

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		31/12/2014	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		03/12/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Alex McDougall				2013/6914/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
67 Goldhurst Terrace London NW6 3HB				Refer to draft decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Excavation of single storey basement level extension including front and rear lightwells, erection of single storey ground floor rear extension, erection of rear dormer roof extension, alterations to fenestration of rear outrigger, erection of waste and cycle storage enclosure in front garden and installation of entrance door on side elevation							
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional planning permission					
Application Type:		Full planning permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	23	No. of responses No. electronic	05 05	No. of objections	05
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>Site Notice 30/05/14 – 20/06/14 and 12/11/14 – 03/12/14. Press Notice: 05/06/14 – 26/06/14 and 13/11/14 – 04/12/14.</p> <p>5 objections were received from adjoining and nearby properties raising objection to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principle – Too many basements in the street in a short amount of time; should be limit on concurrent works (Officer Comment: As applications are valid for up to 3 years, Council is not able to control when the works actually take place. Furthermore, Council cannot reasonably delay a decision to restrict the total amount of works in a given street/area. In this case a Construction Management Plan is not considered to be necessary for the reasons outlined in Section 7 below). • Basement Impact – River found beneath a nearby property; subsidence risk (Officer Comment: Please see Section 4 below for more information). • Amenity – Noise; dust; dirt from construction vehicles (Officer Comment: Please see Section 3 below for more information). 					

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport – Impact on traffic; heavy vehicles in quiet street; loss of parking; pedestrians forced onto street (Officer Comment: Please see Section 7 below for more information). • Tree – Loss of tree in front garden which contributes to character of area (Officer Comment: The application has been revised to retain the tree. A condition is included requiring that a replacement tree be planted if the existing tree dies).
Local Groups	N/A

Site Description

The site contains a three storey, end of terrace building on the eastern side of Goldhurst Terrace. The building is listed as making a positive contribution to the character of the South Hampstead (formerly Swiss Cottage) Conservation Area. The site contains a large 16m Lawsons Cypress tree in the front garden. The building has an extant permission for use as 3 flats.

Relevant History

67 Goldhurst Terrace (application site)

2013/2910/P: Change of use from five bedroom HMO (house in multiple occupation) (Class C4) on part ground and whole of first floor, a self-contained flat at ground floor (Class C3) and a self-contained flat at second floor (Class C3) to 3 x residential flats (Class C3). Granted 08/07/2013.

61 Goldhurst Terrace (nearby site)

2014/2046/P: Excavation of basement to residential flat including front and rear lightwells (Class C3). Granted 28/05/2014.

2009/4813/P: Erection of a single storey rear extension (following demolition of existing rear extension) and single storey outbuilding at rear of flat (Class C3). Granted 21/12/2009.

8400846: Change of use and works of conversion to form three self-contained flats including the erection of a ground floor extension to the rear. Granted 12/09/1984.

66 Goldhurst Terrace (nearby site)

2012/6105/P: Excavation of basement with front and rear lightwells to residential flat (Use Class C3). Granted 02/01/2013.

60 Goldhurst Terrace (nearby site)

2013/7147/P: Excavation to extend the existing basement level, creation of front and rear lightwells with rear staircase leading from ground floor to basement and addition of metal railings at ground floor level to rear elevation in connection with dwelling house (Class C3). Granted 02/01/2014.

58 Goldhurst Terrace (nearby site)

2012/2538/P: Excavation of enlarged basement with front and rear lightwells, erection of rear ground floor level extension with terrace over at first floor level, replacement of window with door at rear first floor level all in connection with existing flats (Class C3). Granted 20/11/2012.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

National Planning Practice Guidance

London Plan 2015 (consolidate with alterations since 2011)

London Housing SPG

Camden LDF Core Strategy 2010

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 Providing quality homes

CS13 Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS16 Improving Camden's health and well-being

CS19 Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy

Camden Development Policies 2010

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

CPG2 Housing 2013

CPG3 Sustainability 2013

CPG4 Basements and Lightwells 2013

CPG6 Amenity 2011

CPG8 Planning Obligations 2015

South Hampstead Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011

Assessment

1. Detailed Description of Proposed Development

1.1. The proposed works are detailed as follows:

- a) **Basement extension** – Excavation of a single storey basement extension, including front and rear lightwells to provide additional living space to ground floor flat. The basement would also extend below the proposed rear extension. The basement would have dimensions 5.1m (max width) x 20.5m (max length) x 2.75m (deep). The front lightwell would have dimensions 3.0m (max width) x 1.6m (max length) x 1.9m (deep). The front lightwell would be secured with black painted iron railings. The rear lightwell would have dimensions 1.9m (max width) x 11.8m (max length) x 2.75m (deep). The rear lightwell would be to the side of the existing outrigger and proposed rear extension. The total excavated area would be 108sqm, the internal area approximately 91sqm.
- b) **Rear extension** - Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension. The rear extension would have a flat roof, with a single roof light and the rear elevation would be comprised of large sliding glazed doors. The extension would have dimensions 4.7m (width) x 6.6m (depth) x 3.0m (height), an internal area of 27sqm. The rear garden would be reduced from 200sqm to 150sqm, a reduction of 25%.

- c) *Roof extension* – Erection of a rear dormer roof extension. The rear dormer would have dimensions 2.1m (width) x 2.8m (depth) x 1.8m (height), would be set up 1.0m from the eaves, down 1.4m from the ridge, and in 0.5m from the attached building.
- d) *Alterations to fenestration of rear outrigger* – Insertion of large glazed opening in the northern ground floor side elevation of the original outrigger. This opening would extend down into the new rear lightwell in this location.
- e) *New entrance door* – Installation of a new access door on the ground floor side elevation, 4.9m back from the front elevation.
- f) *Waste & Cycle storage* – The proposal includes a cycle store and waste enclosure in the front garden and a cycle store in the side access way.

1.2. During the course of assessment the applicant has submitted revised drawings and reports, retaining the large tree in the front garden and removing a large skylight lantern from the rear extension in response to concerns from Council Officers.

2. Conservation and Design

2.1. *Basement & Lightwells*

The proposed basement and lightwells are considered to be of an acceptable design and have an acceptable impact on the character of the conservation area for the following reasons:

- a) It is considered that the lightwells are modestly sized and maintain reasonably sized gardens.
- b) The front lightwell would be secured with iron railings which are in keeping with the appearance of the building.
- c) The proposed openings within the front lightwells align with, and are the same width as, the windows above, in keeping with the appearance of the building.
- d) Planting is proposed within the front lightwell which will reduce the visual impact of the lightwell.
- e) Front lightwells are a common feature in the street.
- f) The lightwell to the rear would not be visible from outside the site.
- g) The new exposed external basement walls would be finished in brick to match the existing building.

2.2. *Rear Extension*

The proposed ground floor rear extension is considered to be of an acceptable design and have an acceptable impact on the character of the conservation area for the following reasons:

- a) Extensions of similar depth have been approved and built at several nearby properties, including the two immediately adjoining properties. The presence of the two adjoining extensions restricts views of the proposal from further views.
- b) The 3m height of the extension is considered to be subservient to the scale of the three storey building.
- c) The extension would be set in from the northern and southern side boundaries by 1.0m and 0.8m respectively, ensuring the proposal would not be visually dominant when viewed from adjoining properties.
- d) The proposal maintains 75% of the original rear garden.
- e) While the proposed fenestration is not in keeping with the style of the building, it is

considered to be acceptable as it is below first floor level, on the rear elevation, and thus not readily visible from any public space or adjoining/nearby properties. Furthermore, the lightweight appearance would reduce the apparent bulk of the proposal from the rear.

- f) The rear extension would be finished in matching bricks.

2.3. Roof extension

The proposed rear roof extension is considered to be of an acceptable design and have an acceptable impact on the character of the conservation area for the following reasons:

- a) The dormer is adequately set in from the side elevation, up from the eaves and down from the ridge to be viewed as a modest addition to the roof face.
- b) The roof is sufficiently steep to allow adequate habitable space without the creation of an overly large dormer.
- c) Dormers are characteristic of the area; the attached building to the north has a dormer of similar height.
- d) The dormer is generally in line with the windows on the rear elevation below.
- e) The dormer would include two sliding sash windows in keeping with the existing windows on the rear elevation.

2.4. Alterations to fenestration of rear outrigger

Due to the presence of a large rear extension on the adjoining property the alterations to the rear outrigger would not be visible from any adjoining properties or the public domain. While the alterations would be contemporary in appearance they would be in keeping with the design of the rear extension, and due to their limited visibility, are considered to have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the building and preserve the character of the conservation area.

2.5. New entrance door

The new side door is adequately set back from the front elevation so as not to be readily visible from the street. The side passageway is also restricted from public views by the existing tree in the front garden. As such the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the building and preserve the character of the conservation area.

2.6. Waste & Cycle storage

Waste and cycle store enclosures are characteristic of the area and serve to limit the cluttered appearance of waste containers and bicycles. As such the principle of a waste and cycle store in this location is considered to be acceptable. However, full details of the enclosure have not been provided. As the site is located in a conservation area it is considered that such details should be secured via condition.

For the reasons listed above the proposed development is considered to be consistent with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of the London Borough of Camden's Local Development Framework as well as Camden Planning Guidance on Design.

3. Residential Amenity

3.1. Basement & Lightwells

The proposed basement would be below ground level and as such would not impact adjoining properties by way of loss of privacy, loss of light, loss of outlook, sense of enclosure or the

like.

3.2. Rear extension

The proposed rear extension is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining and nearby properties for the following reasons:

- a) The proposed extension is generally in keeping with the depth of the rear extensions on the adjoining properties to the north and south and as such would not appear dominant from adjoining gardens.
- b) The extension would be a maximum of 3m in height and set in from the northern and southern side boundaries by 1.0m and 0.8m respectively, ensuring the proposal would not unreasonable overshadow or restrict the outlook of adjoining properties.
- c) The proposal includes a flat roof that would be easily accessible from an existing rear window. Use of this space as a terrace would unacceptably impact the privacy of adjoining and nearby properties. As such a condition is recommended requiring that this space not be used as a terrace.

3.3. Roof extension

The proposed roof extension is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining and nearby properties for the following reasons:

- a) The roof extension is set sufficiently into the roof face so as to have minimal impact on the solar access, outlook or sense of enclosure of adjoining and nearby gardens.
- b) The extension is oriented such that views would be primarily out over the rear garden of the site, and not down into the adjoining private gardens.
- c) The roof extension does not include any side windows.

3.4. Alterations to fenestration of rear outrigger

The new fenestration would be on the northern side elevation of the outrigger, directly facing the adjoining property. However, the adjoining property has a large rear extension which extends along the boundary. The new openings would be at or below ground level and as such would look out onto the side of the adjoining extension. As there are no side windows in the adjoining extension the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy for the adjoining property.

3.5. New entrance door

The new entrance door on the side elevation would result in increased movements to the side setback area. There are no doors or windows on the side elevation of the adjoining property to the south and as such this use would not result in unacceptable amenity impacts, by way of loss of privacy or noise, to the adjoining property.

3.6. Waste & Cycle storage

While details have not been provided it is considered unlikely that the waste and cycle store would be of a scale to impact the amenity of any adjoining or nearby properties.

Any excessive noise or disturbance can be referred to Council's Environmental Health team. An informative will detail the standard hours of construction. For the reasons listed above the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Development Policy DP26 of the London Borough of

4. Basement Impact

4.1. Policy DP27 and planning guidance CPG4 state that developers are required to demonstrate, with methodologies appropriate to the site, that basement schemes do not interfere unreasonably with underground water flows; maintain the structural stability of the land, existing building and neighbouring properties; and do not contribute to localised surface water flow or flooding.

4.2. The application is accompanied by a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) which has been prepared in accordance with policy DP27 and planning guidance CPG4 – Basements and lightwells. The BIA has been prepared by suitability qualified engineers. The report goes through the screening exercise recommended in CPG4 in respect of groundwater flow, land stability and surface flooding and triggered the following requirements for further investigation:

Subterranean groundwater flow

- The proposal *may* extend below the water table.

Land stability

- London Clay is the shallowest strata at the site.
- Trees are in the vicinity of the site.
- There is a history of seasonal shrink/swell subsidence in the local area.
- The proposal will substantially increase the differential depth of foundations relative to adjoining properties.

Surface flow and flooding

- The site is within an area known to be at risk of surface water flooding.

4.3. The scoping stage of the report concluded that a site investigation report should be undertaken. The site investigation included a review of geological and hydrogeological maps, a review of historical OS maps and environmental searches, a walkover, 2 boreholes, 2 trial pits, and laboratory testing of soil samples for geotechnical purposes. The ground investigation confirmed that London Clay was present at a shallow depth of 0.9m-1.0m and no groundwater was recorded in the boreholes.

4.4. With regard to groundwater flows the BIA finds that it is unlikely the proposed basement extends below the water table and as such will not have a significant impact on ground water flows. Notwithstanding, it is recommended that the basement be fully waterproofed.

4.5. With regard to stability of adjoining properties the BIA finds that the potential for damage to adjoining properties would not exceed damage category 1 (very slight). CPG4 states that specific mitigation measures are required when the proposal exceeds Category 2 classification. As such the proposal is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on the stability of adjoining properties.

4.6. With regard to surface water flow, Goldhurst Terrace was subject to localised surface water flooding in 1975 and 2002. As the proposal does not contain any self-contained units wholly below ground level a flood risk assessment is not considered to be necessary. The occupants of the basement/ground maisonette would be able to retreat upstairs in the event of flooding.

The BIA notes that the proposal does not include an increase in hard standing and as such will not affect the ability of the site to absorb storm waters. As such the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact with regard to surface water flow.

4.7. Camden Planning Guidance 4 recommends that BIA independent verification be undertaken if a BIA extends to the scoping stage. A BIA review was undertaken and initially raised several concerns. Subsequently, various additional and revised documents were provided by the applicants' engineers, including a more detailed construction methodology and detailed calculations of predicted ground movements. This additional information resolved all of the reviewer's concerns and they confirmed that the proposal satisfied the requirements of policy DP27.

4.8. Given the scale of the proposed basement and the proximity to adjoining properties and public land, it is considered that a condition should be included requiring that a qualified engineer supervise the excavation.

4.9. Based on the information provided the BIA is considered to adequately demonstrate that the proposal would, subject to condition, maintain the structural stability of 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.

5. Standard of Accommodation

5.1 The proposal is considered to provide an adequate standard of accommodation for the following reasons:

- a) The floor to ceiling height of the proposed extensions satisfy the CPG2 standard.
- b) The proposed windows would receive adequate light from east facing windows.
- c) The proposal would maintain a large rear garden commensurate with the size of the ground floor flat.

6. Trees & Landscaping

6.1. The proposal includes retention of an existing large Cypress tree in the front garden. The large tree is considered to be important for its contribution to the landscaped character of the street. The application is accompanied by an arborist report which outlines protection measures for the tree. A condition will be included requiring that the tree be protected during works in keeping with the recommendations in the tree report. A condition will also be included requiring that the tree be replaced if it dies within 5 years.

6.2. The proposal includes a rear extension with a large flat roof area. Camden planning guidance encourages such areas to be finished as green roofs. As such a condition is included requiring that details of a green roof be submitted prior to occupation.

6.3. The proposal includes planters in the front garden, both within the new lightwell, and to the rear of the front boundary wall and a planted roof to the cycle/waste store in the front garden. Subject to details of the planting, which would be secured via condition, the proposal is considered to provide an acceptable level of landscaping.

7. Traffic & Transport

7.1 The works are not considered to be of a scale requiring a construction management plan as

there are large front and rear gardens which can accommodate building materials and waste. In addition, there are parking bays to the front of the site which, subject to approval from Council's highways department, can provide servicing of the site. The use of parking bays during the construction phase would only be temporary and would facilitate the more expedient completion of works on site. Any obstruction of the footway should be reported to Council's Traffic & Transport team.

8. Sustainability

8.1 LDF Policy DP22 requires developments to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures. The proposed extensions would be built to modern insulation and energy use requirements. Subject to condition a green roof will be provided. Given the limited scale of the proposal this is considered to be satisfactory.

9. Community Infrastructure Levies

9.1. The proposal results in an increase of over 100sqm of residential floor space. As such it will likely be liable for the Mayoral and Camden Community Infrastructure Levies (CILs).

9.2. Based on the Mayor's CIL charging schedule and the information provided on the plans, the charge will be approximately £5,900.00 (uplift of 118sqm x £50/sqm).

9.3. Based on the Camden CIL charging schedule and the information provided on the plans, the charge will be approximately £59,000.00 (uplift of 118sqm @ £500/sqm).

10. Recommendation

Grant Conditional Planning Permission.