

wall to the rear of the property includes piles which would be below the present groundwater level. Conservative (worst case) assumptions were used in the groundwater modelling, this showed that the groundwater would be diverted either side of the structure, and in addition gaps within the contiguous piled wall would also allow a portion of the flow through. The report concludes that the basement level will have no additional impact on subterranean flow. The predicted ground level changes are unlikely to have an impact in groundwater flooding in the vicinity and surrounding structures. It is also concludes that there will be no impact on the spring line.

The screening tests for slope stability identified: the site is within a wider hillside setting where the general slope angle is less than 7°; the site is underlain by made ground, claygate beds and London clay. Slope stability modelling has demonstrated that the construction of the basement and the predicted small changes in groundwater levels would not result in unacceptable basement stability.

Single storey rear extension

The proposed single storey rear extension is divided into two parts, sited on the rear and inner side walls of the original two storey rear projection. The extension would project 1.5m in depth from the rear wall, and 1.6m in width from the inner side wall features a flat roof and is 3.45m in height. The two part glazed extension is relatively small in scale and finished with similar brickwork detailing as the original rear projection of the dwellinghouse. The proposed incorporated glazing would be frameless glass providing a greater proportion of daylight into the extended family/kitchen area.

In view of the fact that the proposed single storey rear extension is not significant in size or scale and has been designed to respect the character and appearance of the original dwelling-house whilst improving the internal habitable space, the extension is considered acceptable in accordance with policies: CS14; DP24; DP25 of Camden's LDF. The extensions are set a significant distance from any neighbouring property and will not impact on their amenity in terms of light, outlook or privacy.

Two storey rear extension

The proposed two storey rear extension projects 2.3m from the principal rear wall of the dwelling-house sited 3.5m from the neighbouring boundary of No. 9 Templewood Avenue. The form, proportions, design and materials match the original two storey rear projection, the only difference between the two wings is 1.7m less depth.

Adopted design guidance CPG1 states that rear extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale unless specific circumstances such as site context or its design would allow an exception to this approach. Extensions which are higher than one full storey below eaves level or rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and extensions are, in most cases, strongly discouraged. Redington/Frognaal conservation area appraisal and management plan note that extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the acceptability of larger extensions will depend upon the particular site and circumstances.

In consideration of the traditional urban grain, buildings on Templewood Avenue are sited on relatively large plots with differing building forms and design. The CAAM states *'For these houses Quennell has used a variety of details and architectural themes to produce a set of houses which are all different but make a cohesive whole'*. The adjacent property at No. 9 Templewood Avenue has two existing projecting wings and the property opposite the subject site No. 12 also has two projecting rear wings.

Although the proposed two storey rear extension is substantial, in this context it is deemed acceptable and in harmony with the character and appearance of the original dwellinghouse. The detailing and materials proposed will match those of the original rear wing as closely as possible which would make it appear as an original part of the property. This is illustrated at the property opposite, No. 12 Templewood Avenue, where an additional two storey front extension was given the benefit of planning permission in 2007.

Residents in No. 9 Templewood Avenue are concerned that the two storey extension would reduce daylighting and outlook into habitable rooms. Although a narrow passageway does exist between the joint boundary and No. 9 Templewood Avenue, the proposed extension would be set in from this boundary by 3.5m and would be no deeper than their two storey projection. A sunlight and daylight study was submitted in conjunction to assess the impact of the proposals upon residential amenity. The assessment, which was undertaken in accordance BRE. The report demonstrates that there are two windows at ground floor level in the flank elevation of this property at ground floor level whose VSC would be reduced to less than 0.8 of its former value, beyond BRE guideline levels. These windows both serve bedrooms. One of these windows serves a room which is also lit by two windows on the rear elevation, and thus it will continue to receive a good level of light. The remaining window serves the third bedroom to this flat, the loss of light would be a reduction from 6.88% to 4.32%, a 0.63

loss. Although this is beyond BRE guidelines given that it is a window in the flank elevation serving a secondary bedroom and the loss is only marginally beyond the guideline this is considered to be acceptable.

No windows are proposed within the side elevation of the extension which would overlook the neighbouring property.

Rear dormer window and rooflights

There is an existing rear dormer window at the subject site which is located off-centre within the rear roofslope, it is 5.35m in length. The applicant has proposed to reduce the length of the dormer window to 4.55m (1.7m in height and 2.3m in depth) and relocate it centrally within the roofslope in accordance with design guidance contained in CPG1. Although the dormer window would be in close proximity to the rear facing chimney, the reduction in size and scale and its central location within the rear roofslope would bring balance to the rear façade. This is welcomed.

The two existing rooflights in the rear roofslope would be removed and replaced by four conservation style rooflights, 0.6m x 0.6m. The rooflights proposed would be sited centrally on the same line as the rear dormer window and sit flush within the roofslope. In addition, two front conservation style rooflights are proposed sited between the two existing front dormer windows. The proportion of the rooflights is not considered overly excessive, nor are they in number, they are not considered to detract from the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse or the conservation area.

Alterations to front boundary wall

The site as existing has a low undulating front boundary wall and the proposal would raise the height of the boundary to 1.8m high with the addition of black painted flat bar horizontals and circular uprights installed within the raised brick piers.

The conservation appraisal notes the importance of front boundary walls which are predominately formed by walls either with railings or hedges. In view that the existing fabric of the front boundary wall will be retained and that other properties in the immediate locality feature low walls with railings the alteration is considered sympathetic and in accordance with policy.

Alterations to fenestration

At the front and rear elevation of the existing single-storey side extension a replacement window is proposed which would match the material and relieving arch of existing windows, in addition to a pyramid rooflight which would project 0.3m above the parapet.

The applicant has proposed infilling three existing window openings at ground and first floor to the side north-east elevation with three separate openings which reflect the size and scale of the majority of windows within this elevation. One first floor window at the south-west elevation will be reduced in size by two panes. The infilled sections will feature brickwork and bonding to match and should not therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property or the Redington/Frognaal conservation area.

Installation of two condenser units with acoustic enclosure

A condenser enclosure is proposed and would be sited at the rear boundary of the site in close proximity to the side boundary of No. 15 Templewood Avenue; the enclosure would be 2.4m in depth and 4.8m in width. The enclosure would be sited 2.1m away from the side boundary and would not be highly visible from the Grade II listed building adjacent. The condenser units proposed form part of a 'comfort cooling system': 2 X Mitsubishi units, PURY-P300.

The nearest noise sensitive façade is 5.4m from the proposed acoustic enclosure and the noise report anticipates that the operational hours will be on a 'demand basis'. The report concludes that the installation will meet policy guidelines, including requirements with regard to adjacent gardens during typical garden use between the hours of 09:00 – 21:00. Environmental Health officers assessed the documentation relating to the proposed air condenser units and have concluded that the proposal meets all relevant Camden policy and guidance. A condition is recommended to ensure that the proposed units will not increase the background noise levels to the detriment of neighbouring occupiers and are maintained in accordance with the manufacturers' specification. The structure itself is relatively small and discreetly located within the garden, it will not harm the appearance of the grounds of this building or the conservation area.

Landscaping and Trees

The applicant has submitted: arboricultural report; and ecology survey report with regard to the potential impact of their proposals. Landscape officers have considered the documents and state that they demonstrate that the works are acceptable in respect of the impact of the proposed basement, extensions and patio works on trees.

The proposal includes the removal of a number of trees (Plum, Lawson Cypress, Crab Apple and a Birch), but these are not considered to be in good health and make a limited contribution to the visual amenity of the area. There will be some encroachment into the RPA of a Bay and Lawson Cypress which are to be retained, but will not affect the long-term health of these trees. A Bay and Magnolia will be affected as some pruning would be necessary, however, their overall contribution to the wider conservation area will be maintained.

Officers sought further information with regard to the associated services linking the condenser units to the house, including proposed drainage channels, and their possible impact on existing trees. An extension to the method statement was provided noting the proposed excavation trenches required (500mm wide x 250mm deep) with pipes placed at a minimum depth of 450mm. The condenser pipes will be laid in the same trenches as the land drainage network to minimise excavation. The report concludes that providing the route is followed and the tree protection measures outlined in the report dated 15th August 2011 are strictly adhered to, which includes arboricultural supervision, there should be no likelihood of any significant impact on tree health or vitality resulting. Conditions should secure tree protection and landscaping.

Transportation

Transportation officers have reviewed the proposals and do not raise objection to the proposal subject to the following matters being secured by a S106 agreement: Construction Management Plan; financial contribution to repave the footway adjacent to the site and vehicular crossover.

Archaeology

The site is location within an area identified as having the potential for archaeological remains. The report provided by MOLAS states that there is a low potential for archaeological remains of low to moderate significant on the site. It states that present archaeological survival is anticipated to be low because of the ground disturbance that has already taken place. The archaeological implications of the development are concluded to be minor, but it is recommended that a watching brief should be secured by condition.

Recommendation: Grant conditional permission subject to S106 agreement.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 5th December 2011.

For further information see

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>