

6 Antrim Grove - 2014/3835/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.

Members Briefing		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		04/08/2014	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		4/12/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Nanayaa Ampoma				2014/3835/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
6 Antrim Grove London NW3 4XR				See Decision Notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Excavation of new basement and associated landscaping works including side lightwell and 3x rooflights							
Recommendation(s):		Grant householder permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	09	No. of responses	12	No. of objections	11	
			No. electronic	00	No. of Support	01	

<p>Summary of consultation responses:</p>	<p>The application was advertised between 19/06/2014 and 10/07/2014 and 29/01/2015 to 19/02/2015. A Site Notice was displayed at the property for a period of 21 days between 23/01/2014 to 13/02/2015.</p> <p>Adjoining neighbours were also notified. Objections have received objections from:</p> <p>5 Antrim Grove - object 7 Antrim Grove – object 9 Antrim Grove- object 14 Antrim Grove- object 58 Antrim Mansions- object 129 Haverstock Hill - support 2 Tasker Road- object</p> <p>These comments can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The road is in an area of vulnerable groups who need foot access through the road and there are health and safety concerns with its closure. - Large cement tracks are regular to the area and block-in residents. - Further building works would cause harm. - Garages are blocked by building vehicles. - There are basement works already at 8 Antrim Grove, 1 and 3(opposite number 6)...and 10... are about to start works, if permission is given to number 6 then neighbours would be surrounded by five major works at the same time. - Antrim Road needs time to recover. - We have been heavily impacted by the other basement development in the area - Contactors have no regard for neighbours and park outside our property for over four hours - There has already been four years of issues. - Concerned with ground water flow. - The whole terrace from no.1 to no.9 Antrim Grove contributes to the maintenance of a pump which must be ready at all times to prevent water entering the basements at the beginning of the row. It is vital to know if the direction and volume of flow will be affected to the detriment of the whole terrace. - Serious concerns that the development would disrupt the water flow in the area. - There have been basement works at number 10 which have disrupted local residents and it is noted that the same contractors will be involved for works at no.6 - Need a more robust Construction Management Plan - There has been three years of noise from other basement developments - Reduced parking facilities, and traffic congestion from basement
---	---

developments

- Applicant has answered “no” to the question “will the proposed works affect existing parking arrangements?” however there are clearly current parking issues due to existing constructions. Therefore the development will affect parking. It is obvious that during the development at least one residence parking bay will be blocked to accommodate vehicles.
- Loss of parking does not matter to the applicant as they have a disabled bay.
- Previous developments have had a complete disregard for basic construction management in term of dust, parking of heavy vehicles and construction hours.
- The cumulative impact of the development could have serious implications for such a narrow road.
- I would ask the planning committee to ensure that the two developments in at 1 Antrim Road and 6 Antrim Grove are not allowed to proceed at the same time, Furthermore that you obtain written confirmation that all working time parameters are adhered to AND that the contractors keep to the parking regulations and provide tickets for all vehicles at all times AND do not park under the houses on the South side of Antrim Grove, which have daytime restrictions in force.
- Should the development be given permission a Construction Management Plan should be drawn up in respect of residents that includes dust mitigation and transport considerations.
- If people want a bigger house then they should buy a bigger house.
- Construction of basement would demand the structure of the adjacent houses
- Development would have an impact on the children who use the road by being noisy and causing fumes.
- Development aims to avoid stamp duty
- The development would lead to increased dust, mud, parking issues and noise
- We were not notified even though we are immediate neighbours, however we support development in terms of design and proposal.

Officer response: please see paragraphs 8.1 -8.3 for formal discussion on the above. A CMP has been agreed and the cumulative impact of the development in relation to the others at neighbouring properties has been assessed by the independent assessor.

**CAAC/Local groups*
comments:**
*Please Specify

CAAC: Object to scale of development, disruption to neighbours, proximity to trees, size of roof lights, concrete front garden, seven number openings in flank wall.

Officer response: please see paragraphs 8.1 - 8.3 for formal discussion on the above.

Site Description

The application site relates to a two storey semi-detached dwelling house situated in Antrim Grove. Antrim Grove is a branching road off England's Lane and Haverstock Hill. The area is characterised with residential properties at either side of the road and is close to Belsize Park tube station.

The property the subject of the application is believed to have been built in the 20th Century. In 1958 permission was granted for the property to be converted into flats. The property has since been refurbished and reinstated as a single residential unit. The adjoining property, no.4 Antrim Grove, is currently a group home for adults with learning disabilities.

The site falls within the Belsize Conservation Area and further restrictions on the property's development by way of Permitted Development (PD) has been removed under an Article 4 Directive placed on the property in September 2010. This Directive removes a significant amount of the properties PD rights.

Currently, there are a number of basement works that have been recently approved, are being constructed or due to start shortly. These are at numbers 8(2012/0994/P), 10(2013/6337/P, 2010/4405/P) and 15(2010/4152/P). Details received as part of the assessment of the application suggests that there are also basement works at numbers 1 and 3 however these may have deemed consent under previous Permitted Development rules.

Relevant History

6 Antrim Grove

4881: The conversion of No. 6 Antrim Grove, Hampstead, to form a self-contained flat on the ground floor and a self-contained maisonette on the first and second floors.- **Granted 27/6/1958**

T9601338: To reduce tree in garden by 8 feet. - **No objection to works 10/06/1996**

129 Haverstock Hill (The application will have an impact on the tree in this garden)

2015/1532/T: (TPO REF: 28H T-11) REAR GARDEN: 1 x Sycamore - Fell to ground.- **Grant consent 2nd June 2015**

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy (2010)

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS13 Tackling Climate Change through promoting higher environmental standards

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

LDF Development Policies (2010)

DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking

DP19 Managing the impact of parking

DP22 Promoting Sustainable Design and Construction

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

Supplementary Planning Policies

Camden Planning Guidance 1 Design (2015)

Camden Planning Guidance 4 Basement and Lightwells (2015)

Camden Planning Guidance 6 Amenity (2011)

Camden Planning Guidance 8 Planning Obligations (2015)

Belsize Conservation Area Statement (2002)

1.1 The key planning concerns relate to the scale, size, design and structural stability of the development. As well as the resulting cumulative impact the development may have on the area when considered against the backdrop of the other current basement developments in the area. It is also necessary to consider the impact of the works on any nearby trees.

1.2 The following sections will be set out as follows:

- Design
- Basement Impact Assessment
- Findings of the Independent Basement Impact Assessment
- Amenity
- Highways
- Tree Impact
- Local Representations

Design

- 2.1 The basement will have a footprint of 28.7 metres in length, 4.5 meters in height and a width of 8 metres, extending beyond the rear and front walls of the existing property. The proposed extension would increase the floor space of the property by around 50%. The space created would be used as a playroom, hall, library, utility room, shower and gym.
- 2.2 Policies CS14 and DP25 require that all alterations in conservation areas respect and enhance the character of the area and location. The Council will only give permission to those developments that preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. This is further supported by policies CS5 of the Core Strategy and DP24 of the Development Policies which state that the Council will require all developments including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest design standard in terms of the character, sitting, context, form and scale to the existing building and the general area
- 2.3 The proposed basement unit would cover an area greater than the footprint of the existing property. With regard to basement developments, CPG 4 states that basements that do not extend beyond the footprint of the original house are the most appropriate. The proposed basement development does not meet this. However CPG 4 does not suggest that those that do not meet this requirement should be automatically refused. Officers are of the opinion that should the development be deemed structurally sound by the independent assessor, the basement would be acceptable as it is not considered to be significantly large in scale to render a refusal on these grounds. In fact the size and scale is appropriate and is in keeping with other previously approved schemes.
- 2.4 As the development would not be visible, it would have no visual impact on the character of the property or the conservation area.

Independent Basement Assessment

- 3.1 A Basement Impact Assessment dated June 2014, was submitted as part of the supporting documents for the application. The assessment was completed by Knapp Hicks and Partners Ltd. A summary of the details contained in the BIA is provided below. An addendum to the report was also later submitted in June 2015 to address issues raised by the independent assessor.

Extent of basement

- 3.2 The application proposed to excavate the lower ground floor area of the property to create an extensive basement. The proposed basement would extend the full length of the property and

protrude from the rear wall by between 3-3.7 metres. It would also extend from the existing front boundary wall by between 1.5 metres and 4.3 metres.

- 3.3 At the front basement area a new shower room would be created. The remaining proposed excavation would be to create a play room, utility room, library, family room and gym. The ground floor would remain as existing. Due to the nature of the foundation levels the basement would have a higher head height than the rear and to the rear it would have a floor to ceiling height that is greater than the front. To the rear the proposed basement area that extends beyond the existing property boundary will be covered with a green roof.

Screening and scoping reports

- 3.4 In the original screening and scoping report detailed in the BIA states that 1 window sampler borehole, and 3 hand dug trial pits were used. These works confirmed that the topsoil of the area comprised of a thin layer of clay, sand and gravel head deposits. The site is within 5 metres of a highway. The proposed basement would maintain a 1.20 to 2.10 metre wide zone of undisturbed ground between the basement wall and the boundary with the Antrim Grove pavement. The proposed basement would be excavated in two stages. Stage one will excavated to a pre-arranged depth (this is not confirmed in the BIA) and stage two will excavate the remainder. It should be noted that it is not clear what time lapse will be given between the two excavation processes.
- 3.5 The proposal answered "No" to all screening questions aside of question 1b of the Subterranean (groundwater) flow screening flowchart which states "Will the proposed basement extend beneath the water table. Ground water was not encountered in any of the exploratory holes. In addition works to no.8 and 10 Antrim Grove also only found "perched groundwater".
- 3.6 No significant surface water and flooding issues are considered as similar works at no.8 Antrim Grove did not raise any issues

Summary

- 3.7 3A which considers surface water and flooring issues has raised one issue with regard to the development, which is that potentially the basement may extend below a perched water table. However recent similar works at the next door property (no.8) reported minor quantities of perched water in the Head deposits and it is concluded that the situation at no.6 and can be dealt with via temporary water resisting measures in the structure.
- 3.8 3B which deals with subterranean water flow has returned two potential issues with regard to the development: (1) groundwater has been encountered in recent excavations and (2) the proposed basement works will marginally increase the impermeable /permeable area ratio for the site. In relation to point one, it is thought that this issue can be dealt with by sump pumping during the excavation works. The report recommends that further holes are dug deeper than the perched water table and specialist advice is sought as required. In relation to point two, this will be offset with the provision of a green roof to the basement extension and the front garden will be reinstated with shrub beds and gravel over the top of the basement.
- 3.9 Part 2C which looks at slope stability, identified issues with questions 12 and 13. These can be dealt with by appropriate temporary measures.
- 3.10 Subsequent details were submitted (see letter dated 19th December 2014 from Knapp Hicks and Partners Ltd) after the initial independent assessment. This confirmed that further hand dug pits will be created and there would be further monitoring. This satisfied the requirements of the independent BIA.

Findings of the Independent Basement Impact Assessment

- 4.1 As part of the assessment of the development and given that the development relates to the construction of a new and large basement, officers sought independent verification on the technical sufficiency of the supporting BIA and that it would accord with policy DP27 by:
- a. maintaining the structural stability of the building and any neighbouring properties
 - b. avoiding adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment and
 - c. avoiding cumulative impacts on structural stability or the water environment in the local area
- 4.2 The Independent Assessment found that further works were required to deal primarily with point c. above. This was later submitted and on 22nd July 2015 GEA confirmed that the most recent addendum suitably addressed any remaining issues; that the proposal had fully met all the requirements stated above and that the proposed basement works had accounted for the relationship of the neighbouring basement works.

Amenity

- 5.1 Under section 7 of supplementary planning guidance CPG 6 (Amenity), all developments are required to have some regard for the amenity of existing and future occupants. Policies CS5 (Core Strategy) and DP26 (Development Policies) state that the council will protect the quality of life for existing and future occupiers, as well as neighbours by only granting permission for those developments that would not have a harmful effect on amenity. Such issues include visual privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, outlook, sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels.
- 5.2 Policy DP26 looks to protect the amenity of neighbours from the effects of development by way of overlooking, enclosure, loss of privacy, noise, fumes and dust. However it should be noted that this policy looks at the more long term impact of a development rather than more immediate and what can be considered shorter term impacts such as building noise in the day time. A visit to the site demonstrated that the proposed development is unlikely to impact the neighbouring properties in the ways described above in the long term. However in the short term it will create discomfort in terms of dust, noise and construction works. In assessing these concerns officers are required to balance the need to acknowledge neighbour concerns with policy and adequate reasons for refusal. It is expected that there will be some level of disruption due to building works by way of dust, noise and fumes. However, having carefully considered neighbour comments it is concluded that the objections expressed fall under the short term impacts of the development and do not form strong enough grounds to refuse the application. However it is recommended that approval be granted subject to the securing of a Section 106 agreement to ensure that any impact can be controlled via a Construction Management Plan.
- 5.3 In terms of overlooking, loss of sunlight and loss of privacy officers are of the view that the development would not affect the current amenity arrangements adversely.

Highways

- 6.1 The highways officer has said that the application is acceptable subject to a Section 106 for a Construction Management Plan, an Agreement in Principle and Highways contributions of £2000.
- 6.2 There have been a number of complaints made to the highways team regarding previous basement development schemes at nos. 1, 8 and 10 Antrim Grove. A number of issues have been highlighted by neighbours in their objections such as dust, noise and parking. While the Highways Officer does not object to the development, they have commented that the details submitted as part of the application does not fully address highways matters. Whilst there is no

objection to the principle of developing the basement itself, the short term impacts of the works in terms of its construction has presented on going issues between contractors and residents. Many neighbours have complained that construction vehicles have parked in residential parking bays for prolonged periods of time, of unsympathetic construction practices by contractors blocking access and increased noise and dust. As a result of these concerns the Highways Officer has asked for a joined up approach to the required construction works.

- 6.3 Although the Council has a duty to facilitate development there are concerns that the concurrent basement construction sites could be considered as being contrary to DP20 if they are not properly controlled. DP20 requires that developments of this kind seek to minimise impact, however each development will present its own disruption no matter how much thought has been given to the construction process. Therefore by definition several basement developments will create significant disruption. A consolidated approach to construction and managing the cumulative impacts would be seen as a crucial part of the development to ensure that a complete picture of the construction impacts can be assessed.
- 6.4 A Construction Management Plan has been submitted as part of the application. This states that contractors will apply for a Parking Order to suspend a length of parking bay for construction vehicles and deliveries to and from the site. The plan also states that as the contractors' conveyor belt will be fully enclosed and their skip and material compound fully hoarded, it is not anticipated that any significant volume of dust/dirt to the highway will be created. However dust is likely to result in any building works and could travel through the air into the street and to neighbouring properties. The report continues that the work surfaces will be washed down each day to help control the amount of resulting dust.
- 6.5 While the plan shows that thought has been given to the construction process it looks at the proposed works at 6 Antrim Grove in isolation of the other basement works in the area. As noted above, concerns raised by neighbours have not been the result of simply one basement development but rather the cumulative impact of concurrent basement development in the area. In isolation the proposed basement works at 6th Antrim may be acceptable, however together with the current developments and possible further works this has created added pressures on the highways infrastructure in the area as well as disrupted the day to day amenity experienced by neighbours in the area.
- 6.6 In light of the above the Highways Authority has requested that a more robust Construction Management Plan be secured via Section 106 to give further assurances to the neighbouring properties and provide the Council with a much stronger basis for enforcement. The requisite CMP should specifically focus on the cumulative impact of the concurrent basement developments in the area.
- 6.7 In addition, the highways authority has requested that an Agreement in Principle be secured also via S106. The AIP confirms that the Highways Authority will give their agreement to the development subject to S106 and contributors. The AIP is required as the basement works are considered sufficiently close to the public highway as to cause structural concern. The AIP incurs a cost of approximately £2,000 towards associated highways works.

Trees

- 7.1 The proposed basement works would be built close to an existing offsite tree. Supporting documents submitted include a tree report. This shows that the proposed Tree Protection Area around the protected tree has been drawn to a radius of 4 metres from the centre of the tree. However the British Standard requires that it is 9.6 meters.
- 7.2 The applicant has stated that this is because the tree's condition has significantly declined since 2011/12 which has meant that the radius could be reduced. Additionally, that the BS standard

has been changed since 2012 and that in any case it is a guide and not a minimum requirement. The Tree Officer has made a site visit and looked in detail at the situation of the tree and considers the report acceptable. However the proposed works would impact the tree in the garden at 129 Haverstock Hill as such a TPO application was submitted for the works to fell the tree. This was considered under application 2015/1532/T and granted. Therefore there are no issues with the proposed works in regards to its impact on the trees.

Neighbour Representations

- 8.1 Several comments have been received from nearby residents who have experienced issues with the previously approved schemes at nos. 8 and 10. Many of these concerns have been discussed in the above sections. In summary, neighbours are concerned with the structural safety of their works and the disruption to the highways from the proposed works. The question of structural stability has been answered by the undertaking of an independent assessment of the proposed basement works. The findings provided by GEA are considered by officers, to represent a fair assessment of the structural stability of the proposed basement and provides an adequate response. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed works would be structurally sound.
- 8.2 In regard to the highways matters these are more complicated. In isolation the development would cause disruption to the highways, however this could be considered to be no more than is normally experienced. However due to the unique situation of the site and other projects in the vicinity, officers have taken the view that an assessment of the basement should consider the cumulative impact of the proposed works. This would help create a more acceptable situation for local residents in the area. To this end, officers will seek a more robust CMP as part of the S106 agreement, which will be assessed by the highways authority who are mindful of the issues and comments received regarding the numerous basements in the area.
- 8.3 It would be unreasonable to refuse any development based on what is considered to be a short term impact, as in this case. During construction there will be some disruption to the highway and there may even be damage which will be recouped via the £2000 highways contribution secured by S106. However this disruption is not permanent. Neighbours have reported that some developments have been taking place for several years. However this is still a temporary time scale. Since all developments cause some form of disruption officers have taken the view that as a reason for refusal, this is not sustainable. As a result, measures must be taken to mitigate any temporary or minor disruption or harm caused by a development that would otherwise be completely acceptable. In this particular case officers are of the view that the proposed S106 is the most suitable course of action as it allows greater legal powers for planning and highways enforcement and compliance by the applicant.

Conclusion

- 9.1 The application has been formally assessed and the proposed works have been independently assessed and deemed appropriate. The BIA and additional basement documents are considered sufficiently robust and accurate and are accompanied by sufficiently detailed amelioration/mitigation measures to ensure that the grant of planning permission would accord with DP27. The necessary works to the trees have also been considered and approved. Therefore officers are of the opinion that the proposed works are acceptable and should be approved.

- 10.1 **Recommendation: Grant conditional planning permission.**

DISCLAIMER: Decision route to be decided by nominated members on 17th August 2015. For further information please go to www.camden.gov.uk and search for 'Members Briefing'

Architecture
11A Beresford Road
London
N2 8AT

Application Ref: **2014/3835/P**

17 August 2015

Dear Sir/Madam

FOR INFORMATION ONLY - THIS IS NOT A FORMAL DECISION
Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

DECISION SUBJECT TO A SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT

Address:
**6 Antrim Grove
London
NW3 4XR**

Proposal:
Excavation of new basement level and associated landscaping works including side lightwell and 3 x rooflights
Drawing Nos: 100A, 101C, 102, 103A, 104A, 110C, 111C, 112A, 113A, 114A, 115A, Construction Management Plan (14th May 2014), Arboricultural assessment and Protection Method Statement, Knapp Hicks and Partners Ltd Basement Impact Assessment and Site Investigation Report June 2014, Knapp Hicks and Partners Ltd BIA Addendum 19th December 2014, Knapp Hicks and Partners Ltd BIA Addendum 26th June 2015.

The Council has considered your application and decided to grant permission subject to the conditions and informatives (if applicable) listed below **AND** subject to the successful conclusion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

The matter has been referred to the Council's Legal Department and you will be contacted shortly. If you wish to discuss the matter please contact **Aidan Brookes** in the Legal Department on **020 7 974 1947**.

Once the Legal Agreement has been concluded, the formal decision letter will be sent to you.

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 policy 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: 100A, 101C, 102, 103A, 104A, 110C, 111C, 112A, 113A, 114A, 115A, Construction Management Plan (14th May 2014), Arboricultural assessment and Protection Method Statement, Knapp Hicks and Partners Ltd Basement Impact Assessment and Site Investigation Report June 2014, Knapp Hicks and Partners Ltd BIA Addendum 19th December 2014 , Knapp Hicks and Partners Ltd BIA Addendum 26th June 2015.

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

- 4 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.

- 5 The proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the hereby approved arboricultural report by ACS Consulting dated 22nd May 2014 and the Tree Protection plan ref: TPP1_6AG.

Reason: To ensure the preservation of the amenity value and health of the tree in accordance with policies CS13 of the Core Strategy and DP25 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 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.
- 3 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 Noise and Licensing Enforcement Team, 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.

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.

Yours faithfully

Culture and Environment Directorate

6 Antrim Grove



Front of property 1.1



Rear of property 1.2



Rear of property 1.3



Side boundary 1.4