

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1229/P	Mr Irving Yass	5a Templewood Avenue NW3 7UY NW3 7UY NW3 7UY	20/09/2017 10:20:57	COMMNT	<p>Basement Impact Assessment and Audit</p> <p>The BIA and the audit by Campbell Reith fail to demonstrate that the proposed basement complies with the requirements of the Local Plan adopted in July 2017. Para 6.45 states that</p> <p>“All schemes will be expected to provide evidence against each of the considerations in Policy A5.”</p> <p>The BIA and the audit fail to do so in the following respects:</p> <p>Size of the Basement</p> <p>Policy A5 states:</p> <p>Basement development should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h. not exceed 50% of each garden within the property; i. be less than 1.5 times the footprint of the host building in area; j. extend into the garden no further than 50% of the depth of the host building measured from the principal rear elevation; k. not extend into or underneath the garden further than 50% of the depth of the garden; l. be set back from neighbouring property boundaries where it extends beyond the footprint of the host building; <p>There is no discussion in the BIA of the size of the proposed basement or whether it complies with the rules above. It is not possible for the layman to calculate whether these criteria are met from the plans provided. The audit report does not identify the failure of the BIA to assess the proposal against these criteria.</p> <p>As far as l. is concerned, it is not clear how the ‘host building’ is defined. We suggest that it should not include the existing side extension, which is to be demolished, and that the new side extension should not be treated as part of the ‘host building’. The proposed basement beneath the new side extension is immediately adjacent to No 5a at the point where the most damage to 5a could be expected – see para 10.6.7 of the BIA et seq. In order to comply with l. the basement should be set back from its present position at this point.</p> <p>Cumulative Impact</p> <p>Policy A5 states that BIAs “need to demonstrate that proposals for basements...avoid cumulative impacts”. Para 6.124 states:</p> <p>“BIAs must identify all relevant basements in the neighbouring area...and make an assessment of the combined effect of underground development with all nearby basements considered together. The assessment must include existing and planned development including schemes with planning permission.”</p> <p>The BIA identifies six existing and planned basements in the vicinity of No 5 (para 2.10), but only in order to cite the results of ground investigations. There is no consideration of the cumulative impact of the proposed new basement and the other basement developments that have been identified. The audit report does not identify the failure of the BIA to assess the cumulative impact of these developments..</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The BIA fails to meet the requirements of Policy A5 and the proposal should be rejected. Camden Council should consider the adequacy of Campbell Reith’s audit in the light of their failure to identify these deficiencies in the BIA.</p>