

# 23 Downside Crescent 2014/7587/P



This material has been reproduced from Ordnance Survey digital map data with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Photograph 1 – Rear elevation



Photograph 2 – rear elevation 2



<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>09/02/2015</b>
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>14/01/2015</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Rachel English			2014/7587/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
23 Downside Crescent London NW3 2AN			See draft decision		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Excavation of single storey basement, erection of full-width rear extension following demolition of existing part width extension. Conversion from 2x flats to single family dwelling house.					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant conditional planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	19	No. of responses	08	No. of objections	06
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Press notice displayed from 24/12/2014 until 14/01/2015 Site notice displayed from 19/12/2014 until 09/01/2015</p> <p>Objections received from 19C, 21, 25 and 31 Downside Crescent, 95 Redington Road. Comments have been received from Globe Lawn Tennis Club (190A Haverstock Hill) and occupiers of 29 Downside Crescent</p> <p><u>Basement issues/Structural stability</u></p> <p>1) The excavation will exacerbate the movement of clay soil and subsidence. There is already subsidence at the property. 2) The new basement will create problems for structure of nearby houses 3) Problems for the water table and drainage - pre-existing ground water and perched water problems will be made worse 4) Groundwater is likely to build up behind the basement walls of 21 and 25 causing harm to these properties. There is already damp at 19C Downside Crescent. The extent of ground water has not been identified and therefore the severity of its potential impact is unknown over time. 5) The area is not suited to basement developments as there are many underground water courses and a combination of clay and sandy soil. London clay is prone to high contraction and expansion and could lead to an increase in ground water 6) The BIA is insufficient - there is no detail on how surrounding properties will be protected 7) The BIA should be independently verified 8) Scale of basement development is excessive 9) Need to understand whether it is proposed that the basement extends beyond the existing footprint of the house. 10) The area slopes down and gardens downhill regularly flood. 11) No statement has been made as to how the “dewatering” will be accomplished 12) The BIA has not been carried out by suitably qualified professionals</p> <p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>13) Excessive noise from the excavation and water pumping 24 hours a day 14) Neighbours will have to suffer noise, vibration, damage 15) Concern about the construction impacts with a large number of lorries removing soil over a long period</p> <p><u>Trees and amenity space</u></p> <p>16) There will be damage to the Lombardy Poplar tree which is on the Globe Tennis Club site. It would be a loss to the area if the tree is damaged by the basement excavation 17) Loss of garden/green space</p>					

	<p><u>Amenity impacts</u></p> <p>18) the increased height of the development will reduce sunlight access</p> <p>19) the rear extension will overlook neighbouring properties</p> <p>20) The glazed roof rear extension will cause light pollution</p> <p><u>Design</u></p> <p>21) the plans show a plant room</p> <p>20) there are other permitted development consents granted for rooms in the roof therefore the building is increasing its size by nearly 100%</p> <p>22) Object to the design of the rear extension – the roof profile is out of keeping with the rest of the street.</p> <p>23) The existing rear extension should be retained.</p> <p><b>Officer response</b></p> <p>1) - 6) The applicant has submitted further information to include a more comprehensive assessment of the hydrogeological conditions and a ground movement/ building damage assessment which have both been independently revised. See basement section 3</p> <p>7) The BIA has been independently reviewed by Geotechnical Consulting Group.</p> <p>8) and 9) See design section 4 below</p> <p>10) See paragraph 6.2 below</p> <p>11)</p> <p>12) See design section 4 below</p> <p>13) and 14) see amenity section 5</p> <p>15) see proposal description</p> <p>16) See trees section 7 below</p> <p>17) see design section 5 below</p> <p>18) -20) see amenity section 6 below</p> <p>21 – 23) The proposed rear extension has been revised following Officer comments. See design section 5 below. There is no plant or machinery proposed that will create any noise issues.</p>
<p><b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b></p> <p>*Please Specify</p>	<p>Belsize CAAC –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Object to basement excavation</li> <li>2) Object to full width rear extension</li> </ol> <p><i>Officer response</i></p> <p>See design section 4 below</p> <p>Parkhill CAAC – no response received</p>

## Site Description

The site is located on the west side of Downside Crescent and comprises a three storey Victorian semi-detached dwelling. The property is not listed but is located in the Parkhill Conservation Area. It is noted as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. The rear of the site contains a brick built, part width, single storey extension with pitched roof. To the rear of the site is a Tennis Club.

## Relevant History

### 23 Downside Crescent

2013/7333/P - Erection of full-width rear extension following demolition of existing part width extension, installation of rear dormer window and two side rooflights, removal of external staircase, and alterations to fenestration and front boundary wall. Planning permission was granted on 03/01/14

2013/8078/P – Certificate of lawfulness (proposed) – excavation of basement. Granted on 22/01/2014

2013/1300/P - Conversion from 1 x self-contained flat and 1 x self-contained maisonette to single dwelling house (Class C3). Planning permission was granted on 10/05/2012.

F8/7/15/7882 - Self-containing ground floor flat by erection of external staircase at side of 23 Downside Crescent. Planning permission was granted on 15/01/1970

F8/7/15/16713 - The erection of an "Eden 608" Garden shed at the rear of 23 Downside Crescent. Planning permission was granted on 08/08/1973

### 21 Downside Crescent

2011/5180/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension with roof terrace and alterations to existing extension at ground floor level, installation of two rooflights to side roof slope, removal of existing car port and reinstatement of ground floor window to front elevation, erection of front boundary wall with railings, alterations to doors and windows to side elevation, replacement of existing rear windows at second floor level, replacement of rear first floor windows with French doors and addition of a Juliette balcony to residential units (Class C3). Approved 19/12/2011

### 27 Downside Crescent

2014/3518/P - Erection of a full width rear extension as a replacement to existing extension. Alterations to side elevation and installation of railings to front boundary. Approved on 21/07/2014

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS6 (Providing quality homes)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity)

DP2 (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing)

DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking)

DP19 (Managing the impact of parking)

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)

### **Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG1 (Design) 2014

CPG4 (Basements and Lightwells) 2013

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011

CPG7 (Transport) 2011

Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011

The London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011.

NPPF 2012

## **Assessment**

### **1.0 Proposal**

1.1 Permission is sought for the excavation of single storey basement, erection of full-width rear extension following demolition of existing part width extension and conversion from 2x flats to single family dwelling house. Planning permission was granted for the same design of single storey rear extension and the conversion to two flats in 2014 (ref 2013/7333/P and 2013/1300/P) however these permissions have not been implemented.

1.2 The proposed basement would measure 18.1metres x 7.2metres x 3.7metres deep. It would lie under the footprint of the house extending underneath the rear extension and extend into the garden by 2.5metres. The basement would only be visible at the rear via a 0.7m x 7.5m long rooflight at ground floor level. It would be located 0.9metres from the rear façade of the extension. The basement would not be visible from the front or side.

1.3 The applicant originally proposed a full width rear extension with an asymmetric roof profile. Following Officers advice the applicant has revised the proposals and reverted back to the design of the proposed rear extension that was given planning permission under reference 2013/7333/P. The proposed extension would replace the existing part width extension and would keep the same depth at 5.6metres. Part of the extension would have a hipped slate roof and the other half would have a flat roof with grey single ply membrane and a glass rooflight. The extension would be brick built with render. The rear façade would have aluminium framed folding doors and a fixed glazing panel.

1.4 The application proposes the amalgamation of a self-contained ground floor level flat and a first and second floor self-contained maisonette into a single family dwelling.

1.5 This application is assessed in terms of:

- Proposed use
- Basement impact
- Design and impact on the host building and Camden Town Conservation Area
- Impact on amenity of surrounding occupiers
- Transport and construction impacts
- Trees

## **2.0 Proposed use**

2.1 Planning permission was granted for use as a single family dwelling house under reference 2012/1300/P (see history section above). The policy position has not changed since this approval. Policies DP2 and CS6 of the LDF seek to protect existing housing by resisting development that would involve the net loss of two or more homes. As the proposal would not result in the net loss of residential floorspace and would only involve the loss of one residential unit it is considered to comply with these policies.

2.2 The proposed unit is considered to provide a good standard of residential accommodation in terms of layout, room sizes, sunlight, daylight, ventilation and outlook. The proposal is consistent with Policy CS6 and the Residential Development Standards contained in Camden Planning Guidance 2.

## **3.0 Basement impact**

3.1 The Applicant submitted a Basement Impact Assessment in accordance with policy DP27 and the guidance set out in CPG4. Policy DP27 and CPG4 state that developers will be required to demonstrate with methodologies appropriate to the site that schemes for basements maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties; avoid adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment; and avoid cumulative impact upon structural stability or water environment in the local area.

3.2 The Basement Impact Assessment and related documentation submitted by the applicant has been subject to independent verification. This is owing to two main factors, as detailed within CPG4. First, it is owing to the nature of the proposals (the BIA submitted goes beyond the screening stage) and secondly the Council received technical objections from third parties (concerns listed above). In such instances the Council requires all information (subsidised by the applicant) to be independently verified.

3.3 Concerns have been raised from neighbouring properties about inadequacies of the BIA. Concerns have been raised about the existing subsidence, groundwater flows and lack of structural assessment for the application. The submitted BIA was independently reviewed by Geotechnical Consulting Group (GCG) who also took into account the objections of the neighbours. GCG considered that 4 key points were needed to be addressed in order to comply with DP27 and CPG4. These were:

- Further monitoring of the existing groundwater installations should be undertaken, with additional intrusive works, as recommended by GEA, completed, to enable the groundwater regime to be more fully understood (including how it varies with time).
- A hydrogeological report should be completed for the site. This should specifically address the relationship between the tennis courts, the site and the neighbouring structures as regards both current hydrogeological conditions, and conditions following completion of the proposed scheme. The temporary case of the conditions during construction should also be considered. (Note also the requirements regarding professional qualifications of the author of the groundwater flow assessment, and the need to consider question 6 of the surface flow and flooding screening flowchart).
- The construction methodology needs to be more fully developed. While detailed construction calculations are not required, it is necessary to present a full understanding of how the soil and all existing structural elements will be supported throughout the works.
- A ground movement / building damage assessment report is required, that details predicted movements and likely damage classification for all buildings affected by the proposed works.

3.4 In response to this the Applicant submitted a revised BIA including additional ground investigations, and further groundwater monitoring, a ground movement / building damage



assessment report, a detailed construction methodology, (supported by structural design calculations) and a revised site investigation report. The original BIA was authored by a professional with the qualifications required for the land stability assessment and surface flow and flowing however did not meet the requirements of CPG4 for the groundwater flow assessment. The additional supplementary reports submitted ensure that the authors of the report hold the qualification requirements of CPG4 to include a chartered geologist with a CGeol qualification.

3.5 Geotechnical Consulting Group reviewed the additional information and considered that the revised submission was “a more comprehensive assessment of the hydrogeological conditions” and “specifically addresses the issue of flow from the tennis courts, and demonstrates how this will not affect the site”. The revised reports now specifically addresses question 6 of the surface flow and flooding screening flowchart and fully includes groundwater flows including during construction. Further groundwater monitoring and ground investigations have been carried out and GCG consider now appropriately address the original concerns about the groundwater regime.

3.6 GCG consider that the submitted detailed construction methodology with structural design calculations appropriately demonstrate measures to ensure structural stability throughout the basement works. They consider the works to be viable and suitable for the size and nature of the proposed works. GCG have examined the submitted ground movement and building damage assessment and find that it covers the predicted movements and damage classifications for all buildings affected.

3.7 As such GCG consider that the deficiencies of the BIA have been addressed and with the revised BIA and supplementary documents and the basement would comply with CPG4 and policy DP27. It is recommended that a condition is added to ensure that the basement works are monitored by a qualified engineer (Council’s standard basement condition).

#### **4.0 Visual impact on the host building and the Parkhill Conservation Area.**

4.1 The Belsize CAAC have objected to the basement extension. The proposed basement would be visible from the rear only with via a skylight. Concerns have been raised about the basement being excessive in size. It would extend just 2metres into the garden from the façade of the existing rear extension and there would be sufficient margins left within the garden to enable natural processes to occur and vegetation to grow naturally.

4.2 Concern has been raised from a neighbouring occupier and the CAAC about loss of garden space. In terms of management of change, the Conservation Area Management Strategy does seek to resist the loss of private open spaces and recommends that any development of rear garden spaces should not detract from the general feeling of openness and should ensure that most of the existing garden space is retained. The existing garden covers an area of approximately 150sqm, the proposed rear extension would result in the loss of approximately 24sqm of garden space so it would allow for the retention of a reasonably sized garden.

4.3 There is a pattern of single storey extensions at the rears of numbers 23-31 Downside Crescent. The existing part width extensions look to be similar in size, scale and design with hipped roofs which contribute to the appearance of the rears of the buildings. The Belsize CAAC has objected to the full width rear extension and objections have been raised regarding the design of the asymmetric roof of the rear extension. The proposals for the rear extension have been revised and it is the now same as approved (ref 2013/7333/P). Full width extensions have been approved at numbers 21 and 27 Downside Crescent (see history section above).

4.4 Objections have been raised from neighbouring properties about the loss of the existing part width extension. Within the previously approved application the applicant was advised to retain the existing

rear, hipped roof extension however the applicant confirmed that there are structural problems with the rear extension and submitted a cover letter from the structural engineer confirming this. As a consequence the extension would be rebuilt to the same depth, using stock brick and natural slate similar to the existing with a glazed infill extension. The design of the existing pitched roof of the rear addition would be matched. The adjacent infill extension would be more lightweight and would remain subordinate to the existing house in accordance with CPG1. It would be constructed using matching bricks and render with aluminium doors which are considered appropriate materials. The extensions would not be visible from the public realm and given that it is limited to the ground floor its design is considered acceptable. As such it is in accordance with Development Policies DP24 and DP25.

## **5.0 Impact on amenity**

5.1 The proposed basement would be accommodated below existing ground level therefore it would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining or nearby occupiers by way of loss of light, sense of enclosure, loss of outlook.

5.2 Concerns have been raised from neighbouring occupiers about a loss of light, overlooking and potential light pollution. The rear elevation of number 21 Downside Crescent has a single storey extension that abuts number 23 Downside Crescent. The proposed infill extension would be at the same depth as the extension at number 23 and therefore would have no adverse impact on the amenity of number 23 in terms of loss of light. There would be no direct overlooking from the proposed extension back into any residential rooms. The application proposes a raised rooflight on the infill extension and a rooflight on the pitched roof section. The residential dwelling may emit some light at night however this would not be significant enough to refuse the application.

5.3 The proposals would not adversely harm the amenity of adjoining occupiers and would comply with policies CS5 and DP26 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance 6.

## **6.0 Transport and construction impacts**

6.1 As there will be a reduction in the number of residential units, there is no requirement for car capping or for the site to be car free.

6.2 Concerns have been raised from neighbouring occupiers about the construction impact. Owing to the location of the building on Downside Road and the level of works associated with the excavation of the basement, it is considered necessary for a construction management statement (CMS) to be submitted. The purpose of the CMS is to minimise, as far as possible, the impacts of construction on neighbouring occupiers, and the highway. It is recommended that a CMS be secured via condition.

6.3 Concerns have been raised about the noise, vibration and disturbance as a result of the proposed works. Any noise and disturbance caused by the building works are not considered to be a reason to refuse the application. An informative is added to the draft decision that highlights that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 building work should not be heard at the boundary of the site outside 0800 and 1800 Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays.

## **7.0 Impact on nearby trees**

7.1 There is a semi-mature cypress tree near the boundary with number 25, half way down the garden of the application site and a maple and cherry tree at the rear of the garden. The largest nearby tree is a mature poplar tree located outside the site, within the Tennis Club at the rear.

7.2 The applicant has submitted an arboricultural report with the application. The report has been assessed by the Council's Tree Officer who considers that there is sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development can take place without adversely impacting on the trees on site and neighbouring sites. The two most affected trees are the cypress and the poplar trees. The proposed encroachment into the root protection area of T1, the poplar (the largest tree nearby) would be approximately 2% of the RPA therefore it is considered there would be a negligible impact. The encroachment into the root protection area of the cypress is approximately 18% however the proposed nearest works would have a very low impact as it is just removal of a shed and hardstanding. It is recommended that the standard condition standard be added requiring details of tree protection measures and an arboricultural method statement prior to commencement of the development.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

8.1 It is recommended that planning permission subject to conditions.

### **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> May 2015. For further information please click [here](#)**

Mr. Philip Kavanagh  
Bickerdike Allen partners  
121 Salisbury Road  
London  
NW6 6RG

Application Ref: **2014/7587/P**  
Please ask for: **Rachel English**  
Telephone: 020 7974 **1343**

13 May 2015

**DRAFT**

Dear Sir/Madam

## **DECISION**

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

### **Full Planning Permission Granted**

Address:

**23 Downside Crescent  
London  
NW3 2AN**

**DECISION**

Proposal:

Excavation of single storey basement, erection of full-width rear extension following demolition of existing part width extension. Conversion from 2x flats to single family dwelling house.

Drawing Nos: (8323/) D1002/RevP1, D2000/PL1, D2001/RevPL1, D2003revPL1, D2004/PL1, D2005/PL1, D2006/PL1, D3001/PL1, D3101/PL1, D3102revPL2, D3103revPL3, D3104revPL2, D3105revPL2, D3106revPL2, D3107revPL2

Supporting documents

Landmark Trees Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report (ref BDA/23DWN/AIA/01) dated 17th October 2014

Bickerdike Allen Partners Design, Access and Heritage Statement dated October 2014

GEA Site Investigation and Basement Impact Assessment Report (ref J13331A) dated 16th April 2015 (issue 3)

GEA Envirocheck Report Datasheet (order number BDA/23DWN/AIA/01)

Conisbee Structural Proposals and Construction Method Statement (ref 140381/KH revP1)

Ground Movement Assessment Report (ref J13331B - issue 2) dated 16th April 2015

Geotechnical Consulting Group - Assessment of documentation submitted to support



planning application 2014/7587/P dated February 2015  
Email from Geotechnical Consulting Group dated 01/05/2015 at 18:33.

The Council has considered your application and decided to grant permission subject to the following condition(s):

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

- 1 The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the end of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In order to comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 All new external work shall be carried out in materials that resemble, as closely as possible, in colour and texture those of the existing building, unless otherwise specified in the approved application.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of policy CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 and DP25 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: (8323/) D1002/RevP1, D2000/PL1, D2001/RevPL1, D2003revPL1, D2004/PL1, D2005/PL1, D2006/PL1, D3001/PL1, D3101/PL1, D3102revPL2, D3103revPL3, D3104revPL2, D3105revPL2, D3106revPL2, D3107revPL2

Supporting documents

Landmark Trees Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report (ref BDA/23DWN/AIA/01) dated 17th October 2014

Bickerdike Allen Partners Design, Access and Heritage Statement dated October 2014

GEA Site Investigation and Basement Impact Assessment Report (ref J13331A) dated 16th April 2015 (issue 3)

GEA Envirocheck Report Datasheet (order number BDA/23DWN/AIA/01)

Conisbee Structural Proposals and Construction Method Statement (ref 140381/KH revP1)

Ground Movement Assessment Report (ref J13331B - issue 2) dated 16th April 2015

Geotechnical Consulting Group - Assessment of documentation submitted to support planning application 2014/7587/P dated February 2015

Email from Geotechnical Consulting Group dated 01/05/2015 at 18:33.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

- 4 Prior to the commencement of any works on site, details demonstrating how trees to be retained shall be protected during construction work and an arboricultural method statement shall be submitted to and approved by the Council in writing. Such details shall follow guidelines and standards set out in BS5837:2012 "Trees in Relation to Construction". All trees on the site, or parts of trees growing from adjoining sites, unless shown on the permitted drawings as being removed, shall be retained and protected from damage in accordance with the approved protection details.

Reason: To ensure that the development will not have an adverse effect on existing trees and in order to maintain the character and amenity of the area in accordance with the requirements of policy CS15 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

- 5 The development hereby approved shall not commence until such time as a suitably qualified chartered engineer with membership of the appropriate professional body has been appointed to inspect, approve and monitor the critical elements of both permanent and temporary basement construction works throughout their duration to ensure compliance with the design which has been checked and approved by a building control body. Details of the appointment and the appointee's responsibilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Any subsequent change or reappointment shall be confirmed forthwith for the duration of the construction works.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance and structural stability of neighbouring buildings and the character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of policy CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies and policy DP27 (Basements and Lightwells) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

- 6 A Construction Management Statement (CMS) outlining how construction work will be carried out and how this work will be serviced shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council before the development commences. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CMS unless otherwise agreed by the Council.

Reason: To protect the local transport network and the amenity and safety of pedestrians and other road users in accordance with the requirements of policy CS5 (Managing the impact of growth) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy, and policies DP20 (Movement of goods and materials) and DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

Informative(s):

- 1 Your proposals may be subject to control under the Building Regulations and/or the London Buildings Acts which cover aspects including fire and emergency escape,

access and facilities for people with disabilities and sound insulation between dwellings. You are advised to consult the Council's Building Control Service, Camden Town Hall, Argyle Street WC1H 8EQ, (tel: 020-7974 6941).

- 2 Noise from demolition and construction works is subject to control under the Control of Pollution Act 1974. You must carry out any building works that can be heard at the boundary of the site only between 08.00 and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays. You are advised to consult the Council's Compliance and Enforcement team [Regulatory Services], Camden Town Hall, Argyle Street, WC1H 8EQ (Tel. No. 020 7974 4444 or on the website <http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/content/contacts/council-contacts/environment/contact-the-environmental-health-team.en> or seek prior approval under Section 61 of the Act if you anticipate any difficulty in carrying out construction other than within the hours stated above.
- 3 Your proposals may be subject to control under the Party Wall etc Act 1996 which covers party wall matters, boundary walls and excavations near neighbouring buildings. You are advised to consult a suitably qualified and experienced Building Engineer.

In dealing with the application, the Council has sought to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way in accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

You can find advice about your rights of appeal at:

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/appeals/guidance/guidancecontent>

Yours faithfully

Director of Culture & Environment