

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		09/06/2016	
(Members Briefing)		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		09/08/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Kate Phillips				2016/1737/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
77 Lawn Road London NW3 2XB				Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Creation of basement to form additional living accommodation for existing dwelling and new 1x self-contained 1-bed flat at lower ground floor level; alterations to driveway and erection of new boundary fencing; erection of part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension; alterations to fenestration; and associated works							
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional permission subject to Section 106 legal agreement					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	14	No. of responses	10	No. of objections	10
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed on 21/04/2016 (expiry 12/05/2016) and a notice was placed in the local press on 20/04/2016 (expiry 11/05/2016).</p> <p>In response to the original plans, objections were received from 9 different properties. The comments are summarised thus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basement will cause damage to neighbouring buildings (see section 10 of officer's report) • Concerns about removal of tree – impact on conservation area (see sections 6 and 9 of officer's report) • Will their insurance cover damage to neighbours (see below) • Disturbance during the construction period (see sections 7 and 8 of the officer's report) • No boundary wall between application site and rear property on Downside Crescent (see below) • Lowering driveway would have adverse visual effect on street scene (see sections 2 and 6 of the officer's report) • The basement being visible from the road would be out of keeping with the rest of the street (see section 6 of the officer's report) • Building makes positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area (see section 6 of the officer's report) • Alteration to driveway would impact on neighbour's ability to use their driveway (see below) • Impact on trees (see section 9 of the officer's report) • Loss of light/outlook to neighbours (see section 7 of the officer's report) <p>In response to the revised plans, objections were received from 2 different properties. The comments are summarised thus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about removal of tree – impact on conservation area (see sections 6 and 9 of the officer's report) • Subsidence concerns (see below) • Concerns about alterations to driveway (see sections 2 and 6 of the officer's report) <p>Officer comment</p> <p><i>Please see the Officer's Report below which addresses the principle of development, the impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area, the impact on neighbouring properties, trees and landscaping considerations, transport considerations and basement considerations.</i></p>					

	<p><i>Issues relating to boundaries (i.e. the lack of boundary treatment) or insurance are a civil matter and are not a planning consideration.</i></p> <p><i>Issues relating to the basement are covered by the independent audit of the Basement Impact Assessment.</i></p> <p><i>The removal of the tree has been considered by the Tree Officers and Planning Officers and judged to be acceptable.</i></p>
Belsize CAAC	No objection.

Site Description

No. 77 Lawn Road is a semi-detached, two storey, red brick residential dwelling on the western side of the road. The property has a garden at the front, with steps leading up from the public pavement to a shared path to the front doors of the pair of semi-detached properties. The property has a sloped driveway to the side of the front garden which leads to a single garage, which is attached to the main building. At the rear, the property benefits from a private garden.

The application site is within the Parkhill Conservation Area. Nos. 70-85 Lawn Road (consecutive) are identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Relevant History

77 Lawn Road

None

72 Lawn Road

8905326 - Construction of a new garage and utility area at ground floor level and bedroom with en-suite bathroom and balcony at first floor level of single family dwelling – Granted 15-02-1990

73 Lawn Road

2004/0572/P - New side and rear dormer windows for the conversion of loft space into additional accommodation and the replacement of a ground floor side entrance with a window - Granted 26-03-2004

76 Lawn Road

F9/14/1/1582 - Erection of garage and car port at side and formation of new means of vehicular access to the highway - Granted 06-04-1966

78 Lawn Road

2007/6177/P - Installation of a dormer window in the side elevation at the front of the property - Granted 02-04-2008

79 Lawn Road

9501771 - Conversion of the existing attic space into residential accommodation, including the installation of a dormer window at the rear, increasing the height of the window on the landing above the eaves and the installation of a circular window to the front gable – Granted 08-03-1996

81 Lawn Road

2015/4039/P - Erection of single storey rear extension and two storey side extension following the demolition of the existing side and rear extensions, and alterations to openings on side elevation - Granted 02-09-2015

2007/3342/P - Creation of new basement level with front, side and rear lightwells to single-family

dwelling house (Class C3.) - Granted 26-11-2007

PEX0100597 - The provision of side and rear dormer windows, and the enlargement of the existing lean-to at the rear – Granted 17-12-2001

82 Lawn Road

PEX0100914 - The enlargement of the existing rear dormer window and installation of three roof lights on the front side and rear elevations – Appeal allowed 20/08/2002.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan (2016)

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies (2010)

CS1 Distribution of growth

CS3 Other highly accessible areas

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 Providing quality homes

CS11 Promoting sustainable and efficient travel

CS13 Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

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

CS18 Dealing with our waste and encouraging recycling

CS19 Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy

DP2 Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing

DP5 Homes of different sizes

DP16 The transport implications of development

DP17 Walking, cycling and public transport

DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking

DP19 Managing the impact of parking

DP20 Movement of goods and materials

DP21 Development connecting to the highway network

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

DP29 Improving access

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (2015)

CPG2 Housing (2015)

CPG3 Sustainability (2015)

CPG4 Basements and lightwells (2015)

CPG6 Amenity (2011)

CPG7 Transport (2011)

CPG8 Planning Obligations (2015)

Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011)

Assessment

1. The proposal

1.1. This application seeks planning permission for the following:

- Creation of basement to form additional living accommodation for the existing dwelling and to create 1x additional, self-contained 1-bed flat;
- Alterations to the driveway, including the erection of new boundary fencing;
- Erection of a part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension;
- Alterations to fenestration.

1.2. The proposed basement would have a larger footprint than that of the above-ground part of the resultant building as it would extend out to the rear, underneath the patio area; it would extend under part of the driveway at the side and front of the house and there would be a sunken lightwell directly in front of the existing bay window at the front of the house. In total, the basement (including the sunken lightwell to the front) would measure approximately 200sqm.

1.3. The self-contained flat within the newly created basement would measure 50sqm. It would comprise: living/kitchen area, bedroom, bathroom, storage cupboard and hall. Both the bedroom and main living area would have access to a sunken lightwell. Within the sunken lightwell at the front of the building, there would be a cycle storage facility. The main entrance to the basement flat would be via the front lightwell, from a new set of stairs leading down from the driveway.

1.4. The remainder of the basement (which would be accessed from the main dwelling or from the rear garden) would comprise: wine cellar, utility room, study, changing room, gym, storage. The gym area would have doors opening into a sunken lightwell directly at the rear of the host building (within the patio area at ground level).

1.5. The driveway would continue to slope upwards towards the house from the road as it currently does for a length of approximately 11 metres, but to the side of the host building, the existing hardstanding of the driveway would be replaced with an area of ground level planting directly adjacent to the building, a sunken lightwell to serve the basement flat, and a pedestrian ramp leading down to basement level. The introduction of the pedestrian ramp will necessitate the erection of fencing along the shared boundary with No. 76 Lawn Road for a distance of approximately 9 metres (measured forwards from the front of the new side extension). Approximately 5 metres away from the pavement edge, the driveway would be widened and a new set of stairs would be added to provide access down to the newly created front lightwell (to access the self-contained basement flat).

1.6. The proposed side and rear extension (which would replace the existing, single storey garage at the side of the host building) would extend out to the side of the host building by 2.5 metres at ground floor level (i.e. up to the shared boundary with No. 76). The kitchen extension element would measure up to 2.8 metres tall and would extend along the shared boundary with No. 76 for a distance of 5.7 metres. Beyond this, would be the staircase to access the basement from the rear garden and the wall at the side of the staircase would extend further back by another 4.1 metres, at a height of 1.2 metres above ground level. There would be rooflights above the kitchen extension and the staircase elements of the new extension.

1.7. At first floor level, the side projecting part of the new extension would extend out to the side of the host building by 1.2 metres and the flank wall would measure 8.4 metres long (the overall

rear projecting element would extend out to the rear of the original building by 4 metres). It would measure 5.3 metres to the eaves and 7.4 metres to the ridge. The side projecting part of the extension would have a flat roof. The rear projecting element would have a hipped roof.

- 1.8. The proposal involves the creation of more accommodation in the roof space. There is currently a small room in the roof, and the resultant building would have a bedroom, study, bathroom and storage space within the roof. The existing staircase to the room in the roof would be removed and the main staircase in the building would be extended upwards instead. This would necessitate changes to the existing staircase window on the side of the building and the creation of a side dormer window.
- 1.9. 6x rooflights would be inserted in the roof (4x on the front projecting gable roof and 2x on the side roof slope). The existing dormer in the rear roof slope would be retained and refurbished.
- 1.10. On the front elevation, the 2x windows above the front door would be fitted with clear glazing (instead of leaded lights as currently). Conversely, the windows in the ground floor part of the bay window would be fitted with leaded lights to match the upper part of the bay.
- 1.11. On the side elevation, at ground level, a door and window would be removed. At first floor level, a window would be removed.
- 1.12. On the rear elevation, the cills in the rear facing room would be lowered to 0.6 metres above the finished floor level (a drop of approximately 0.6 metres).

2. Revisions

2.1. The following revisions have been made during the course of the application:

- Changes to works on driveway (less excavation)
- Omission of car lift and subterranean car parking
- Reduction in amount of new fencing along shared boundary with No. 76
- Alteration to position/angle of staircase to access front lightwell
- Reduction in amount of demolition required on side and rear facades
- Changes to fenestration (provision of leaded lights in ground floor of bay window)

3. The principle of development

- 3.1. Policies CS6, DP2 and DP5 seek to maximise the supply of additional homes in the borough and the creation of an additional residential unit is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to the detailed considerations below.
- 3.2. Policy DP24 requires all development, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and Policy DP25 notes that development will only be permitted in conservation areas which preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area. The proposed extensions and alterations to the host dwelling are therefore also considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to the detailed considerations below.

4. Dwelling mix

- 4.1. Policy DP5 seeks to ensure that all residential development contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Size Priorities Table (DSPT). The DSPT indicates that 1-bed dwellings have the lowest priority and 2-bed dwellings have the highest.

4.2. The newly created flat in the basement would only have 1 bedroom, whereas the creation of a 2-bed unit would be preferable. However, it is understood that the flat will provide accommodation for a nanny, in relation to the main building. On this basis, the fact it would only have 1 bedroom is considered to be acceptable.

5. Living standards for future occupiers

5.1. Policy DP26 requires new development to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space; facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste; facilities for bicycle storage; and private outdoor amenity space.

5.2. The Government's current technical housing standards require a 1-bedroom-2-person unit to provide 50sqm of floor space, including 1.5sqm of built-in storage. The new unit would meet the required space standard.

5.3. The new unit would be fully self-contained and it is considered that all of the rooms in the new flat would be able to function for the purposes for which they are intended. They would all have an adequate size, shape, door arrangement and height.

5.4. The new dwelling would feature an open-plan kitchen / living space, which is considered to be acceptable because the size is considered to be suitable to cater for the greater range of activities that would take place therein. Furthermore, there would be a permanent separation between eating and sleeping areas in the flat, which is welcomed.

5.5. There are 2 ways to access the flat. The main entrance is via the front lightwell, and leads directly into the main living space, and there is also an entrance from the side lightwell into the bedroom. This means it would not be possible to access all habitable rooms without passing through another; however, the layout is designed to maximise natural daylight in the main living space at the front of the building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, on balance.

5.6. The new flat would be dual-aspect insofar as it would have openings on the front and sides of the host building. The lightwell at the front would measure 1.4 by 4.7 metres, which is relatively generous; and there would be windows on all three sides of the front bay window element at basement level. As such, it is considered likely that future occupiers would benefit from sufficient levels of natural light.

5.7. There would be in-built storage within the flat and there would be cycle storage within the front lightwell, which is considered to be acceptable.

5.8. Overall, it is considered that the new dwelling would provide an acceptable standard of residential accommodation, in accordance with Policy DP26.

5.9. Similarly, it is considered that the main (existing) dwelling would continue to provide an acceptable standard of residential accommodation for future occupiers.

6. Impact on the character and appearance of the wider area (including the Parkhill Conservation Area)

6.1. The application site is within the Parkhill Conservation Area; wherein the Council has a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, in accordance with Section 72 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990. Nos. 70-85 Lawn Road (consecutive) are identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Creation of basement

6.2. The proposed basement would manifest itself above ground by way of the front, side and rear lightwells and the pedestrian ramps leading down from the driveway. CPG4 (Basements and lightwells) recommends that any exposed areas of basement are subordinate to the host building; respect the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style; and retain a reasonable sized garden.

6.3. The lightwells are all relatively modest in size and it is considered that they would be subordinate to the host building. Furthermore, it is considered that the lightwells would be in keeping with the design of the host building and the proposal would retain a generous sized garden. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in this respect.

6.4. Whilst it may be possible to discern the new front and side lightwells from the street, they are unlikely to be prominent in views of the house, because of the intervening change in ground levels. Furthermore, the lightwells would be secured with a grille, set flush with the ground level, which would minimise their visibility.

Changes to driveway

6.5. The plans have been altered during the course of the application to reduce the amount of changes to the driveway. The driveway would continue to slope upwards towards the house from the road as it currently does for a length of approximately 11 metres, but to the side of the host building, the existing hardstanding of the driveway would be replaced with an area of ground level planting directly adjacent to the building, a sunken lightwell to serve the basement flat, and a pedestrian ramp leading down to basement level.

6.6. The changes towards the top end of the driveway (i.e. closest to the host building) may be visible in the street scene; however, they are unlikely to be prominent. Although there is a relatively consistent pattern of development along the street, there are slight differences between the separate pairs of dwellings and their driveways etc. It is recognised that no other property in the row has an access to the basement from the driveway, but on balance, this is not considered to have such a detrimental impact on the character of the host building, the row of properties or the conservation area so as to warrant a refusal of the application on this basis.

6.7. The introduction of the pedestrian ramp will necessitate the erection of fencing along the shared boundary with No. 76 Lawn Road for a distance of approximately 9 metres (measured from the front of the new side extension). The plans have been revised to reduce the amount of fencing along the shared boundary, which is welcomed. Furthermore, there are other examples of fencing along the shared driveways on Lawn Road: for example, between Nos. 80 and 81 and between Nos. 82 and 83. A planning condition can require the submission and approval of details of the fencing prior to the commencement of development, in order to ensure it is of a high quality which is in keeping with the character and appearance of the wider area.

Part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension

- 6.8. The proposed extensions at the side and rear would replace the existing single garage at the side of the host building. There is no objection to the loss of the existing garage, because it is a later addition to the building and it does not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the host building or the conservation area.
- 6.9. The new extensions would sit forwards of the existing garage front building line; however, they would still be set back considerably from the front of the host building and would therefore appear subordinate to the original building.
- 6.10. The proposal would introduce a first floor element at the side of the building which would be visible in the street scene along Lawn Road; however, the fact it would step in from the single storey, ground floor element is welcomed, to maintain the gap between the neighbouring buildings. The side projecting element would have a flat roof and the hipped roof on the rear projecting element of the extension would be set fully behind the main building, so it is not visible in the street scene.
- 6.11. The rear projecting part of the new extension would extend out to the rear of the host building by 4 metres and the flank wall would measure 8.4 metres long. This element of the extension is considered to be subordinate to the main building in terms of size, bulk and design. There are other examples of rear projecting extensions on Lawn Road, including at No. 78 (the attached property to the south). The fact the hipped roof is only above the rear projecting part of the extension would limit its visibility in the street scene and the top of the hipped roof would be far below the main ridgeline of the building, and at a similar height to the corresponding hipped roof at No. 78.

Alterations to fenestration

- 6.12. On the front elevation, 2x windows above the front door would be fitted with clear glazing (instead of leaded lights as currently). Conversely, the windows in the ground floor part of the bay window would be fitted with leaded lights to match the upper part of the bay. The changes to the windows above the front door are considered to be acceptable insofar as they would match the corresponding windows at the attached neighbouring property, No. 78. The re-introduction of leaded lights to the lower half of the bay window element is welcomed in terms of improving the overall appearance of the front elevation of the building, and mitigates against the harm caused by changes at the rear.
- 6.13. The proposed staircase feature on the side elevation of the building would be in keeping with other properties in the street that have carried out similar works (e.g. Nos. 72, 73, 74, 75, 76), which is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.14. The 6x new rooflights would also be in keeping with other properties in the street (e.g. No. 76), which is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.15. The removal of a door and a window on the side elevation would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. These works would be barely visible in the street scene, due to their position on the side of the building.
- 6.16. At the rear, lowering the cills of the first floor windows to 0.6 metres above the finished floor level would alter the symmetry between the pair of attached dwellings and the proposal would impact adversely on the wall-to-window ratio of the host building. However, these

alterations would not be visible in the public realm and the rear elevation of the property is undergoing significant change as a result of the new rear projecting extension. Given that the overall proposal seeks to reduce the visual impact on the street scene, the changes to the rear facing windows are considered to be acceptable.

Conclusion

6.17. Overall, it is considered that the proposed alterations and extensions to the host building would be of a high standard of design, which would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Parkhill Conservation Area, in accordance with the requirements of Policies DP24 and DP25 of the LDF.

7. The impact on the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of nearby and neighbouring residential properties

7.1. Policy DP26 notes that the Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors to consider include: visual privacy and overlooking; overshadowing and outlook; sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels; noise and vibration levels; odour, fumes and dust; microclimate; and the inclusion of appropriate attenuation measures.

7.2. The main properties that are likely to be affected by the proposal are Nos. 76 and 78 Lawn Road (the neighbouring properties). All other nearby residential properties are considered to be sufficiently removed from the application site so as not to be adversely affected by the proposal.

7.3. The creation of additional floor space and an additional residential unit at basement level is unlikely to cause undue harm to neighbouring properties. Whilst there may be increased comings and goings from the host building, the level of additional activity is unlikely to be so severe as to warrant a refusal of the application on this basis. Similarly, the level of noise generated from the use of the basement is unlikely to cause undue harm.

7.4. The alterations to the driveway are considered to be acceptable. It is recognised that the fencing along the shared boundary may cause difficulties to cars using the adjacent driveway (No. 76), but the applicant would be able to erect fencing up to a metre high without the need for planning permission. The plans have been revised to reduce the amount of fencing along the shared boundary, which will allow cars using the adjacent driveway to continue to 'swing over' the part of the driveway that belongs to No. 77 when driving onto the driveway.

7.5. The proposed side and rear extensions have been designed to limit the impact on the neighbouring properties and it is not considered that they would cause any undue loss of light or outlook or appear overbearing when viewed from the neighbouring properties. The fenestration has also been designed to prevent undue overlooking into neighbouring gardens. Any views into neighbouring gardens would be at an oblique angle rather than direct, which is considered to be acceptable.

7.6. The alterations to the existing fenestration are not considered to cause undue harm to neighbouring properties. The enlarged side window and dormer feature would serve the staircase and is therefore not likely to cause overlooking. The enlarged windows at the rear would allow more light into the rooms they serve, but they would not increase the level of overlooking to neighbouring properties.

7.7. Policy DP28 notes that the Council will seek to minimise the impact on local amenity from the

demolition and construction phases of development. Given the extent of the proposed works (including the basement construction) and the nature of the application site, the Council will secure the submission of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) through a legal agreement.

8. Transport considerations

- 8.1. The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4, which means it is reasonably accessible by public transport; and it is within the Belsize controlled parking zone (CA-B), which operates between 0900 and 1830 hours on Monday to Friday and 0930 to 1330 on Saturday. Policy DP18 expects new development to provide the minimum necessary car parking provision.
- 8.2. The proposal would result in a reduction of car parking spaces on the driveway, and the loss of the existing garage, which is welcomed in terms of encouraging reduced car ownership in the borough. The applicant is willing to secure the new unit as 'car-free' through a legal agreement.
- 8.3. In accordance with The London Plan 2016 requirements, the new flat would require 1x cycle parking space, in order to encourage cycling as an efficient, healthy and sustainable alternative to private motor vehicle usage. Cycle parking provision is illustrated within the front lightwell and a suitable planning condition can require the submission and approval of full details of the cycle storage prior to the occupation of the new unit.
- 8.4. Policy DP20 seeks to minimise the impact of the movement of goods and materials by road. Due to the scale and nature of the proposed development a Construction Management Plan (CMP) will be secured by the legal agreement to ensure the development can be implemented without being detrimental to amenity or the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the local area.
- 8.5. The legal agreement will also secure a contribution towards highways works required as a result of any damage caused during the works.

9. Trees and landscaping

- 9.1. Policy DP24 requires new development to consider existing natural features, such as topography and trees. New development should respond to the natural assets of the site and its surroundings and development will not be permitted which fails to preserve or is likely to damage trees on a site which make a significant contribution to the character and amenity of an area.
- 9.2. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment which accompanies the application notes that Trees T1 (Cherry) and T7 (Pittosporum) will require removal due to direct conflict with the proposal. Furthermore Tree T8 (Yew) will require reduction back to the boundary. The report notes that Trees T1 and T7 have limited public visibility due to their positions at the rear of buildings, but they can be seen from neighbouring properties. Reduction of the crown of T8 would only be noticeable from within the site.
- 9.3. The loss of Tree T1 is deemed to be acceptable because the tree is within the proposed footprint and is of limited value beyond its immediate surroundings. Furthermore, this tree has been unsympathetically pruned in the past and has some structural and physiological defects which limit its safe useful life expectancy. The loss of T7 is also acceptable due to its small size, and low visual impact.

- 9.4. The loss of both trees can be adequately compensated with suitable replacement planting, which can be secured by condition.
- 9.5. The works to Tree T8 (Yew) are considered to be significant. The crown of this tree overhangs the shared boundary with No. 76 and the overhanging section of the crown will require reduction back to the boundary, due to conflict with the layout. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment acknowledges that the extent of crown removal is significant; however, it notes that Yew is a species known to be tolerant to extensive reduction, and capable of regenerating fresh growth from bare wood, so this reduction is not considered to be detrimental to the tree's long-term retention. In reality, the impact to Tree T8 is likely to be acceptable, due to site factors likely limiting the actual root development of the tree. Physical boundaries and level differences between the tree and the proposal are considered sufficient deterrent to major root growth, such that it is very unlikely significant roots will be present within the footprint of the proposal. Furthermore, as noted by the applicant, the species is particularly tolerant to works, so any pruning works and/or root loss will likely have minimal impact on the overall health of the tree. Nevertheless, it is considered necessary to request further details of the protection of this tree prior to the commencement of works.

10. Basement considerations

- 10.1. Policy DP27 notes that the Council will only permit basements and other underground development where the applicant can demonstrate it will not cause harm to the built and natural environment and local amenity and does not result in flooding or ground instability.
- 10.2. The Council's preferred approach is for basement development to not extend beyond the footprint of the original building and be no deeper than one full storey below ground level (approximately 3 metres in depth). The internal environment should be fit for the intended purpose, and there should be no impact on any trees on or adjoining the site, or to the water environment or land stability.
- 10.3. In this case, the proposed basement would extend beyond the footprint of the original building: it would extend out to the rear, underneath the patio area; it would extend under part of the driveway at the side and front of the house and there would be a sunken lightwell directly in front of the existing bay window at the front of the building. The extent to which the basement extends beyond the footprint of the host building is considered to be modest. Furthermore, the internal environment would be fit for the intended purpose.
- 10.4. The following underground development constraint applies at the application site: slope stability. The application is accompanied by a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA), which has been independently audited by Campbell Reith, in line with the requirements of CPG4.
- 10.5. The BIA screening exercise identified potential issues that were carried forward to scoping. Subsequent to the issue of the initial audit, additional information was provided by the applicant. Based on the expert advice from Campbell Reith, the proposal accords with the requirements of Policy DP27 and CPG4. The application is therefore considered to be acceptable in this respect.

Recommendation: Grant conditional permission subject to section 106 legal agreement

The decision to refer an application to Planning Committee lies with the Director of Regeneration and Planning. Following the Members Briefing panel on Monday 12th December 2016, nominated members will advise whether they consider this

application should be reported to the Planning Committee. For further information, please go to www.camden.gov.uk and search for 'Members Briefing'.