

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	14/02/2014
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	06/02/2014
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number</b>		
Jonathan McClue			2013/8234/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
19 Bisham Gardens London N6 6DJ			Refer to Decision Notice		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal</b>					
Basement extension with front and rear lightwells; enlargement of dormer and new roof light on rear roofslope; alterations to ground floor rear extension and associated elevation alterations.					
<b>Recommendation:</b>		Grant planning permission subject to conditions			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	05	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Letters were sent to 5 neighbouring occupiers. A press notice was also placed in the Ham and High on 16/01/2015 (expired 6/02/2015) and a site notice was displayed from 10/01/2015 until 31/01/2015.</p> <p>No comments from neighbouring occupiers were received. Comments were, however, received from the following:</p> <p><b>Historic England</b> - The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) provides archaeological advice to boroughs in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and GLAAS Charter.</p> <p>Having considered the proposals with reference to information held in the Greater London Historic Environment Record and/or made available in connection with this application, it is concluded that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest. No further assessment or conditions are therefore necessary.</p> <p><b>Thames Water</b> - should the proposed building work fall within 3 metres of these pipes it is recommended the developer contact Thames Water to discuss their status in more detail and to determine if a building over / near to agreement is required.</p> <p>Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. This is to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.</p> <p>Thames Water requests that the Applicant should incorporate within their proposal, protection to the property by installing for example, a non-return valve or other suitable device to avoid the risk of backflow at a later date, on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions.</p> <p>Where a developer proposes to discharge groundwater into a public sewer, a groundwater discharge permit will be required. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Groundwater permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal</p>					

	and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991.
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>	<p><b>Highgate CAAC</b> – objection to the front lightwell. They consider that it is contrary to policy and in view of the small size of the front garden would make it difficult to store refuse.</p> <p><b><u>Officer Response:</u></b> The front lightwell would be set behind the front boundary wall and covered by a metal grille. Due to the above and the existing landscaping (hedge) to the front it would not be visually prominent within the streetscene. There are examples of lightwells on both sides of Bisham Gardens. The provision for refuse storage to the front would be improved over the current situation. There is currently a lack of refuse space due to a difference in ground level and the existence of a flower bed. The proposal remedies this situation by lowering the front garden level to greatly improve the area available to store refuse bins.</p>

## Site Description

The application relates to a mid-terrace dwelling located on the northern side of Bisham Gardens within the Highgate Village Conservation Area. It lies within an Archaeological Priority Area and is subject to a Hydrological Constraints Layer and a service water flow and flooding constraint. The host building has an existing rear dormer, a two-storey back addition element, a basement and a single storey side and rear addition to the two-storey back addition.

The buildings on both sides of Bisham Gardens contain front lightwells. No. 36 (opposite the application site) has a fully glazed lightwell while Nos.1 and 3 and Nos.4-24 also have lightwells. The properties within the terrace, which the application dwelling forms part of (Nos.3-21) all share a brick or stone front boundary wall.

The Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy states that a mixture of rooflights and dormers of varying proportions and materials have been installed on Bisham Gardens. It further states that many of the buildings on the northern side have had their rear dormers enlarged. This is most noticeable at Nos. 5, 7 and 13.

## Relevant History

None relevant.

## Relevant policies

### NPPF 2012

**London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011**

### Local Development Framework 2010

#### Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

#### Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

DP27 (Basements and Lightwells)

#### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 (Design) 2014

CPG4 (Basements and Lightwells)

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011

**Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, adopted 4 October 2007**

### 1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for an extension to the existing basement; front and rear lightwells; an enlargement of the rear dormer and a rooflight; alterations to the existing ground floor rear extensions and associated works.
- 1.2 The proposed basement would extend under the entire footprint of the dwelling with a small store room and lightwell in the front garden and a shower room and lightwell to the rear. It would have an overall footprint of 86.4sq.m and a depth of 3.7m below the existing ground floor. The extended basement would also include a study, utility area and gym. The front lightwell would be covered with a metal grille while the rear lightwell would have a glass and metal grille cover.
- 1.3 The proposed enlarged rear dormer would have a width of 2.8m; a height of 1.92m and a depth of 2.21m. It would use matching lead materials and timber casement windows. A conservation style rooflight would be installed adjacent to the dormer.
- 1.4 The existing ground floor rear extension would have its fenestration replaced with a metal framed door and screen. The remainder of the rear elevation would be made good with render to match.
- 1.5 Associated works also include the lowering of the front garden area to be level with the footpath and bottom of the stairwell; a first floor side window being bricked up and another window being replaced with a matching timber sash.

### 2.0 Basement Works

- 2.1 The submitted Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) follows the guidance set out in CPG4 (Basements and Lightwells) providing a screening and scoping approach to assessing the likely impact of the basement. This includes a geotechnical investigation checking details of the building foundations, the properties of the soil, the likelihood of finding contamination on the site and gathered information on ground water. The BIA has assessed subterranean (groundwater) flow; slope stability and surface flow and flooding.
- 2.2 The documents submitted as part of the BIA by Green Structural Engineering; a Groundwater BIA by H Fraser Consulting; a Surface Flow and Flooding BIA by Evans Rivers and Coastal and a Land Stability BIA by Ground and Project Consultants. They were subject to an independent assessment by LBH Wembley in May 2014. Following this, a revised BIA was submitted in April 2015 to address concerns raised by the independent assessor. LBH Wembley confirmed that the revisions overcame the previous concerns.
- 2.3 The assessment and subsequent independent review found the following areas of concern from the screening stage - the site is located directly above an aquifer; the basement would result in a change in the proportion of hard surfaced areas; more surface water than at present would be discharged to the ground; the site is within 5m of a highway and the basement would significantly increase the differential depth of foundations relative to neighbouring properties.
- 2.4 Following the screening stage, a site investigation and study was undertaken to establish the baseline conditions. The investigation included records of a 2m deep hand auger borehole constructed in October 2013; a subsequent 10m deep borehole constructed in August 2014 and a hand dug trial pit constructed in October 2013 to expose existing foundations.
- 2.5 An impact assessment used the site investigation and addressed the areas of concern raised in the screening stage. The assessment concluded that groundwater levels were measured to be 10m below existing ground levels, which is well below the extent of the proposed basement (3.7m); there would not be a significant change in hardstanding areas as the proposed basement occupies an area of existing hardstanding; sustainable urban drainage would be used in the

lightwells and all existing drainage and sewage connections would be maintained; the construction of a front retaining wall and presence of the front garden would mean the services in the street to the front would not be affected by the development; both the adjoining neighbours have basements (No.17 Bisham Gardens has a similar one to the existing basement at the application site and No. 21 has a basement to match its footprint) and an assessment of the damage category has been carried out on both party walls with a resulting category 0 (negligible) being identified.

- 2.6 The revised BIA included confirmation of the actual ground and groundwater conditions within the proposed depth of excavation; further assessment of the possible effects of the works upon neighbouring structures and an assessment of the potential cumulative effects of the basement. Following a further independent review, the BIA was confirmed as being acceptable by LBH Wembley in May 2015.
- 2.7 Based on the above assessment, it is considered that the proposal demonstrates sufficient certainty to meet the requirements of Policy DP27 and CPG4. Due to the nature and scale of the basement and based on the outcome of the independent review, it is not considered that a Basement Construction Plan, secured through a Section 106 Agreement as part of this application, is necessary. A condition would, however, be attached to any planning permission granted requiring a suitably qualified engineer to be appointed to inspect, approve and monitor the critical elements of the basement construction works.

### **3.0 Conservation and Design**

#### **Basement and lightwells**

- 3.1 The proposed basement is largely contained under the footprint of the existing dwelling with only minor extensions into the front and rear gardens. As this would only occupy a small area of the rear garden, the extension to the basement is considered to be acceptable in size and scale.
- 3.2 The front garden would be lowered in height with a metal grille over the lightwell. The lightwell would not be visible when viewed from the front of the host dwelling as it would be concealed by landscaping and a front boundary wall. Furthermore, Bisham Gardens already has a number of front lightwells forming part of its character with Nos. 1, 3, 4-24, 3-21 and 36 all benefitting from lightwells. The proposed front lightwell would be a discreet feature and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area where lightwells form part of the established character in accordance with CPG4 (Basements and Lightwells).
- 3.3 The rear lightwell would occupy a small area of the garden with a metal grille and glass panel so that it would appear at the same level as the patio adjacent to it. Due to its size and location to the rear of the property, it would not be visible within the streetscene and would not cause any harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding Highgate Conservation Area.

#### **Rear dormer and rooflight**

- 3.4 The proposed enlargement of the rear dormer would not significantly alter the size and scale of the existing dormer. Due to there being a precedent of larger dormers in this terrace, with Nos. 5, 7 and 13 Bisham Gardens already benefitting from larger structures than is being proposed, the proposed enlarged dormer is considered to be acceptable.
- 3.5 The rear dormer would retain its 500mm setback from the ridge, side walls and eaves of the dwelling in accordance with CPG1 (Design). Similarly, the fenestration proposed would match the existing and neighbouring dormers within the surrounding area.
- 3.6 The proposed rooflight would be of a 'conservation' style and would not materially harm the appearance of the rear roof slope. Rooflights are present within the front and rear roof slopes of properties within the terrace on this side of Bisham Gardens. It is noted that the dwelling benefits from permitted development rights and would be able to insert a roof light without formal planning

permission being required.

### Other Alterations

- 3.7 The other alterations, including replacement windows, doors and making elements good, would use matching materials and are considered to preserve the character and appearance of the host building and the Highgate Conservation Area.

### **4.0 Residential Amenity**

- 4.1 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore, Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight.
- 4.2 The impact of the basement works has been fully considered within the BIA and the independent review. This assessment concluded the works would not adversely harm the amenities of any of the adjoining occupiers.
- 4.3 The proposed rear extension would retain its existing height, depth and location and would have no greater impact on the amenities of adjoining neighbouring properties.
- 4.4 Similarly, due to the modest nature and location of the works to the rear dormer, the proposed enlargement would not result in undue levels of harm to the living conditions of the surrounding occupiers by way of a loss of light, outlook or an increase in overlooking.

### **5.0 Transport Impact**

- 5.1 It is not considered that a Construction Management Plan would be necessary in this particular case due to the modest scale and nature of the development, the location of the site and the fact that a loading bay is present to the front of the property and Bisham Gardens itself is a relatively wide street.

### **6.0 Archaeological**

- 6.1 The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) has raised no objection to the proposal confirming that due to the scale of the proposed works, it is be unlikely to cause significant harm to archaeological assets. No further assessment or planning conditions are therefore considered necessary.

### **7.0 CIL**

- 7.1 Less than 100sqm of residential floorspace would be created. Therefore, the development would not be CIL liable.

- 8.0 Recommendation:** Grant planning permission subject to conditions.