

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	13/10/2011
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	22.9.11
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Charles Thuaire			2011/3669/P, 2011/3703/C		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
4 North End London NW3 7HH			See decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
<p>P- Erection of four semi-detached three storey plus basement dwellinghouses (Class C3) with associated basement patios, forecourt parking for four cars and landscaping.</p> <p>C- Demolition of existing house and garage</p>					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
Informatives:					

Consultations

Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	15	No. of responses No. electronic	02 00	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Neighbours at <u>nos 1, 6a and 12 North End</u> object-</p> <p>No.1- increased parking congestion from 4 family homes; loss of trees and landscape; out of character with heathside location.</p> <p>No.6a- Overdevelopment in conservation area with huge basements; parking congestion; impact on neighbouring house stability and water flows; reduction in permeable surfaces; construction nuisance from vehicles to excavate spoil; overlooking from ground and 1st floors plus glazed basement wall to 1st floor of 6a; loss of daylight by increased bulk.</p> <p>No.12- construction disruption; parking congestion; harms village atmosphere (already spoilt by other developments); should be no more than original planning application for 2 houses; requests extension to existing parking restrictions.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p><u>Hampstead CAAC</u> object- this is a major overdevelopment, losing greenery, openness and amenity; intensely cramped on the site and damages conservation area.</p> <p><u>Heath and Hampstead Society</u> object- cramped site layout with 4 substantial houses having virtually no gardens and no consideration to children; loss of all fine trees which is feature of site and area and risk to remaining ones by deep basements; BIA needs careful scrutiny; designs are banal, reminiscent of 1950's neo-Georgian and disappointing for 2011.</p> <p><u>North End Residents Association</u> object- overdevelopment; reduction in permeable land, risk to structures and water table and flooding from basements; reference to underground flood tank nearby built to alleviate local flooding and this could be affected by excavations; onstreet parking congestion already exists and would be worsened by new house occupiers each owning 2 cars.</p> <p><u>English Heritage</u> (GLAAS)- no objection but recommend a condition to protect archaeological remains</p> <p><u>London Underground Ltd</u>- no objection as it does not affect their underground tunnels</p>					

Site Description

The property contains a detached 2 storey 4 bedroom house, probably of 1970's origin, with pitched roof, PVC windows and white-painted brick walls, plus a flat roofed rear extension and separate side garage. It is set back from the road frontages on both sides behind low brick wall and high hedge and is surrounded by a large garden which has numerous shrubs and coniferous trees around its edge, plus one protected maple tree. There is offstreet parking for 1-2 cars.

The site is at the junction of North End and North End Way, the latter being a busy road (A502) connecting Hampstead with Golders Green and which descends northwards to the area of North End via a cutting across the heath from Whitestone Pond. Opposite the site facing North End Way is the Old Bull and Bush public house, a Grade 2 listed building.

The area is located in the Hampstead conservation area and specifically referred to in the Conservation Area Statement (CAS) as Sub-area 8 "North End". No.4 is regarded as a neutral building which does not make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area. The surroundings are characterised by quite modest houses, either terraced or detached, scattered in an informal arrangement and many with large gardens. Three buildings opposite the site are listed at grade II The Bull & Bush PH, and nos 1 and 3 North End. This area of North End is described in the CAS as "a small enclave detached from urban life", as it adjoins the northern boundary with Barnet and separated from Hampstead village to the south by Hampstead Heath. The houses on the south side of North End are also described by the CAS as 20th C. and "unassuming".

The area is also sited within an Archaeological Priority Area.

Relevant History

21.3.97- pp granted for Erection of a 2 storey side extension to the existing dwellinghouse.

26.10.99- pp refused for Erection of a 3 metre high brick wall along North End and North End Way frontages,

August 2009- planning and CA consent applications (2009/3489/P) submitted for "Erection of two new houses with garages, associated parking, landscaping, boundary walls and fences, following the demolition of existing house, garage and boundary walls". Later withdrawn following officer advice, due to objections on design, bulk and trees

7.2.11- pp and cac granted for Demolition of existing two-storey house and garage and erection of two new three-storey dwelling houses (Class C3)

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

- CS1 - Distribution of growth
- CS5 - Managing the impact of growth and development
- CS6 - Providing quality homes
- CS11 - Promoting sustainable and efficient travel
- CS13 - Tackling climate change
- CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
- CS15 - Protecting and improving open spaces & encouraging biodiversity
- CS16 - Improving Camden's health and well-being
- CS17 - Making Camden a safer place
- CS18 - Dealing with waste

- DP2 - Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing
- DP5 - Housing size mix
- DP6 - Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes
- DP17 - Walking, cycling and public transport
- DP18 - Parking standards and the availability of car parking
- DP19 - Managing the impact of parking

DP20 – Movement of goods and materials
DP21 - Development connecting to highway network
DP22 - 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
DP29 - Improving access

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

Hampstead Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

Background

The first application for a redevelopment for 2 detached houses here was withdrawn for reasons of bulk and design, on account of the houses' bulk and blocky appearance with a 2nd floor and no roof pitch and with an unsympathetic design and use of materials. However the principle of redevelopment and the layout and footprint of 2 houses here was accepted in principle by officers. The architects had carried out an excellent urban design study for the area (as discussed further below under layout/footprint), which concluded that the proposed layout, height and footprint was the best approach for this site.

The 2nd application was based on this scheme but the new architects adopted a more traditional design approach with timber clad walls and pitched roofs. However the height, width and depth of the houses and the extent of basements remained exactly the same. Planning permission was therefore granted in January 2011.

The site has now been sold on with the benefit of this permission and the new developer now wishes to erect 4 semi-detached houses here.

Proposal

The current building will be demolished and four new semi-detached houses erected on the site in a staggered layout so that one pair is set back at the corner of the road junction with North End Way. One pair of houses (H3,4) will be located broadly in the same place as the existing house next to no.6 North End and the other pair (H1,2) will be sited to its southwest alongside North End Way, set back approx 4m from its front facade and adjoining the rear garden boundary. In contrast to the earlier scheme with 2 detached houses, there will be now 4 houses with deeper above-ground footprints and narrower plot widths plus overall less soft landscaped areas.

Both pairs of houses will have an identical design, form and size, each with 2 storeys plus an attic storey within the pitched roof form and a basement storey. They will be approx 12m deep and 12m wide at above-ground floor levels. Unlike the previous scheme, both pairs will be entirely separate with no intervening single storey wings. Sunken patios will be provided adjoining the basements, at the front for house H1, at the side next to its adjoining semi H2, and to the rear for the pair H3/4 adjoining no.6 North End. All houses will have brick walls, large timber framed full height window openings, projecting bays at front ground floor level, balconies at 1st floor and dormers in a pitched slate roof. The rear and side facades are much plainer with smaller window openings, some high level, and rooflights. The centre of both pairs will have a projecting 2 storey element with stone cornice which rises above the eaves line to accommodate a staircase.

The front of the site will be mainly hard surfaced for forecourt parking and driveway and other ancillary utilities- 2 car spaces are provided in front of house H2, one is provided on the west side of the paved forecourt and one is to the east side adjoining no.6. The existing crossover and vehicular entrance will

be retained as well as the existing hedge and fence. The existing holly to the west of the entrance, in contrast to the previous scheme, will now be removed to accommodate new bin store and cycle store structures. To their west is a new energy centre although its purpose has not been explained in the applicant's submission.

The existing chestnut tree overhanging the front garden from no 6 next door will be retained and protected; the other protected maple tree will be removed from the rear garden to allow the new pair of houses H1/2 to be built. The existing deodar, birch and cherries will be retained at the rear adjoining no.6a. All other trees including coniferous trees and hedges will be removed and replaced by a formal landscaping treatment containing a variety of small scale tree planting, patios and lawns along the side frontage along North End Way and to the rear embankment.

Demolition

The existing building is of limited architectural or historic interest and indeed is not designated in the CAS as being a positive contributor to the conservation area. At best it is considered as a neutral building and indeed it could be argued that with its PVC windows and painted brickwork, it detracts from the setting of adjoining listed buildings and thus redevelopment provides the opportunity for enhancement of the site. No objection is raised to the building's demolition, subject to its replacement by a building of suitable quality to enhance the character and appearance of the area. (it should be noted that the submitted PPS5 heritage statement by Montagu Evans relates to the previous application and is not relevant to this proposal)

Redevelopment principles

The site is located within a designated heritage asset (i.e. the Conservation Area) and has the potential to impact upon the setting of the nearby listed buildings. In this regard consideration should be had to 'the particular nature of the significance of the heritage asset and the value that [they] hold' and to the desirability of 'sustaining or enhancing the significance' of the heritage assets identified and the 'desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment' (HE7.2 and 7.4 PPS5).

As discussed above, the previously approved scheme was based on a similar withdrawn scheme (ref: 2009/3489/P) which carefully examined the density, built to un-built ratio, form, scale and height of the existing properties in the area by way of justifying the redevelopment proposals.

With regard to the new proposal, the height of the proposed development is the same as the approved scheme and is not considered to be an issue. However the number of dwellings, the depth of each and the overall increase in footprint and bulk, as well as the subsequent increase in the number of plots on the site and the reduction in un-built space and landscaping, are considered to be material considerations of concern. In addition concerns are raised on the elevational design and form of the new dwellings.

The proposed application fails to satisfactorily justify how the increase in the number of plots on the site and subsequent loss of un-built space would impact on the significance of the heritage assets. The onus is on the applicant to demonstrate how the proposal would not harm in this regard. In contrast to the earlier scheme which had a detailed supporting urban design analysis (discussed further below), this has not been undertaken by the current agents to the same level of detail.

An assessment of the area is based on the description of the area in the Hampstead CA statement and repeated in the Montagu Evans report (para 2.9) which states,

"North End is a loose cluster of quite modest houses centred on the Olde Bull and Bush pub with the Hampstead Heath Extension banked up steeply all around. It has the distinct quality of a small enclave detached from urban life. The roads peter out into paths through the surrounding woodland. Greenery dominates and the relationship between the houses, their gardens and the Heath is particularly

intimate.... The houses on the south side are 20th century and unassuming.”

The significance of the site is considered to derive from the open and verdant nature of the site which relates directly to the surrounding woodland.

Layout/footprint

The principle of erecting 2 houses in a staggered fashion on this site is considered acceptable in principle. The site is a large one with the existing house only occupying a small portion of its area. The site is thus capable of accommodating more development here in the form of 2 storey high houses with pitched roofs. In the previous scheme for 2 new houses, one new house occupied a similar footprint to the existing house and another new house was set back to its SW side to allow open views to continue across the site from the cutting and heath opposite North End Way. Both also had large basement floors but this accommodation was mainly confined to below the houses themselves and both had large basement level gardens at either front or rear. It was considered that in this approved scheme, this bulk, form and layout represented approximately the maximum development that the site could reasonably accommodate within the constraints of its heathside and conservation area setting. To some extent, this scheme represents the benchmark against which the new scheme should be assessed.

In the context of the current scheme, the differences with the previous approval are as follows: the height and width of both pair of houses is the same; the extent of basement excavation in footprint and height is approx the same; at above-ground levels, the depth of the eastern pair is extended back by 3m compared to the eastern house, thus reducing the latter's basement garden to a pair of smaller basement patios; similarly the western pair is extended forward by 5m compared to the western house thus reducing the latter's basement garden to one small basement patio and hard surfaced forecourt parking; the single storey side wings have been omitted and replaced by ground or basement level patios; the natural landscaped fringe in front of the western house is replaced by forecourt parking and cycle/bin stores and energy centre; pitched roofs are somewhat steeper in roofslope with dormers at front, not rooflights; the front elevations have projecting bay windows either side of projecting central staircases.

It is important to stress that the agents for the first withdrawn scheme here undertook a detailed analysis of the existing urban structure, grain and density of the North End enclave and the conclusions reached are considered robust and accurate. In particular the western end of North End itself including this site is somewhat different from other areas within the overall area in that it has a finer grain and smaller plot sizes than larger sites with large detached dwellings to the east. Moreover the site in question has a smaller built mass within the site compared to other sites next door and opposite; in these instances, the Bull & Bush pub and Hogarth Court opposite form a terraced 3 storey block of properties with a continuous street frontage; no.6 next door is conjoined with nos. 6a and 8 creating a 2 storey with attic property covering most of the whole plot. Other properties in the immediate vicinity have a medium-scale mass within their sites.

As a percentage ratio of built plan form to total plot area, the existing house at no.4 is estimated to be 14% which is very low compared to Hogarth Court opposite (50%) and 6-8 North End next door (53%) and lower than similar detached houses with large gardens further east at nos. 10 and 12 (21% and 22% respectively). The approved scheme would divide the existing site into 2 plots which would remain medium plot sizes in the area with a ratio of 29% and 30% built form to plot size which would be higher than the average of 23% of built form for detached and semi-detached residential dwellings in the immediate area. However it was considered that these would sit comfortably within this range of plot ratios and would not constitute overdevelopment. It was therefore considered that a higher density and plot coverage would be appropriate here and would still respect the established form and grain of the neighbourhood. The layout reflected the informal random arrangements of houses within their plots in this area and it also retained substantial areas for landscaping and tree retention so that the scheme would blend in with the overall landscape.

The proposed development would now divide the existing plot by 4, resulting in narrow plots akin to

terraced house plots in the area. The table below shows that the average built ratio for the new dwellings would be 38%.

The proposed dwellings have the following approximate ratios

Dwelling	Plot size m ²	Dwelling size m ²	% built form to plot size ratio.
H1	225	78	35
H2	234	72	30
H3	150	75	50
H4	260	100	38
Average			38

The figure shows an average 15% increase in built ratio for detached and semi-detached dwellings in the area. This is partly due to the increased depth of houses compared to the previous approved ones and consequent greater bulk/mass and reduction in landscaped areas. This is considered to be an unacceptable increase which tips the balance between appropriate built development and protection of the verdant and open character of the area.

The proposed tightly knit plots would not have the same characteristic as the immediate dwellings where (to quote the CAS) "Greenery dominates and the relationship between the houses, their gardens and the Heath is particularly intimate". As referred to above, the plots would be more akin to terraced cottages in the area. These are small and unassuming, generally built on the pavement edge with narrow front gardens which have a different character to the semi-detached and detached properties.

However the difference is that the proposed scheme is not intending to create traditional small terraced cottage dwellings. The proposed scheme has designed semi-detached suburban style dwellings with off-street parking which relate to the semi-detached type of dwellings in the area. The scheme has therefore been assessed in comparison to existing semi-detached dwellings in the area and has been shown to have insufficient plot sizes, lack of gardens and inappropriate relationship with the surrounding landscape.

In this regard, the character of the proposed dwellings is at odds with comparable type of dwellings in the area. The proposed plot widths are suitable for terraced housing which are predominantly located at the back of the pavement and have larger rear gardens. The proposed semi-detached dwellings have large areas of non-permeable, low amenity value hardstandings for parking at the front which are more suitable for plots with larger gardens and mature boundary vegetation relating to the woodland, which these new plots lack. It is therefore concluded that the footprint and layout would result in an excessive form of site coverage which would be out of character with the prevailing urban grain and landscaped character of the area and thus would be harmful to the character of this heathside locality and conservation area.

Bulk/height

The current scheme is similar to the previous scheme in terms of width and height of houses as facing the main road frontage. This maintains the pattern of development along this side of the road in terms of large detached houses with intervening gaps and pitched roofs with a unified ridge line. However their roof pitches are steeper than previous and have projecting dormers while the front elevations have each projecting bays and a projecting staircase which rises above eaves level. Thus the roof forms and the front facades appear somewhat bulkier than that of previously approved houses as well as existing adjoining houses. Moreover the depth of the new houses at all above-ground levels has been considerably increased as discussed above. This will be particularly noticeable at the western corner where the side elevation will be apparent in long views along North End Way and where the increased built mass and reduction in landscaped areas and tree cover will be very obvious. However the eastern pair of houses will be also somewhat noticeable in their depth of built form which will be visible through gaps between both houses and the neighbouring ones at 6/6a. This increased bulk

and scale is considered inappropriate and harms the overall character of the conservation area and heathside setting. As before, the basement accommodation would not be visible from the public realm and indeed the ground floors would be barely visible through the retained boundary frontage of high hedges and fences.

In conclusion, the combination of type and design of the development in relation to the size of the proposed plots would have an incongruous impact on the surrounding area. The proposal fails to sustain or enhance the significance of the identified heritage assets and fails to make a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. Moreover the proposal has failed to fully satisfactorily justify the works in relation to PPS5. Overall, the layout, scale and mass is not considered respectful of the surrounding townscape and its somewhat semi-rural grain and character. The scheme would result in overdevelopment of the site by virtue of the increased footprint and mass of the buildings and consequent reduction in open landscaped areas. It is considered that the scheme would not preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. It would harm the setting and character of the adjoining heath and would harm the setting of nearby listed buildings on the north side.

Design

A contemporary design idiom is considered acceptable here, given the variety of 19th century, neo-Georgian and contemporary postwar styles evident in the road. However for the most part they display a traditional and modest (indeed “unassuming” according to the CAS) approach in form and detailed design. The previous proposal provided a contemporary interpretation of 2 vernacular cottages with a palette of traditional natural materials that was considered appropriate for this semi-rural context adjoining the heath and the heavily landscaped surroundings.

In contrast, the current scheme’s design is not considered to successfully respond to the significance of the area or to the type of dwellings which contribute to its significance.

The proposed dwellings appear as executive properties of a pattern-book style found in more suburban estate developments and are not considered appropriate for the “*distinct quality of a small enclave detached from urban life. The roads peter out into paths through the surrounding woodland.*” Their design appears rather formal and urbane compared to the rather informal and varied pattern of styles in the vicinity, both in facade and layout design. Moreover as already noted above, the new houses’ façade projections and roof forms add to the overall impression of bulk and do not relate to their neighbours in this street.

It is acknowledged that the south side of the road has a variety of styles; however this is not sufficient to introduce a housing style which has no reference within the immediate area. The broad character of the area is as a small enclave of dwellings with a rural charm. Any new development should seek to reinforce this character. In areas, such as the south side of North End Way, where no pattern prevails, development should improve the quality of an area and give a stronger identity. It is thus considered that the proposed design and form is harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene and conservation area.

Landscape/trees

The site contains a maple in the rear garden and adjoins a mature horse chestnut in the front garden of no.6, both of which are subject to Tree Preservation Orders. The maple has been subjected to a severe and damaging reduction to the extent that it is no longer worthy of retention. The proposed house footprint, basement excavation and forecourt surfaces are considered to be sufficiently far from the horse chestnut not to be damaging to its root system. A method statement for the protection of this tree should however form part of any planning permission.

The removal of a number of conifers which border the site to North End Way is acceptable as these are incongruous elements at the fringes of the Heath. However they do provide a useful screening function to views into the site and their removal should be replaced with a tree belt along this

boundary which is more congruent with the woodland landscape of the Heath. The previous scheme successfully retained a margin along this boundary of 5m to provide sufficient space and soil volume adjacent to the proposed basements to establish such a tree belt of native species.

The current scheme retains the same width of landscaped fringe along the side of North End Way and the same width of embankment at the rear untouched by basement excavation. However the frontage along North End has, compared to both existing and previously approved, a larger paved forecourt area for parking and manoeuvring which extends towards the western corner, as well as new ancillary store structures; consequently there is less potential for large scale planting of trees than. Also the scheme, as a result of the increased depth of houses, now has only much smaller basement level patios at front and rear which will have non-permeable surfaces in contrast to the much larger approved basement level gardens with permeable surfaces and potential for natural planting. Once again, there is less availability of room for natural planting within the site to help connect the site and its development to the setting of a mature landscape adjoining the heath. The earlier scheme had green sedum roofs to all flat roofs and permeable surfaces with Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to the 2 sunken gardens; in contrast, the current scheme has none of these features.

Furthermore the landscaping proposals as indicated in the Design and Access Statement show a different landscaping treatment of all external areas which now involves a more urban and formal design, comprising features such as pleached trees, planter troughs, decking, lawns and patio furniture. Only 4 smaller trees are proposed at the road junction corner with none along the side frontage, non-native bamboo species are introduced and the existing holly tree at the frontage is also now removed. This contrasting approach in landscape design and quality and quantity of tree planting is considered inappropriate to this site and its semi-rural setting next to the heath.

Overall the quality and quantity of landscaping is considered inappropriate and inadequate for this site and setting and it would harm the character of the heathside and conservation area as well as fail to achieve a satisfactory level of biodiversity on the site compatible with its surroundings. Again it is symptomatic of a perceived overdevelopment of the site as discussed above.

Density

In terms of density, the previous approved density was 200 habitable rooms per hectare (hrh) whereas the new proposed density is approx 355.55 hrh (based on 8 habitable rooms for each house). LDF policies CS1 and DP2 encourage higher density development to maximise the use of land and the opportunities for more housing. They also state that densities should be in accordance with the London Plan matrix for density but promote densities at the higher end of this scale. In this case, the proposed scheme at 355 hrh is considered to considerably exceed the table's suggested range of 150-200 hrh for suburban locations with poor accessibility; this merely supports the urban design analysis above which indicates excessive footprint and bulk and insufficient landscaped areas and which suggests an overdevelopment of the site.

However LDF policy DP2 para 2.10 states that the Council does not favour very large homes and therefore when using the London Plan matrix, it will refer primarily to dwelling densities measured in units per hectare (u/ha). In this case, the density calculation gives 44.44 u/ha which falls within the London Plan's matrix range of 40-80 u/ha for this type of area. On that basis, it is considered that it would be difficult to refuse the scheme on grounds of excessive density in the light of this policy advice on the approach to be taken.

Basement impact

The houses have identical sized basement excavations as the previous scheme. This had a hydrological review, updated in January 2011, which concluded that there would be no impact on local hydrogeology and land stability. Circumstances have not materially changed since this except that Camden has now formally adopted its CPG4 guidance on basements. Accordingly a new study has been undertaken which updates the previous one in the light of this new advice and sets it out in the form of a Basement Impact Assessment which complies with the recommended approach of

screening and scoping.

This new study shows that the site does not fall within an area at risk of flooding nor is near any known underground water courses. The site lies on Bagshot Beds comprising permeable sands and clays overlaying the Claygate Beds. Another soil investigation was carried out in July 2011 involving 3 boreholes and deep trial holes which confirmed that the main basement area would be above the ground water level by 1.2m thus no localised water pumping would be required and there should be no effect on surrounding properties. The flow chart diagram supplied also shows that no further assessment on land stability is required.

In terms of hydrology, the basement level will be above ground water levels and this would retain existing ground water flows and not cut them off nor would lead to an increase in flood risk. As with the previous approved scheme, it is intended for the application site to adopt construction measures which will allow existing ground water to be maintained and allowed to flow around the new basement and under the slab which will stop any build up of ground water from occurring or affecting adjoining properties. Ground water will freely filter into the proposed drainage geo-composite under the basements. The proposed sequence of works with piling and basement retaining walls will ensure stability of adjoining properties.

It is considered that the scheme broadly complies with LDF policy DP27 on basements- the basement accommodation itself will be only 1 storey deep and located under the houses, in accordance with guidance in para 27.9, although it is acknowledged that there will be basement level patios adjoining these which will have a coverage equivalent to the main house footprint and which will cover a substantial part of the gardens. However there will be substantial margins around the basements overall to enable landscaping and retention at normal garden level, no trees will be adversely affected and also some of the hard surfacing covering the basement accommodation, ie. at the front of houses H1/2, will have permeable surfaces. Moreover the use of SUDS as recommended by para 27.8 for basements extending beyond the profile of the building should mitigate against harm to water environment.

It is concluded that the scheme and its construction methodology will seek to retain existing ground water flows and will not lead to an increase in flood potential. As with the previous approval, any permission for this new scheme should have conditions requiring submission of details of SUDS and methodology statement for construction works.

English Heritage (GLAAS) have confirmed that they have no objection to the excavation works in principle but, as these may affect archaeological remains of importance, they wish a condition to be attached to require investigative work to be carried out before development on site.

Residential standards

The provision of additional housing is welcomed by LDF policies and the houses provide spacious family sized (6 person) accommodation in compliance with CPG standards. The houses are capable of complying with all relevant Lifetime Home standards. In terms of internal amenity, the basement accommodation appears to be somewhat poor quality in that the kitchens and family rooms receive very little light as a consequence of the increased depth of houses with only one side lit by a basement lightwell. However in the context of the generous accommodation at upper levels and the ability for future occupiers to replan internally if necessary, it would be difficult to refuse the scheme on the basis of inadequate amenity.

The scheme is targeted to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 which is welcomed. A pre-assessment report has been provided which shows that the subcategories of materials, energy and water also meet the Council targets of 50%. In terms of energy reduction, the scheme is targeted to reduce CO2 emissions by 25% as compared against a Building Regulation compliant dwelling, through the use of air-source heat pumps. Again this is welcome and accords with Council and London Plan policy. These targets should be secured at implementation stage by means of a S106.

Neighbour amenity

The scheme has the potential for only affecting the amenity of nos.6/6a North End next door. A full daylight and sunlight analysis has been undertaken which shows that no windows will be adversely affected and that they will continue to receive above-standard levels of light. The only exception is one side window at 1st floor level of no 6a which is at the rear of the site and which will experience some reduction in winter sunlight marginally below the recommended minimum as advised in the BRE guide. However overall this window receives good levels of annual sunshine and of course it is only one window of many within the whole house, most of which are not affected or still receive adequate winter sunshine. The 9m distance of the new house H4 from the side of nos.6/6a is the same as previously approved and thus there would be no unreasonable loss of outlook; despite the increased depth of this new pair of houses, the outlook of the side windows of no.6a would continue to be mainly over the rear gardens. There are no new windows proposed in the side elevation facing the neighbours, except for 2 rooflights to bathrooms which would be obscure glazed, thus there are no overlooking issues.

Transport

The site has a low PTAL rating of 2 which indicates poor accessibility and hence onsite carparking is acceptable in principle. However it is noted that neighbours complain of localised parking congestion and it is important that any development here complies with the Council's maximum standards for carparking and does not result in further unnecessary onstreet congestion. The scheme provides 4 carspaces in compliance with standards for one space per dwelling and thus any permission should be subject to a S106 which would require the house to be car-capped to prevent further parking permits issued to future occupiers.

The 4 parking areas shown on the forecourt are not clearly defined and the layout would appear to be problematic resulting in difficult manoeuvres, including turns and reversing. It is considered that actually only 2 spaces, ie. those in front of H2 and H4, would comfortably work in allowing cars to enter and exit the site in a forward facing direction. The other spaces in front of houses H1 and H2 would require either tortuous movements on the driveway or reversing in/out of the site due to insufficient onsite manoeuvring space if all spaces were occupied. This would result in a localised safety hazard to vehicles and pedestrians on the public highway which would be harmful to road safety.

As with the previous scheme, the existing vehicular entrance and crossover is retained as well as the perimeter hedge and wall/fence, so it is unlikely that construction activity would affect and damage the surrounding pavement except for the crossover itself. Thus as before, it is unlikely to be necessary to require financial contributions for repaving the footway as no changes are proposed to the adjoining footway.

8 cycle spaces are shown which complies with standards for 2 cycles per dwelling. However they will need to be redesigned as the communal store shown is too small, although enough space exists on site to accommodate a different arrangement.

A Construction Management Plan is considered necessary here. Although this is a relatively large site with easy access from a main road, it is at a potentially dangerous corner with vehicles descending from North End Way in a steep cutting. Furthermore the scheme retains the existing boundary treatment and involves a substantial sized basement covering virtually the whole site, leaving little room left for onsite storage, vehicles parking and manoeuvring etc., which would necessitate onstreet parking and servicing. This could have safety implications for the corner with North End Way as well as local parking arrangements. A draft detailed CMP has been submitted this time for the new scheme, although transport officers have not commented upon its acceptability. Notwithstanding this, any permission for 4 houses for this scheme should be subject to a S106 requiring approval of a CMP and implementation in accordance with it.

Conclusion

The scheme is considered unacceptable by reason of its built footprint, layout, bulk, design and landscaping which results in overdevelopment of the site, causing harm to the character of the streetscene, heathside setting and conservation area.

It is also unacceptable in terms of its forecourt and parking layout which has the potential to harm highway safety. The CAC application should also be refused on account of an unacceptable scheme to replace the existing house.

On account of the refusal based on these issues, the scheme will also have to be refused on account of the lack of a S106 agreement to secure the other requirements, ie. a post-construction review on sustainability, car-capping for the new houses, and a Construction Management Plan.

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