

Address:	40 Queen's Grove London NW8 6HH		
Application Number:	2008/0679/P	Officer: Tania Skelli-Yaoz	
Ward:	Swiss Cottage		
Date Received:	31/01/2008		
Proposal: Erection of a three storey plus basement single-family dwellinghouse following the demolition of the existing family dwellinghouse, and associated landscaping.			
Drawing Numbers: Site Location Plan EPA QGR 00 081 P1; 00 101 P1; 00 100 P0; 01 079 P0; 01 080 P0; 01 081 P0; 02 101 P0; 02 102 P0; 02 103 P0; 02 104 P0; 01 099 P2; 01 100 P2; 01 101 P1; 01 102 P1; 01 103 P1; 02 111 P2; 02 112 P1; 02 113 P1; 02 114 P1; 03 100 P1; 03 102 P1; 03 105 P1; 14 201 P1; 14 301 P1; 02 115 P2; 03 201 P0; Letter by DP9 ref. DWG/njk/DP/1823 dated 9th June 2008; 662_LAN_DET_003 TREE PIT DETAIL; Acoustic Report REF. AAc/075547-79 dated 29Jan2008; Conservation Area Analysis dated December 2007; Planting Strategy Report; 39 Queens Grove - Daylight dated 3rd June 2008; Daylight and Sunlight Report 23rd January 2008; Environmental Statement.			
Recommended Summary: Grant planning permission subject to conditions and a Section 106 Legal Agreement			
Related Application:	Conservation area consent application		
Date of Application:	31/01/2008		
Application Number:	2008/0680/C		
Proposal: Demolition of existing single-family dwellinghouse.			
as shown on drawing numbers: As above.			
RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant conservation area consent subject to conditions			
Applicant:		Agent:	
Sir Stuart Lipton 40 Queen's Grove London NW8 6HH		DP9 100 Pall Mall London SW11 5NQ	

ANALYSIS INFORMATION

Land Use Details:			
	Use Class	Use Description	Floorspace
Existing	C3	<i>Dwelling House</i>	583m ²
Proposed	C3	<i>Dwelling House</i>	810m ²

Residential Use Details:										
	Residential Type	No. of Bedrooms per Unit								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+
Existing	<i>Single House</i>			1						
Proposed	<i>Single House</i>				1					

Parking Details:		
	Parking Spaces (General)	Parking Spaces (Disabled)
Existing	3	0
Proposed	3	0

OFFICERS' REPORT

Reason for Referral to Committee: Development involving the total demolition of a building in a conservation area and the making of a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 [Clauses 3 (v) and (vi)].

1. SITE

- 1.1 The application site is located on the north western side of Queens Grove, and it accommodates a single dwellinghouse. It dates from c.1937 and comprises 3 storeys (including semi basement) in brown brick with hipped, tiled roof and timber casement windows. This dwelling has an existing two-storey, half-width rear extension with a sunken open terrace at basement level, which is contemporary in design and is predominantly glazed.
- 1.2 The site lies in a predominantly residential area and is located within the St. Johns Wood Conservation Area (CA). It is not a Listed Building. The site lies in close proximity to the boundary with the adjoining City of Westminster.
- 1.3 No. 42 Queen's Grove, located to the west of the site, is a recently built dwellinghouse comprising four levels (substantial basement, ground, first and second floor attic). See Relevant History section for further details.
- 1.4 Nos. 34 – 37 [inclusive], located on the other side of Queen's Grove almost opposite the application site, are Grade II listed buildings.

2. THE PROPOSAL

Original

- 2.1 Planning permission and conservation area consent is sought for the demolition of the existing building and its replacement with a detached single dwellinghouse in a contemporary design.

Revision

- 2.2 Following comments made on the original submission, the proposal was revised to include:
- i) The reconfiguration of the forecourt arrangements to allow for less car parking space, in order to limit the proposed car parking spaces on site to the existing three spaces in total and to allow for more space for the planting and root distribution of a mature tree.
 - ii) Cycle parking and storage for 1x cycle has been shown to be provided on site.
 - iii) Details on drainage to include a rainwater harvesting system and green sedum roof.
 - iv) Alterations to the forecourt hard landscaping in order to enable a sustainable planting plan for a new mature tree on site.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 Planning permission (Ref: 2005/2482/P) for the demolition of the existing rear extension and erection of full width rear extension, with terraces and steps, at lower ground and ground levels, to enlarge the existing single family dwellinghouse was granted on 26th August 2005.
- 3.2 Planning permission (Ref: 9200499) for amendment to planning application ref. 9100057 involving the erection of a glass green house and alterations to west east south and north elevations was granted in 1992.
- 3.3 Planning permission (Ref: 9100057) for the erection of lower ground and ground floor extensions at the rear erection of a new porch installation of a new double garage door on the front elevation and installation of new windows on lower ground and ground floor levels on rear and front elevations was granted on 18th December 1991.

3.4 HISTORY OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

- 3.4.1 A number of permissions have been granted for the substantial and total demolition of properties in Queens Grove.

3.4.2 41 Queen's Grove

Planning permission (reference 2006/3619/P) was granted on 08/12/2006, for the *Demolition behind retained front facade and the erection of a building comprising basement, ground, first and second floor level roof storey with integral double garage for use as a single family dwelling (Class C3), plus creation of raised patio at rear and alterations to fenestration of retained front facade.* An associated

Conservation Area Consent (reference 2006/3620/C) was also granted on 08/12/2006.

3.4.3 41 Queen's Grove

Planning permission (reference 2007/3397/P) was granted on 22/11/2007, for *Erection of a building comprising basement, ground, first floor and roof storey for use as a single-family dwellinghouse (following the demolition of existing single dwellinghouse)*. The associated application for Conservation Area Consent (reference 2007/3398/C) for the *demolition of existing single-family dwellinghouse* was also granted on 22/11/2007.

3.4.4 42 Queen's Grove

Planning permission (reference PE9900345) was granted on 22/02/2000, for the *demolition of existing house and erection of a new detached dwelling*. The associated Conservation Area Consent was also granted on 22/02/2000. These works have been undertaken and completed.

3.4.5 48 Queen's Grove

Planning permission (reference 2007/6101) was granted on 3/07/2008 for the demolition and rebuild behind the principle facades of the single family dwelling house (Class C3) including excavation at basement level to provide additional accommodation, dormer windows to roof, erection of a single storey rear extension to connect to new coach house and alterations to side vehicular access. The associated Conservation Area consent was granted on the same date. These works have not been implemented to date.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Statutory Consultees

4.1 English Heritage

No objections. Advised that they did not wish to provide any comments on this application, and that it should be determined in accordance with the national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of the Council's specialist conservation advice. Flexible authorisation issued.

4.2 City of Westminster

Did not comment on the application.

4.3 Conservation Area Advisory Committee

There is no CAAC for this conservation area.

4.4 Other Groups

E@H Org – National Heritage Nature and Environmental Preservation Society:
Objection. Concerns raised over the demolition of a house making a positive contribution to a Conservation Area and overall cohesion of the road and junction; PPG 15 demolition tests have not been satisfied; the building gives continuity and unity to the current street scene, even if not of the same quality of design and composition as some of the other Queen Ann revival houses on street; the replacement design is of lesser quality than the present building and of clashing

style with Queen's Grove, rigid lines, brutalist uninspired design; it also clashes with the 1830's listed no. 39; the proposed design is of poor quality, clashing façade with harmful effect on the Conservation Area; proposal would negatively affect the grade II listed buildings opposite it.

4.5 Adjoining Occupiers

	Original
<i>Number of letters sent</i>	12
<i>Total number of responses received</i>	5
<i>Number of electronic responses</i>	0
<i>Number in support</i>	3
<i>Number of objections</i>	2

4.5.1 3 adjoining occupiers (nos. 27, 37 and 45 Queen's Grove) have expressed their **support** for the proposal, referring to the proposed scheme being interesting, improving the street and first class modern design in St John's Wood should be possible and would have an organic vibrancy in the established historic area.

4.5.2 2 adjoining occupiers have expressed their **objection** to the proposal, as follows:

i) 39 Queen's Grove:

- Felt that his light would remain unaffected but asked that the officer check this;
- Asked for confirmation that none of the proposed flat roofs would not be used as roof terraces as this would result in overlooking;
- The large window at the top of the house would result in overlooking into his property;
- Concerns over the impact of the proposals on the party walls; and
- Was sure that the proposed building would fit quite comfortably with the multi-styled street.

ii) 38 Queen's Grove:

- Objection raised over extent and scale of development and design of proposed rear extension;
- Harmful to Conservation Area and prevalent urban grain in locality; justification for demolition not made and unconvinced that new design will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- With regards to the rear extension, the bulk, height, depth and overbearing height when viewed in context with adjoining property boundaries is particularly referred to and raised as harmful to amenities of neighbours, and sets an unacceptable precedent for rest of road; proposal out of keeping with rest of houses in the Conservation Area.
- They are aware of the previous planning permission, which has not been implemented. The objector considers that a larger extension is acceptable only when an existing house is enlarged and not with a replacement house.

Applicants should be able to accommodate the additional floorspace required in the enlarged footprint of the house in a holistic way and not as proposed.

5. POLICIES

5.1 Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

S1/S2 Sustainable development **(Complies subject to conditions)**
SD1 Quality of Life **(Complies)**
SD2 Planning Obligations **(Complies)**
SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours **(Complies subject to condition)**
SD7B Noise/vibration pollution **(Complies subject to conditions)**
SD8 Disturbance **(Complies subject to conditions)**
SD9 Resources and energy **(Complies)**
H1 New Housing **(Complies)**
H3 Protecting existing housing **(Complies subject to condition)**
H7 Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing **(Complies)**
H8 Housing Mix **(Complies)**
B1 General Design Principles **(Complies subject to conditions)**
B3 Alterations and extensions **(Complies subject to conditions)**
B7 Character and Appearance of Conservation Areas **(Complies subject to conditions)**
N8 Ancient Woodlands and Trees **(Complies subject to conditions)**
T3 Pedestrian and cycling **(Complies)**
T8 Car Capped housing **(Complies)**
T9B Impact of parking **(Complies)**
T12 Works affecting highways **(Complies subject to a Section 106)**

5.2 The London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004) February 2008

3A Living in London **(Complies)**
4A Climate change and London's Metabolism **(Complies)**
4B Designs on London **(Complies subject to conditions)**

5.3 Other Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

- **PPG 15: Planning and the Historic Environment (Complies)**
- **Camden Planning Guidance 2006 (Complies)**
- Note that there is no Conservation Area Statement for the St John's Wood Conservation Area Statement: currently in draft form.

6. ASSESSMENT

The principal considerations material to the determination of the applications are summarised as follows:

- Demolition of existing building
- Design of new building
- Land use and accessibility
- Residential amenity

- Trees and Landscaping
- Transportation issues
- Sustainability
- Refuse and Recycling

6.1 Demolition

- 6.1.1 40 Queen's Grove is a large detached house in the St John's Wood Conservation Area. It is not listed. It dates from c. 1934 and comprises 3 storeys (including semi basement) in brown brick with hipped, tiled roof and multi pane timber windows. It supports a two-storey, half-width rear extension built in 1992 and designed by Eric Parry architects, which takes a contemporary form, being predominantly glazed within a travertine-clad frame. The extension is of high quality in terms of its detailing and finish.
- 6.1.2 The St John's Wood Conservation Area boundary is currently under review, and the Council does not at this time have a conservation area statement for the area. As such there is no published list of unlisted buildings which are considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area. The contribution that the buildings in Queen's Grove make has been considered on a case-by-case basis.
- 6.1.3 The St John's Wood Conservation Area is situated on the former Eyre Estate, which was originally developed in the 1830s. When the 99-year leases of the original houses expired, many were demolished and rebuilt in the Neo-Georgian idiom, which was fashionable at the time. The quality of the buildings from this period varies widely, but as a building type they are not uncommon in the area, although the majority are situated within the City of Westminster, which houses the larger part of the Eyre Estate.
- 6.1.4 The submission has been considered against the criteria contained within the English Heritage *"Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas"* checklist and it has been concluded that the building makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Although the three neo-Geo houses of which no. 40 forms a part form a group which represents a typical phase of historical development, they are of modest quality, and were built speculatively by an architect who is not of particular regional note. They are considered, therefore, to be of limited architectural interest, and form a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the St John's Wood Conservation Area. Permission has recently been granted for the demolition and rebuilding of the other two buildings in the group.
- 6.1.5 The principle of demolition is therefore considered to be acceptable contingent on the quality of the replacement building, and whether it preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

6.2 Differences in height and bulk from the existing and approved extension and the proposed.

- 6.2.1 As discussed above planning permission for a rear extension was granted in 2005. This planning permission is still valid and the height and bulk of the existing plus

the approved extension needs to be taken into account when assessing this application. The differences are as follows:

- The overall height of the proposed building is the same as the existing, however the proposal includes a flat roof in place of the existing hipped roof which results in the increase in height of the front elevation by 2.2m and the rear elevation by 3.4m.
- The front elevation of the building does not project beyond the existing building line;
- The rear elevation at first and second floor level does not project beyond the existing rear elevation of the building.
- The rear ground and basement element of the building is 340mm lower than the extension approved in 2005. The part of the structure closest to number 39 is 800mm deeper than the previously approved extension with the part closest to number 41 (the garden room and kitchen) being the same depth as previously approved. As the previous extension has a concave central portion the bulk of the extensions is slightly different.

The acceptability of the proposed height, bulk and massing is detailed below.

6.3 Design of proposed building

- 6.3.1 One of the defining characteristics of the Conservation Area is that it comprises semi-detached and detached villas which are set within generous individual plots. Pre- and post-war replacement buildings adhere to this layout, and the proposal seeks to carry on this tradition. The proposed building is positioned on the same building line at the front as the existing and is set sufficiently away from the neighbouring buildings at either side.
- 6.3.2 The replacement building is 3 storeys in height, as existing (with an enlarged basement) over five bays in a contemporary design idiom, with flat roof contained behind a straight parapet. The ground floor is set back slightly (400mm), and is faced with ceramic panels which incorporate a horizontal strip of glazing. The main face of the building is finished in painted render, which emulates the stucco finish of the C19 villas in the area. The front boundary treatment reflects the existing and is considered satisfactory.
- 6.3.3 The height increases from the parapet height of the existing building to sit at the eaves level of the adjacent C19 Italianate villa (no. 39). Some additional height at roof level which integrates with the modulation of the building's rear elevation is contained towards the rear of the roof, and will not have an impact on the streetscene. The solar thermal panels are located on the flat roof and are set back 1.2 metres from the front elevation of the building and only project 100mm above the parapet. Due to the set back and minimal height they will not impact on the streetscene.
- 6.3.4 The window bays are evenly spaced and the proportions reflect those of the traditional building types in the area. The first floor windows are slightly taller than the second, reflecting the traditional piano nobile arrangement. The windows are positioned on the front building line, and incorporate an 80mm wide x 100mm deep

gap, which provides some relief, shadowing and visual interest. The front elevation is considered to be an elegant contemporary response to the context.

- 6.3.5 The rear elevation of the building is more modulated than the front and incorporates a lot of glazing. The comparative informality of this elevation is considered to respond well to the garden context.
- 6.3.6 In summary, the building's bulk, height, depth and position on its plot are considered acceptable; it sits comfortably in the streetscene. The detailed design in terms of façade treatment incorporates elements of the traditional architecture, but in a contemporary idiom. The architects have a reputation for producing high quality architecture, as is evidenced by the form and finish of the recent extension to the existing building. The proposal is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and complies with relevant design policies (B1, B3 and B7). The proposal is not considered to have an impact on the setting of the Grade II listed buildings on the opposite side of Queen's Grove.
- 6.3.7 To safeguard the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the conservation area, it is recommended that a condition be placed on the decision notice requiring samples of all facing materials (including a sample which demonstrates the window framing material, colour and finish) to be erected on site for approval by the Council prior to the commencement of the relevant parts of the works.
- 6.3.8 Notwithstanding, the acceptability of the proposed replacement building, it is recommended to remove Permitted Development rights to this dwelling house as it is considered that this site will contain a large capacity of built material once completed and further alterations and extension may result in potential harm to the amenities of adjoining properties. It is also considered necessary to safeguard the integrity of the design details and materials, in order to ensure that the character and appearance of the conservation area is preserved. The relevant parts of the General Permitted Development Order to be removed are as follows:

Section of GPDO	Restriction
Part 1, Class A	The enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse
Part 1, Class C	Any other alteration to the roof of a dwellinghouse
Part 1, Class D	The erection or construction of a porch outside any external door of a dwellinghouse
Part 2, Class C	The painting of the exterior of any building or work.

As the property is located within a conservation area, Part 1, Class B permitted development rights for the erection of a roof extension have already been removed and therefore it is not necessary to include this in the condition.

6.4 Land Use

- 6.4.1 The proposed demolition of an existing single dwelling house of 3-bedrooms and replacement with a 4-bedroom house would result in the temporary loss of residential accommodation in the borough, but ultimately result in a modern larger

replacement house. As the site lies within a Conservation Area, a suitable condition would secure the redevelopment of the site following the demolition. The proposed demolition and redevelopment is therefore considered acceptable in land use terms and complies with policies H1, H3 and H8. The proposed dwelling house exceeds the residential standards with regard to size, ceiling heights, daylight and outdoor amenity space.

6.5 Amenity

6.5.1 Overlooking

The proposal includes a large rear window on the rear elevation at second floor level, adjoining no. 39. Concerns have been raised by the neighbour over potential overlooking into the existing garden of no. 39 from that window. Policy SD6 requires the consideration of visual privacy of rear gardens from any new development. Whilst the proposed subject window is larger than standard windows, there is existing overlooking from the second floor dormer window. In addition the proposed window would not enable overlooking into any of the rooms in the adjoining property. In this context the proposed window is not considered to cause a detrimental impact on the current levels of privacy enjoyed by the occupiers of 39 Queens Grove.

6.5.2 There are no proposed windows on the north east elevation of building (facing number 39). The proposed south west elevation (facing number 41) includes windows to light the stairwell. As there are existing windows in this location, there will be no loss of privacy to the occupants of number 41. The side elevation of the rear projecting element of the development would have clear glazing with metal louvers. Views from this window to the rear windows of number 41 are obscured by the part of the building containing the kitchen and will not result in a detrimental loss of privacy to the occupiers of number 41. The proposed clear glazing on the side elevation at ground floor level is 3.1metres above ground level and therefore will not result in overlooking. The existing ground floor rear terrace is extended. However, it is located 5m away from the boundary and only 400mm above ground floor level and will not result in a loss of privacy to number 41.

6.5.3 Concerns were raised over the use of the roofs of the proposed dwelling as terraces. The previous 2005 approval was granted subject to a condition which stated that the flat roof shall not be used as a roof terrace. The solar thermal panels, lift overrun and plant take up the majority of the main roof and therefore does not provide space which could be easily used as a roof terrace. The flat roof at first floor if used as a roof terrace would cause a detrimental loss of privacy to the occupiers of number 39. Although no direct access is proposed to this area, it is considered appropriate to impose a condition restricting access out onto this flat roof for maintenance of the building only and for no other purposes.

6.5.4 To summarise the above, it is considered that the proposed building will not result in a detrimental loss of privacy to the neighbouring in accordance with Policy SD6.

6.5.4 Impact on Daylight/Sunlight

6.5.5 As discussed above in section 6.2.1 the overall height of the rear element of the extension is 340mm lower than the previously approved extension and 750mm deeper on the boundary with number 39. For the purposes of assessing the impact of the proposed on the daylight/sunlight the height and bulk of the approved extension needs to be taken into account. The windows on the rear basement and ground floor extension of 39 are the windows which are directly beside the proposed rear element of the building. As they are not located within 90 degrees of due south, tests with regard to the impact on sunlight were not required. The three windows on the basement floor serve one room, likewise the three windows on the ground floor also serve one room. BRE daylight test carried out on the ground and basement floor windows. This involved drawing a 45 degree angle from the centre of the windows in plan and elevation. The BRE guidelines state that the 45 degree angle has to be obstructed in plan and elevation for the levels of daylight to the window to be affected. The results are as follows:

O = Obstructed NO = Not Obstructed

For clarity the window adjoining the boundary with number 40 is referred to as "right"

Existing (including previously approved application)

Window	45° angle in plan	45° angle in elevation	Affected
Ground floor left	NO	NO	No
Ground floor middle	NO	NO	No
Ground floor right	O	O	Yes
Basement left	O	NO	No
Basement middle	O	O	Yes
Basement right.	O	O	Yes

Proposed

Window	45° angle in plan	45° angle in elevation	Affected
Ground floor left	NO	NO	No
Ground floor middle	O	NO	No
Ground floor right	O	O	Yes
Basement left	O	NO	No
Basement middle	O	O	Yes
Basement right.	O	O	Yes

6.5.6 The tests carried out above show that the Ground floor left and middle window and the basement left window would not be affected by the proposed extension. The ground floor right, basement middle and basement right are affected by the existing extension and boundary wall and the proposed extension will also affect these windows. However, the context of the windows has to be taken into account when

assessing the overall impact on the levels of daylight received by the two rooms. With regard to the ground floor room, the tests show that two out of the three windows will still receive adequate daylight. The third window immediately adjacent to the boundary will be affected, however it is currently affected by the existing boundary foliage and extension. It is considered that as two of the three windows on this level will remain unaffected the overall levels of daylight received by this room will not be detrimentally impacted. The windows to the basement room are affected by the boundary wall, foliage and existing staircase which enables access from the garden of number 39 to the ground floor. It is considered that due to the existing obstructions to daylight to the basement windows it is not considered that the height and depth of the proposed extension will result in a detrimental impact on the current levels of daylight received by the occupiers of this room.

- 6.5.7 Daylight tests carried out on the rear windows of number 41 show that no detrimental impact on the current levels of daylight received by these windows would occur.

6.5.8 Outlook

- 6.5.8 The proposed building would not result in a detrimental impact on the outlook of the adjoining occupiers at numbers 39 and 41.

6.5.9 Noise

- 6.5.9 The proposals includes the provision of plant at basement level, in addition 3 x a/c units are proposed at roof level. The plant included at basement level will include an emergency generator. The noise study submitted with the application states that the proposed plant and generate can operate in accordance with Camden's standards. This report has been assessed and found acceptable by the Council's Environmental Health Pollution Team, subject to conditions requiring details of the proposed plant and emergency generator and a condition requiring all of the plant to operate within the Council's noise standards. Subject to these conditions the proposed plant and emergency generator are considered to comply with Policies SD6, Sd7B and SD8 of the RUDP.

6.6 Trees and Landscaping

- 6.6.1 The principle of the removal of the Birch at the front of the property has been approved by the previous planning permission (2005/2482/P). The current proposals involve the excavation of the frontage for the construction of a basement up to the front boundary of the site. Concerns have been raised over the provision of sufficient ground area to support a mature tree and the creation of additional storm water drainage, however the proposals have been amended as detailed above to address these issues. The proposals show a planter for the planting of a Japanese Pagoda tree, which can reach a mature height of 15-25m and would therefore make a useful addition to the street scene. Revisions have included drawings showing a larger planter to the front forecourt to allow for sufficient area to provide enough soil volume to support the growth of a Pagoda tree to its potential mature size. This is considered acceptable, subject to full hard and soft landscaping details to include drainage.

- 6.6.2 There are a number of existing trees in the rear garden which are not directly affected by the proposals but could be damaged during the construction process. Therefore it is recommended that a condition be attached to the planning permission requiring details of how these trees are to be protected during construction be submitted to the Council prior to construction for approval.
- 6.6.3 A sedum roof is proposed to the ground floor roof, this is welcomed. A condition has been attached requiring details of this roof and a programme of maintenance be submitted to the Council for approval prior to construction.
- 6.6.4 A condition has been attached to the decision notice requiring details of all hard and soft landscaping to be submitted to the Council for approval prior to construction on site and afterwards carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

6.7 Transport

- 6.7.1 The site is located on the border between Camden and Westminster.
- 6.7.2 The development has been provided with 1x cycle storage space in the basement of the property and therefore complies with policy T3.
- 6.7.3 The site has a PTAL of 4 (good), which under normal circumstances would mean that this site would be considered for being made car-free. However, there is an existing single residential unit on the site with 3 existing car parking spaces. Camden's parking standards state that a maximum of 1 parking space per residential unit is permitted. Because there are 3 existing off-street parking spaces the applicant is entitled to carry over these 3 existing spaces to the proposed development. Revised drawings have reduced the space allowed for car parking to allow for three only (including two within car lift), which is as existing. This is considered acceptable and complies with policy T8 and T9. As there are no additional units being proposed on site and the proposals include the retention of 3 car parking spaces, it is not considered reasonable to require the property be designated as car capped.
- 6.7.4 The proposal includes the demolition of the existing building, extensive earth excavation and a large amount of construction works to take place on site. Therefore, there will be a large number of construction vehicle movements to and from the site which will have a significant impact on the local transport network. As a result a Construction Management Plan to outline how construction work will be carried out and how this work will be serviced, with the objective of minimising traffic disruption and avoiding dangerous situations for pedestrians and other road users is required. This requirement has been added as a head of term to the Section 106 legal agreement. Subject to the Section 106, the proposal complies with policy T12.
- 6.7.5 It is considered that constructing the development will be likely to cause considerable damage to the footway adjacent to the site and the vehicular

crossover. Therefore a financial contribution should be required to repave the adjacent footway and the vehicular crossover. This will also need to be secured through a Section 106 agreement. The Council will undertake all works within the highway reservation, at the cost of £8,000 to the developer. This complies with policy T12.

- 6.7.6 An informative has been added to the decision notice advising the applicant that drawings of the basement should be submitted to Council's Highway department for approval prior to construction to ensure the structural integrity of the highway is not affected.

6.8 Sustainability issues

- 6.8.1 The Environmental statement for this proposal states that this building will aim to reduce energy use, be energy efficient, supply energy more efficiently by using a ground source heating and cooling system and use renewable energy for generating hot water with solar thermal panels at roof level. The submitted data indicates combined savings through energy efficiency, low carbon and renewable technologies [solar hot water and ground source heat pump] of 60% of CO₂ emissions. The following are noted in particular:

- Building fabric better than required by the Building Regulations – inc. insulation that is almost three times better than the standard
- Comfort Cooling provided by a Ground Source Heat system - will save 50% of the Building Regulations carbon emissions
- Natural ventilation with opening windows and trickle vents for normal use
- Mechanical ventilation for individual rooms as required on demand, which means no electricity use when the rooms are unoccupied
- External louvers to the large SW facing glazed sliding door to the garden at ground floor level and adjustable roller blinds between the glazing layers on the SE windows facing the street at first and second floor levels to reduce heat gain [and hence the cooling energy required]
- Optimise the use of daylight, and use of energy efficient lighting
- Solar thermal panels on the roof to provide domestic hot water – will save two thirds of the hot water energy use over a year
- Water strategy that reduces water use through water efficient fittings, captures rainwater for garden irrigation and supplying the washing machine, re-uses grey water from showers and baths for flushing toilets, reduces water run off with a green roof and by providing hard surfaces with permeable materials as part of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System
- Re-using materials where possible and providing space for segregated recycling
- Sourcing materials where possible from re-cycled or re-used products and timber from sustainably managed forests.

This is welcomed and complies with policy SD9.

6.9 Refuse and Recycling

6.9.1 The proposal includes adequate refuse and recycling storage in the basement.

6.10 Lifetime Homes Standards

6.10.1 The proposed replacement dwelling house will be constructed according to Lifetime Homes standards and include a main entrance at street level, a living room at ground level, kitchen and WC at ground level, internal lift installation, improved access to garden and good lighting to front canopy. All floors provide generous proportions to allow for wheelchair users. The proposal therefore complies with 'Lifetime Homes' standards and policies SD1 and H7.

6.11 Other issues raised by objectors

6.11.1 Issues with regard to structural stability and party wall matters are not a material planning consideration.

7. CONCLUSION

7.1 The proposed demolition and redevelopment of the site is considered acceptable within the context of this area and is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The design and materials are of a high quality and are considered to complement the character and appearance of the area.

7.2 The proposed building would not result in a detrimental impact on the existing amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining properties in accordance with Policy SD6.

7.3 The scheme is considered to generally comply with all the relevant UDP policies, Camden Planning Guidance 2006 and PPG15.

7.4 Planning Permission is recommended subject to conditions and a S106 Legal Agreement covering the following Heads of Terms:-

- i) Construction Management Plan; this shall be approved prior to any works starting on site and the approved plan shall be followed, unless otherwise agreed with the Highway Authority.
- ii) Financial Contribution towards highway works of £8,000.00 - to repave the adjacent footway and the vehicular crossover.

8. LEGAL COMMENTS

8.1 Members are referred to the note from the Legal Division at the start of the Agenda.