PLANNING STATEMENT

PROPOSED RE-DEVELOPMENT OF SITE AT

23A, 23B AND LAND ADJOINING AT
23 RAVENSHAW STREET, LONDON, NW6 1NP

PLANNING REF: PP-05782933

07/02/2017

Applicant and Contact:

Mr C S Taylor, 23A Ravenshaw Street, London NW6 1NP

chris.stuart.taylor@gmail.com

Tel: 07739108695

Contents

1. Pre Application Discussions Jan 2015

1.1 Pre-application for the development was submitted in January 2015. Detailed pre-application drawings, supporting documents, 3D illustrations and site photographs were submitted at the time. The pre-application meeting was held on 16 January 2015 attended by the applicant, Chris Taylor, and his planning consultant at that time Ray Reilly. Officers Rob Tulloch (Case Officer) and Victoria Pound (Conservation and Design were in attendance, along with, for part of the meeting, Anthony Bourke from Camden Building Control.

1.2 During the meeting almost every aspect of the proposal was examined to one degree or another and answers to officer's questions and concerns were addressed by the applicant; with specific points such as, massing, privacy issues, the impact of the basement and light wells and views/overlooking were illustrated via an animated 3D model of the development presented on a laptop. The history of the site was discussed along with its development challenges, such as:

A. The difficulty of organising units on such an acutely triangular shaped plot.

B. The restricted frontage and practical problems that presents; access, waste and bicycle storage etc.

C. The difficulty of arriving at design, particularly for the front elevation, which at the same time as fitting harmoniously alongside its Victorian neighbours and looking comfortable in the long established street scene:- is still a strong, coherent, contemporary design in its own right, as opposed to resorting to simplistic mimicry or pastiche.

D. To the rear, minimising issues of overbearing that may be felt by neighbours and fully respecting the main view of 21A, with the associate sunlight daylight issues it presents.

…and its advantages, such as;

E. The almost unimpeded south-west facing rear aspect of site and the opportunities for natural light penetration into the building it affords.

F. The outer corner site presents the opportunity to design a building which largely, at the rear, when viewed from neighbouring properties, is only partially visible from any given vantage point.

1.3 The inability of the design to accommodate 12+ bikes, along with the main entrance waste and recycling provision was discussed. The practical difficulties of accommodating a large number of bicycles at the front of the property was

acknowledged - but we understood that the requirement for cycle storage may be satisfied if we were able to find a workable way to provide a viable amount of bike storage at front of the property with supplementary storage to the rear, perhaps providing a stair track to assist residents in retrieving bicycles from a rear storage area. After revisiting this aspect of the design we believe the current application should satisfy this requirement.

1.4 Mr Bourke asked if we had completed a survey as to the depth of the main sewer along Ravenshaw Street; his concern being that the soil pipes of the WC's located in the basement apartments, being at a depth of approximately 3m should have a sufficient drop to the main sewer to be gravity fed. After conducting such a survey we can confirm that the main sewer running down the center of Ravenshaw Street is approximately 5m below street level - enabling all the waste outlets from the ground floor apartments to the main to be gravity fed.

1.5 Other aspects of the design, while not regarded as particularly onerous, were mentioned in passing. Of note, was the blocky "wedding cake" stepped treatment of the design to the rear of the property adjacent to the rear of number 21. The design has been revisited so that mansard roofs, that veer away from 21, have been implemented, lessening a sense of enclosure. We hope officers will regard as a welcome improvement.

1.6 Subsequent to the meeting a comprehensive pre-application report was issued to us on 13 February 2015. The report reads as generally very positive and encouraging. The present application is very much a refinement of the design presented at the pre-application stage. The pre application advice gave us the chance to lock down key aspects of the design, allowing us to focus much more on weakness and details that require more thought. We hope that officers will welcome the enhancements we have made and hope they feel confident enough in the application to recommend its approval to members of the planning committee.

2. The Site and its Surroundings

2.1 *The site is at 23A, 23B and l facilities and adjoining at 23 Ravenshaw Street London NW6 1NP. Fortune Green Ward, Location Coordinates: Easting 524849 Northing 185034. The site currently comprises of:*

23a: 2 Bed Ground Floor Garden Flat 69.7 m²
23b: 3 Bed Maisonette with Garden 94.5 m²
86.3 m² GEA House Foot Print
98.3 m² Permeable Garden Area
34.4 m² Semi Permeable Garden Paving
265.1 m² Concrete Hard Standing and Steps
Total Site Area: 484.1 m² Approx

2.2 The site consists of a two story plus loft conversion end of terrace Victorian red brick house with an adjacent area of hard standing car park. It is assembled from three separate titles 23A, a two bed ground floor flat, 23B, a three bed first and second floor maisonette along with a car park area, listed as Land adjoining 23 Ravenshaw Street London NW6 1NP. Most of the site backs directly onto a railway banking, apart from the rear garden of 23A which backs onto the apex of the communal garden of Ellerton Tower on Mill Lane.

2.3 The site is broadly triangular in nature with a narrow front facade on Ravenshaw Street broadening considerably to rear where it abuts the railway banking. The area between the railway line and the site is a site of nature conservation importance. Ravenshaw Street, and the surrounding area, is predominantly residential. The site is not within a conservation area.

2.4 Given the predominantly residential nature of the general area and overall street scene, the site being situated in a Victorian residential terrace and adjacent to four existing residences, we believe that a Mixed Use Development, attempting to incorporate office or retail space in the proposal as outlined in **Policy DP1** would be an inappropriate response in this case.

3. The Proposed Development

3.1 The proposal necessitates the complete demolition of the existing house, comprising of 2 flats, and its replacement with an 8 unit apartment block comprising 4 × 3 bed flats and 4 × 2 bed flats. Substantial excavation and the construction of a one-story deep basement structure providing residential accommodation is required.

Summary of Proposed Accommodation GIA's:

Lower Ground Floor:
Flat A: 3 Bed, 6 Bed Space - 104.91 m² *Patio 23.56 m² & Front Lightwell 11.95 m²*
Flat B: 3 Bed, 6 Bed Space - 109.10 m² *Patio 27.74 m² & Front Lightwell 10.83 m²*

Ground Floor:
Flat C: 2 Bed, 4 Bed Space - 79.20 m² *Patio 21.27 m²*
Flat D: 2 Bed, 4 Bed Space - 74.73 m² *Balcony 6.27 m²*

First Floor:
Flat E: 3 Bed, 4 Bed Space - 79.71 m² *Balcony 5.90 m²*
Flat F: 3 Bed, 5 Bed Space - 89.54 m² *Balcony 6.27 m²*

Second Floor:
Flat G: 2 Bed, 3 Bed Space 61.40* m² > 1.5m (Total 75.28 m²) *Balcony 5.86 m²*
Flat H: 2 Bed, 3 Bed Space 59.06* m² > 1.5m (Total 71.40 m²) *Balcony 5.86 m²*
**Inc. storage under eaves with headroom of 900-1500mm counted at 50%*

Area Totals:
Total Extant Habitable GIA: 164.4 m² (Flats 23a & 23b)
Total Proposed Habitable GIA: 657.65 m² > 1.5m
Total Additional Proposed Habitable GIA: 493.25 m² > 1.5m (for CIL ect)
Total Proposed Amenity, both private and communal: 196.44 m²

3.2 The existing property is of no particular architectural merit, and due to the ad hoc nature of its various historical extensions and additions it makes inefficient use of the site in terms of its provision of residential accommodation. Consequently, we believe the proposal fulfils the principal requirements of **Policies DP2, DP3, DP4** and **DP5.**

3.3 Policy DP6 is addressed by the Lifetime Homes Statement included with this application, the provision for wheelchair chair access detailed in the accompanying Design and Access Statement and wheelchair turning circles illustrated on the accompanying drawings.

Policies DP7 to DP15 are do not appear pertinent to this application.

4. Planning History

4.1 The complete history of the site and it uses is detailed in the design and access statement. The planning history of the site is as follows:

8905200 The erection of a single storey rear extension. Granted 11/10/1989

20351 Change of use to 2 self-contained dwelling units involving construction of a two storey extension at rear, a roof extension at the side and dormer windows. Granted 06/06/1975

5107 The erection of a concrete garage at the side. Granted 19/06/1968

5. Assessment Criteria

5.1 We understand that the application will be judged in large part against the following criteria: Land use, Design, Residential Development Standards, Amenity, Sustainability, Transport and Community Infrastructure Levy.

6. Land Use

6.1 Policy DP2 makes it clear that additional housing is by far the priority land use set out in the Camden LDF. We understand that subject to residential development coming forward that meets other criteria such as accessibility, the quality of design, having a built form that respects its surroundings and is considerate of the amenity of its occupants and of its neighbours - such development will be generally be welcomed. After all the thought that has gone into its design we believe this application fulfils those criteria.

6.2 Policy DP5 asserts that the market housing two-bedroom and three-bedroom dwellings on the whole most desirable. The unit mix being put forward, a 50/50 split of two and three bed units should be welcomed. It should be noted that achieving any other mix of units, that satisfactorily met planning requirements, would be very difficult indeed given the shape, constraints and orientation of the site.

6.3 The site density is at the higher end which we understand is in line with both the **London Plan** and **Policy DP2.**

7. Affordable Housing

7.1 As the development proposes only six additional dwellings with a floor area not in excess of 1000 m² in line with criteria set out in **Policy DP3** - the development will not be subject to a requirement for affordable housing.

8. Design

8.1 Front Elevation
Ravenshaw Street is dominated by two story Victorian terraced houses with a mixture of facade treatments and roofing materials, many of which have been altered in an ad-hoc manner over time. While the roof pitches are very uniform and all of the properties feature canted bays of either one or two stories, brick colour varies quite considerably with some properties being rendered. The dominant feature of the street is that the topography slopes at 4.4° and consequently the roof ridge heights step down sporadically in line with the slope of the street. No. 23 is sited at a bend in the street and is accompanied by a gap in the terrace with a crossover to an accompanying car park area, formerly a working stone yard, but since the 1950s has principally been used as car parking.

8.2 A great deal of design work and thought has gone into our design response to the existing street scene and the challenges that it puts forward. A very detailed explanation of our approach is outlined in the Design and Access Statement. We understood from the pre-planning application exercise that our general approach to the front facade of the development, that of a contemporary treatment with windows and details not mimicking, but rhyming with, both the adjacent buildings, their bay windows and fenestration, along with the wider street scene, was generally welcomed. We hope that the work put in to refine the design since submission of the preplanning application will be welcomed by officers.

8.3 Our goal throughout has been to achieve that most elusive balance. That of putting forward on the one hand an unapologetically contemporary design, one very much of its time, that presents a confident, coherent aesthetic but one that still sits comfortably alongside its neighbors.

8.4 The front elevation is broadly designed to present the appearance of two contemporary terrace houses that sit comfortably alongside neighbouring properties is in the street scene. It has been designed specifically so as not to present the appearance of an apartment block.

8.5 The omission of protruding bay windows on the front elevation was a very deliberate decision. Our Design and Access Statement sets out our reasons for doing this in great detail; suffice to say here that we believe the result led to far more

successful design than would otherwise have been the case. Though none seemed to work effectively, we tried many times to add bay windows, and went through many designs, but we eventually came to the conclusion that we were doing it simply because we felt obliged to. Every bay design we tried left the facade looking uncomfortably intrusive and over dominant; in effect accentuated by the site being on a bend making them very visible from any direction. As soon as we took the decision to omit the bay windows the design became far cleaner and more coherent.

8.6 A great deal of thought is also gone into the colour palette and being put forward; all of which have been chosen to further our wider design goals. Again the design and access statement sets out the reasons for our choices in detail.

8.7 Rear Elevation

At the same time as having to tie in with the front elevation, the rear elevation of the building presents a radically different set of design challenges to that of the front.

8.8 Being triangular, the site splays out considerably to the rear facing south-west, turns the outer corner by 145°, lies on a 4.4° slope. Additionally, any design has to respect the drop of 1.52 m between the ridge heights of neighboring properties at No.21 and 25. It is also imperative that the design accommodates:

- Sunlight daylight issues, largely in respect of number No.21's rear living room window.
- Material harm in terms of being too overbearing.
- Avoiding creating too much a sense of enclosure with respect to neighboring amenity
- Issues of outlook and overlooking from windows and balconies.
- Eliminating or minimising other noise and privacy issues.
- Presents a form, from those vantage points from where it can naturally be seen, that sits comfortably with the existing, rather ad-hoc, existing grain of development to the rear of neighbouring properties along this part of Ravenshaw Street.

8.9 The rear elevation, along with the rest of the development, has been designed from its inception entirely in 3D. Every decision regarding form, massing, fenestration, balconies, pitched roof angles and ridge heights has been driven from beginning to end by continuously referencing and considering the effect on the outlook, views, amenity and building lines of neighbouring properties. Those requirements then drove the internal layout of the apartments. The resulting design is the result of that continuous two-way process.

8.10 In the attached 1:100 planning drawings, of necessity, the rear elevation is his presented as a continuous elevation - essentially viewed from the railway tracks, through the banking, its foliage and the rear brick wall. In reality however, perhaps only one quarter of the rear of the building can ever be seen from any given real-world

vantage point. From neighbouring gardens more than 50% of the building is obscured below the level of existing walls and fences. Of the remainder only around half can be seen from any given vantage point due to 145° turn the façade makes at the apex of the corner. Taking full advantage of its corner site, only perhaps one quarter of the rear facade is ever actually visible from ground level from neighbouring amenity space; in fact the same is true even if one were to be standing on a chair.

8.11 Self-evidently, given the nature of the site, now part of the rear elevation is even remotely apparent in the street scene from Ravenshaw Street.

8.12 Many views from neighbouring windows and amenity are illustrated in the Design and Access Statement.

8.13 The design being presented is the result of now years of thought and planning; many design decisions are subjective by the very nature, it is for officers and members to decide if those decisions have been the right ones.

9. Residential Standards

9.1 We believe that all the proposed dwellings comply with the minimum floor space requirements of the supplementary planning guidance of both the London Plan and Camden **CPG2 – Housing** and **DCLG Nationally Described Space Standards** in terms of overall floor space and bedroom size. In line with **Policy DP6** (Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair housing) all the units will meet all the Lifetime Homes Standards. Wheelchair turning circles and stairway platform lift tracks are illustrated on the plans when necessary and the application is accompanied by a Lifetime Homes Statement.

9.2 Schedule of Accommodation:

Lower Ground Floor GEA 253.17 m²
Flat A: 3 Bed, 6 Bed Space - 104.91 m² *Patio 23.56 m² & Front Lightwell 11.95 m²*
Flat B: 3 Bed, 6 Bed Space - 109.10 m² *Patio 27.74 m² & Front Lightwell 10.83 m²*

Ground Floor GEA 231.64 m²
Flat C: 2 Bed, 4 Bed Space - 79.20 m² *Patio 21.27 m²*
Flat D: 2 Bed, 4 Bed Space - 74.73 m² *Balcony 6.27 m²*

First Floor GEA 205.09 m²
Flat E: 3 Bed, 4 Bed Space - 79.71 m² *Balcony 5.90 m²*
Flat F: 3 Bed, 5 Bed Space - 89.54 m² *Balcony 6.27 m²*

Second Floor GEA > 1.5m 126.16 m² (Total 172.63 m²)
Flat G: 2 Bed, 3 Bed Space 61.40* m² > 1.5m (Total 75.28 m²) *Balcony 5.86 m²*
Flat H: 2 Bed, 3 Bed Space 59.06* m² > 1.5m (Total 71.40 m²) *Balcony 5.86 m²*
**Inc. storage under eaves with headroom of 900-1500mm counted at 50%*

Area Totals:

Total Extant Habitable GIA: 164.2 m² (Flats 23a & 23b)
Total Proposed Habitable GIA: 657.65 m² > 1.5m
Total Additional Proposed Habitable GIA: 493.45 m² > 1.5m *(for CIL etc.)*

Total Proposed GEA > 1.5m: 498.97 m²

Proposed Total Bedrooms: 20
Proposed Total Bed Spaces: 35

9.3 Amenity
Private amenity space is provided either in the form of private patio garden areas, in the case of flats A, B, and C. Flats D, E F, G and H all benefit from private balconies.

Additionally, all residents will benefit from a 70.92 m² communal garden area cited to the rear of development which will be furnished with screen seating areas and garden furniture. **Total Proposed Amenity: 196.44 m²**

9.4 Refuse, Bike Storage, Post & Parcel Lockers
At the pre-application stage officers expressed concerns with the layout of refuse storage, bike, and postal locker facilities as set out in our plans at that time. We impressed upon officers that this had been probably the single most challenging aspect of the design, however, it was agreed that we would seek to revise these facilities in order to improve this aspect of the proposal.

9.5 The recurring difficulty here is not so much accommodating refuse storage, but the additional problem of accommodating so much bicycle storage here as well. The central problem that the restrictions imposed by this highly contested area of the site do not allow for three discrete entrances and anti-chambers for: A. Residential Access, B. Refuse and C. Bike Storage, all at the front of the development. All attempts to pack even more service space into the front of the property severely compromises the ground floor accommodation; principally by robbing flats C and D of access to the natural light they need to remain dual aspect and leaving much of the floor space behind it practically useless as habitable residential accommodation.

9.6 However, in view of the officers observations, the entrance layout, lower ground and ground floor corridor and core stairways along with apartment layout changes, internal entrance lobby, post and parcel locker area, refuse area, bicycle storage facilities have been completely revised. These changes also required, in consequence, changes to the external facade, door placement and re-design of the entrance walkway.

9.7 Post and parcel boxes have been incorporated into the main residential entrance lobby so that post and food deliveries are wholly isolated from the refuse area. However, the refuse and bicycle storage area share a common entrance. An 8 unit bicycle storage Josta type rack will be isolated from the refuse bins by being sealed in an airtight, separately ventilated, secure compartment within the chamber. The chamber as a whole is 17.77 m². Crucial to the viability of this solution is that both the external and internal doors do not impede access to either the bins or the bicycle rack. Although only eight bicycle spaces are being provided at the front, additional spaces are being provided at the rear of the property with a cycle wheel track being incorporated into the stairs leading up from the lower ground floor to the ground floor.

9.8 We understand that the design for the bin and bike chamber being put forward, isn't what one would want in an ideal world. We accept that. However, a we believe that, if executed properly, it will provide a workable solution to the problem.

9.9 Noise, Vibration and Air Quality Studies
As requested, a Noise, Vibration and Air Quality Reports are being provided. It is our understanding that no particular concerns were raised by these studies.

10. Sunlight and Daylight Studies

10.1 Due to the orientation of the building we understand that the only real concern regarding sunlight daylight issues to neighbouring properties is with respect of the rear side facing living room window of No.21A. As has been explained previously, and in the Accompanying Design and Access Statement, a large part the design of the proposal has been dictated by the need to respect the sunlight, daylight and overshadowing needs of the living room of number 21A.

10.2 The full sunlight daylight study, based on accurate geo-located 3-D models of the extent and proposed properties, accompanies this application. In summary, the test results conclude that the proposed building will not have a harmful impact on sunlight or daylight to No. 21A.

10.3 Daylighting: Vertical Sky Component calculations, calculated at the exterior face of the adjoining building, confirm that access to daylight meets acceptable standards.

10.4 Sunlight: Based on the assessment methods set out in BR209, the adjoining building has good access to sunlight, both in the summer and winter. All of the sampled points identified good solar access.

10.5 Overshadowing: Detailed analysis of the impact of shading on adjacent amenity spaces was undertaken and remain within the acceptable range defined by the BRE.

11. Outlook

11.1 The ground floor living room window of No. 21B faces the site, but mainly from behind the 1.7m garden fence, which obscures much of the view. The room is dual aspect so the impact on outlook to this room at is not considered to be as significant as it otherwise may be. Design and Access Statement *P.33 Fig.1,2, 3 & 4* illustrate the view.

11.2 No. 21B has frosted toilet windows at first floor level facing the existing and proposed building. Perpendicular to the existing and proposed building are a first floor kitchen window and the window of a rear bedroom roof dormer. As illustrated in our Design and Access Statement *P.33 Fig.7 & Fig.8,* the new development will have a very marginal effect on outlook from the kitchen window, but almost no effect at all on that of the bedroom window. No Sunlight/Daylight issues are anticipated to these windows.

11.3 None of the windows to No.25A or 25B directly face the proposed building. As illustrated in the Design and Access Statement *P.34 Fig.1 & Fig.2*, the rear bedroom roof dormer window of 25B will have a partial oblique view of the new mansard roof to the right, resulting in a quite marginal effect on its outlook which we don't see as an onerous imposition. Also due to its S/W facing orientation no Sunlight/Daylight issues are anticipated.

12. Overlooking

12.1 Currently two windows of 23B, a clear hallway window and a frosted bathroom window, directly overlook No.21. In the proposed building there would be no windows directly facing neighbouring properties, and the majority of the rear fenestration is either parallel to or beyond the rear building lines of neighbouring properties. See the Design and Access Statement *P.32 Fig.1 to 3* for illustrated views.

12.2 The plans show 4 windows in the rear elevation of the proposed development closest to the main rear elevation of No. 21. Three of these windows, Plans Sheet 14: RW1, RW3 & RW4, feature obscured glazing, with only RW2, a narrow bedroom window being in clear glass. However, all these windows are set deep into the reveal to further protect privacy. Only RW2 has any real view of the bay window at No.21, but (due to the heavily inset reveal) only really if one stands right in front of the window and very close to the glass. In any case the view is more restricted than that currently available from the kitchen window of 23B.

12.3 While there would be some overlooking of neighbouring gardens from the upper floors of the proposed development, they are generally oblique views and only of the rear of the neighbouring gardens. Additional privacy is provided by the window and balcony storm shutters being specified. Views that would be available into the garden of No.21 are not significantly different from those currently available from existing windows.

12.4 With respect to overlooking into the garden of number 25A, views from the ground floor balcony of Flat D a highly restricted, principally just skimming the tops of the garden walls with no direct view into the garden. Views from the proposed first floor Flat F do have views into the back half of the garden but not closer to the house. In the case of both these of balconies considerable additional privacy is provided by the window and balcony storm shutters being specified. On the second floor, views from the balconies of Flats G and H, being set back somewhat from the rear façade, are very much restricted to the rear of the garden at 25A. The views are illustrated in our Design and Access Statement *P.34 Fig.5, 6, 7 & 8.*

13. Plant Machinery Noise

From our preplanning application report officers suggest that the terraces and balconies are not of a size that would be likely to generate adverse noise conditions.

14. Sustainability

14.1 In line with Core Strategy **Policy CS13** (Tackling climate change and promoting higher environmental standards), **Policy DP22** (Promoting sustainable design and construction), **DP23 (Water) and** Planning **Guidance CPG3** (Sustainability) of the Camden Development Policies, the development incorporates sustainable development principles into its design and implementation. Accordingly and Energy Statement and a Sustainability Statement the company this application demonstrating full compliance with all relevant policies.

14.2 The Sustainability Statement explains in detail our approach to the management of drainage, surface water run-off and waste water. However, key points are:

14.3 Although the development does not feature a green roof, (most of the usable flat roof area being devoted to solar photovoltaic panels) the proposed development will feature an identical area of permeable garden / soft landscaping area as the existing site: 98m² currently, 99m² is proposed.

14.4 A green wall of approx. 97m2 will be planted along the back garden wall of the development consisting of native climbing species.

14.5 Due to the implementation of large rainwater collection tank and header tank on the roof feeding rainwater to WC's, a significant reduction in run-off will be achieved in comparison to the existing site. The proposal will reduce area subject to rainwater run-off from 381m² currently to just 113m²; a 70% reduction in run-off.

14.6 In spite of the constrained area, 41 tightly arranged 345W solar panels on the flat roof are expected to make a considerable contribution to on-site renewable energy and reduction in CO^2 emissions. Full details are included in the energy statement.

15. Transport & Construction

15.1 Public Transport

The online TFL Public Transport Accessibility Level calculator rates the site as 1b (very poor). However, it arrives at that rating only by omitting to factor in pedestrian only routes. Calculator works only by tracing walking path's down road centres. Quite why such a widely used method of calculating pedestrian walking times omits many common pedestrian walkways is unfathomable. Staff at TFL informed us that it does not take account of pedestrian walkways at all, and that they are fully aware of this shortcoming. In our case it omits the very popular and commonly used pedestrian only "Black Path" from its calculation.

15.2 A site specific PTAL calculation prepared for the site in 2011 by transport consultants TPP, which included Black Path, reveals the actual rating to be an Index=14.71 or PTAL Level 3. The calculation table is included in our design and access statement P.17. It may be noted that ongoing developments at the three West Hampstead Station may conceivably, at some point soon, increase the PTAL Index from 14.71 to over 15.01 - which would actually render the site PTAL Level 4. In short, the site is very well served by all forms of public transport.

15.3 Parking

The site is within the Fortune Green Controlled Parking Zone (CA –P(c)). In line with **Policy DP18** (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking) the site will be an entirely car free development. No on-site parking is proposed. And no on-street permits will be provided. The provision will be secured by a Section 106 Agreement.

15.4 Cycle Parking

Cycle parking should be designed to meet Camden's cycle parking design specifications as set out in **Camden Planning Guidance CPG 7 - Transport**. In line with the Council's parking standards and the London Plan, the provision of cycle storage/parking for a two or three bedroom residential unit is 2 spaces; in this case requiring the storage of 16 x Cycles. The proposed plans indicate cycle storage for 8 x cycles at ground floor level in the form of Josta system. Such two tier systems are recommended by the Council, however the proposed storage at the front of the property does not provide enough floor space for the full 16 x cycles. The difficulty we face in providing a full 16 cycle spaces at the very front of the property has been explained fully earlier on in this document and in our Design and Access Statement.

15.5 In lieu of providing the additional eight cycle spaces at the front of the property, it is proposed to provide them at the rear and include a cycle wheel track running the length of the stairway from the basement to the entrance lobby. Cycle storage facilities at the rear of the property are detailed on Plans Sheet 2 and our Design and Access Statement P.29 Fig.1 and Fig.2. The door to the rear cycle storage and plant area is

exceptionally wide at 1.3 m to ensure that cycles can be stored and retrieved from this area with the minimum of difficulty, then wheeled up/down the cycle track along the stairway. We would envisage allocating one cycle storage space at the front of the property to each of the apartments with a secondary space to the rear. Additionally, folding cycles, now so common in London always provide a convenient alternative.

15.6 While we understand that this bicycle storage solution is not an ideal situation, with the additional measures we will be providing, we believe it is a workable compromise - the alternatives creating far more problems than they solve.

15.7 Construction Management Plan
A Draft Construction Management Plan (CMP) accompanies the application and demonstrates the transport and logistical issues that may be involved in the construction process and how they would be managed should a redevelopment scheme come forward. The final version of the CPM will be secured via a Section 106 agreement.

15.8 Reinstate of the Footway
With no on-site parking, the site's crossover that would become redundant, allowing the existing residents bays to be extended. We understand that the financial contribution would be required to reinstate the footway in front of the site in the region of £5,000 and secured via a Section 106 agreement.

16. Basement Impact Assessment

16.1 The scheme involves excavation to create a basement, as such the proposal will comply with **Policy DP27 (Basements and Lightwells).** A comprehensive Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) prepared by *Croft Structural Engineers Ltd*, based on the results of three on-site boreholes and geotechnical studies prepared by *Julian Maund BSc PhD MIMMM CEng FGS CGeol of Maund Geo-Consulting*, accompanies this application. The professionals concerned are fully qualified in accordance with the requirements of Camden Planning Guidance **CPG4 (Basements and Lightwells**).

16.2 The site is not within an area of constraint for land stability, surface water or groundwater. So, at the preplanning stage it was suggested by officers that there would be no requirement for an independent review of a BIA unless expert objections were received from third parties; in which case we understand that the BIA will have to be reviewed by an independent assessor at the applicant's expense in line with **CPG4.**

17. Trees

17.1 There is a 6.5m Bay Laurel tree on that is to be removed. In case trees outside the site could be affected by the proposed excavation a Tree Survey to BS 5837:2012 has been prepared for us by *Tree Reports Ltd.* Aside from the Bay Laurel, which is categorised as a C1(no recommendations) the report highlights a group of young to mature Poplar Trees on the railway banking to the rear of the site, but again makes no recommendations with regard to them.

18. Biodiversity

18.1 The site also borders a site of nature conservation importance - West Hampstead Rail Sides Site of Borough Importance Grade I. Consequently, in line with **Camden Planning Guidance CPG3 (Sustainability)** a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, conducted by *Urban Edge Environmental Consulting* accompanies the application. The appraisal very detailed; but in summary, while it makes a number of recommendations, its findings do not suggest that the site presents obstacles with regards to its existing ecology that would substantially hamper or prevent the development, subject to its recommendations being adopted.

19. Air Quality Assessment

19.1 The air quality impacts associated with the development have been assessed by *Air Quality Assessments Ltd* and their report accompanies this application. Existing modelled concentration maps predict pollutant concentrations below the air quality objectives at the application site. It concludes that air quality conditions for new residents would be acceptable and there should be no constraints to development at the application site with regard to air quality.

20. Noise and Vibration Assessment

20.1 A noise and vibration assessment, prepared for us by *KP Acoustics,* accompanies the application. Its conclusions are as follows: Measured noise levels allowed a robust glazing specification to be proposed which would provide internal noise levels for all residential environments of the development commensurate to “Good” in the design range of BS8233. No further mitigation measures should be required in order to protect the proposed habitable spaces from external noise intrusion. Measurement of vibration from train activity indicates that vibration levels are below the threshold of human perception in the z-axis, in accordance with BS6472: 2008.

21. Security Issues

Although it benefits from being overlooked by most of the developments many rear windows, one of the main security vulnerabilities to the site is from the apex of the garden of Ellerton Tower to the rear. We'll be looking into securing this part of the wall perhaps with additional fencing, but we will seek further advice on the matter.

22. Foul and Surface Water Connections

Mr Anthony Bourke from Camden Building Control asked a question at the Pre-application meeting about connection to the main sewer. In response, we can confirm that in addition to the utility company asset reports, a sewer video survey shows the main sewer in Ravenshaw Street to be around 5m below the centre of the street. The extant drain exits the site at around 2m at the boundary under the front gate. We estimate that a new sewer connection will have to cross the site boundary at a little more than 3m depth in order to ensure that soil pipes in the basement flats have an adequate drop. A new connection to the main will be needed; these works will be included in the revised Construction Management Plan in due course.

23. Mayor's CIL

We anticipate that prior to commencement of development The Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy will be charged at £50 per sqm. We understand that only additional floor space will be liable for the contribution and that the contribution will be secured through the Section 106 agreement. 100% payable within 60 days of the commencement of development.

Additional Proposed Habitable GIA: 493.45 m² @ £50 m² = £24,672.50?

24. Camden's CIL

We anticipate that prior to commencement of development The Camden Community Infrastructure Levy will be charged at £500 per sqm. We understand that only additional floor space will be liable for the contribution and that the contribution will be secured through the Section 106 agreement. 100% payable within 60 days of the commencement of development.

Additional Proposed Habitable GIA: 493.45 m² @ £500 m² = £246,725.00?

25. Processing and Monitoring Charge

We understand that for every head of term on the s106 we will be required to pay the Council's Processing and Monitoring Charge, charged at £365 per head of term:

- Car-capped housing
- Construction Management Plan
- Highways Contribution *(Est. £5,000?)*
- Post-Construction Sustainability Review/Energy Plan

25. Planning Conditions / Materials

We understand that officers will wish to condition, among other things a number of the materials to be used in the development, in particular:

- Roofing and Facia Materials
- Guttering and Downpipe Materials
- Brick Slips and Pointing Samples
- Front Wall Copping, Cap Stones?
- Steel Entrance Bridge, Detailed Design Drawings?
- Obscured Window, and Balcony glazing samples?
- Garden and Green Wall Planting Specifications and Schedules?

Officers to advise further please.

26. Concluding Note

We hope that the application material demonstrates just how much work has gone into its preparation. It has involved iteratively through countless design decisions, made over what has now turned into years. The design has evolved step by step as a direct response to the many very specific restrictions, as well as opportunities presented by the site and the built environment around it. At every step, as an intrinsic part of the design process the effects on neighbouring amenity and outlook have been taken into account. This involved many hours sitting out in the gardens, looking at the site from neighbouring properties, cross checking views in 3D – all the time considering the effects of each design decision on neighbours as well as occupants. In addition, we responded to mistakes made in the very different 2007 application (..and officers reaction to it at the time), changing planning requirements and officers input at the pre-planning stage.

Naturally, we hope that officers will look favourably on the developments design, choose to support the application and find themselves minded to make a positive recommendation to the Planning Committee.

For any further information you may require please contact the applicant:

Mr C S Taylor,
23A Ravenshaw Street,
London NW6 1NP
Tel: 07739108695
chris.stuart.taylor@gmail.com

s106 and other legal matters will be undertaken by our Solicitor

Ms Linda Felton
Fortune Green Legal Practice,
Golden Cross House,
8 Duncannon Street,
London WC2N 4JF
Tel: 0207 484 5190
l.felton@fglp.co.uk