

SHH Architects  
1 Vencourt Place  
Hammersmith  
London, UK  
W6 9NU

Application Ref: **2010/1553/P**  
Please ask for: **Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin**  
Telephone: 020 7974 **6374**

26 May 2010

Dear Sir/Madam

### **DECISION**

Town and Country Planning Acts 1990 (as amended)  
Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995  
Town and Country Planning (Applications) Regulations 1988

#### **Householder Application Refused**

Address:  
**37 Queens Grove  
St Johns Wood  
London  
UK  
NW8 6HN**

Proposal:

Excavation to extend the existing basement to incorporate a swimming pool and associated plant to single dwelling (Class C3).

Drawing Nos: 0629(P)000 B(Site Location Plan); 002 C; 010 B; 011 B; 012 (B); 013 (A); 014 (A); 020 G; 021 G; 022 E; 201 B; 202 B; 301 F; 302 E; 501 A; Construction Management Plan dated March 2010 by Mace Living; Arboricultural Implications Report dated 3rd March 2010 by ACS Consulting; and Noise Assessment of plant for swimming pool attached to letter dated 8th March from EMTEC Products Ltd.

The Council has considered your application and decided to **refuse** planning permission for the following reason(s):



## Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposed basement extension, by reason of its excessive depth and proximity to the group of Sycamore Trees (T6, T7, T8) would be likely to result in a detrimental impact on the long term health and amenity value of the trees, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to policies B7 (Conservation Areas) and N8 (Ancient Woodland and Trees) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.
- 2 The proposed development in the absence of a S106 legal agreement for a Construction Management Plan, would be likely to increase parking stress and congestion in the locality and affect the highway conditions to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to policies T9 (Impact of Parking) and T12 (Works affecting Highway )of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.

## Informative(s):

- 1 It should be noted that the reason for refusal 2 above could be addressed if a Construction Management Plan were satisfactorily controlled by means of a Section 106 Agreement.
- 2 You are advised that in the context of a scheme which is in all other respects acceptable the Council would seek to secure a financial contribution to cover the costs of works affecting the highway.

### **Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613***