

William Avery

Your Ref: 2017/4327/P

**Planning Advice and Information
Service (Camden Council)**

London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square
c/o Town Hall, Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

98 Victoria Road
London
NW10 6NB
Phone: 020 7993 2075

Email: wea@weaplanning.co.uk

Dear John,

RE: 4 VANE CLOSE: AMENDMENTS

Thank you for your email dated 8th November 2017. We note your concerns regarding “scale” and have revised the drawings to accord with **Policy A5** (see attached). The revisions meet the policy requirements to our interpretation of both the spirit and intent of this new policy which will ultimately be tested by some applicants at appeal.

We do appreciate your following analysis:

“Although it is noted that the application property features only modest garden areas, in order to ensure that the proposed extension remains a proportionate addition to the original dwellinghouse,” (WEA Planning emphasis).

This is a very pertinent point. The property is unique to the Borough in featuring modest and proportionate rear and front garden areas. A typical house (terraced, semi or detached) would contain a small front garden and reasonably substantial rear garden with low boundary screening. The policy is designed to prevent basement development in typical scenarios which is understandable.

I am pleased you appreciate the modest garden areas and the fact it does constrain the ability to source sufficient natural light into the basement, especially given the high walls in the rear garden.

The impacts of excessive “Scale” relates to:

- character and appearance of the property and area;
- Building Impact as a result of the construction; and
- Neighbouring amenity.

In addressing the points you raise, I have headed each issue:

The proposed basement would occupy an area greater than 1.5x the footprint of the dwelling and would project by more than 50% into the depths of both front and rear garden areas.

In summary, the changes to the plans result in a Gross Internal Floor Area of less than 1.5 times the footprint and it projects by no more than 50% into the depth of the front garden.

The basement projection beyond the front building line is requested to be 2.3m

As requested, we attach plans showing the front basement projection be on the front building line to 2.3m.

The basement projection beyond the rear building line should be 2m

We do not propose reducing the basement projection beyond the rear building line to 2m. Although we note that the policy intends to apply to both rear and front gardens, we think this is unnecessary in this instance for the following reasons:

- The substantial garden wall height which shields both adjacent properties and the road;
- the need for natural light (a reduced depth would severely reduce the lightwell which needs to compensate for the overshadowing impact);
- the excavation itself would be contained within the rear garden area and therefore there would be zero excavation impact within the front garden. The added depth to the rear compensates for no impact to the front; and
- the total internal area is actually less than 100% of the depth of the rear garden.
- The basement and the lightwell will not impact the character and appearance [in accordance with Policy A5, C] of the conservation area as acknowledged by your conservation team.

Given the fact we meet all of the policy criteria and the unique circumstances of the rear garden, we believe there is sufficient justification to outweigh this small policy criteria.

Reduce the overall area of excavation from 79.5sqm to 64.3sqm.

The overall area of excavation is reduced as a result of the new proposals. While the amount of excavation is important for the consideration of the Building Impact Assessment (BIA), it is not specified in the policy. As stated above, we have reduced the total GIA to less than 1.5 times the footprint.

In consideration of the above changes and revisions to respect the front open boundary and the lack of objection from the conservation team, the overall proposals will do no harm to:

- character and appearance of the property and area;
- Building Impact as a result of the construction; and
- Neighbouring amenity.

Subject to Campbell Reith's confirmation, it is considered the proposed basement accords with **Policy A5**.

Yours sincerely,

William Avery
Director
WEA Planning