



Planning Solutions Team
Planning and Regeneration
Culture & Environment
Directorate
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor
5 Pancras Square
London
N1C 4AG

www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Date: 14/09/2017
Our ref: 2017/4115/PRE
Contact: Laura Hazelton
Direct line: 020 7974 1017
Email: laura.hazelton@camden.gov.uk

Emma McBurney
93 Hampton Road
Hampton Hill
Teddington
London
TW12 1JQ

By email

Dear Emma,

Re: 1 Spencer Rise, NW5

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property which was received on 18/07/2017 together with the required fee of £426.00.

1. Drawings and documents

Cover letter dated 13 July 2017 and drawing pack received by email dated 13/07/2017.

2. Proposal

Erection of a roof extension (3 options), excavation of basement floor, and single storey rear extension at second floor level.

3. Site description

The application site comprises a two storey mid terrace property located on the north side of Spencer Rise, just east of the junction with York Rise. It sits within a small terrace of three properties with similar architectural detailing. The wider street is characterised by small groups of buildings, often with only subtle variations of style or height between them. However, they are still bound together by the use of the same materials and detailing.

The application building features an original two storey rear closet wing extension with pitched roof, and an infill single storey extension – the same arrangement as that seen at no. 3.

The application site is not listed, but sits within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, designated on 01/02/1992 and is identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area.

4. Relevant planning history

There are no planning records for this site.

Surrounding terrace

No.23 - PEX0300173 - The erection of a mansard roof extension. Refused 01/05/2003 for the following reason:

The bulk and height of the proposed mansard extension are considered unacceptable in that they would cause harm to the appearance of the conservation area, would have a detrimental impact on the symmetry of the terrace, and would be overly bulky and dominant on the existing building form.

No.27 - 2004/3614/P - The erection of a roof extension and ground floor rear extension. Granted 29/10/2004.

No.37 – 8400923 - Erection of a mansard roof extension. Granted 08/08/1984.

No.41 - 2006/3883/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension and roof extension to single family dwelling house (Class C3). Refused 19/12/2006 for the following reasons:

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its bulk, height and design would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the subject dwelling, the terrace of which it forms a part and the surrounding conservation area.

The proposed demolition of the valley roof form, would result in the loss of a feature that is considered to make a valuable contribution to the appearance of the conservation area.

No.49 - 2012/5467/P – Erection of a mansard roof extension to existing dwelling (Class C3). Refused 29/11/2012 for the following reason:

The proposed mansard roof extension, by reason of its bulk, height and position would materially harm the consistent parapet-line and thus the integrity of the terrace of buildings at nos 39-49 Spencer Rise, which have a largely unimpaired roofline, and thus fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Appeal ref: APP/X5210/D/13/2190582 dismissed 21/02/2013.

No.51 - CTP/D11/20/14/28768 - The erection of a roof extension at second floor level to provide additional living accommodation. Granted 06/09/1979.

No.53 – 8903220 - The erection of a roof extension to provide two bedrooms and a single storey rear conservatory to the existing dwelling house. Granted 06/12/1989.

No.55 - CTP/D11/20/11/23216 - Erection of an additional storey to provide two bedrooms. Granted 15/10/1976.

No.57 - 2007/4644/P - Erection of a mansard roof extension with two front dormer windows to existing single dwelling house. Granted 21/12/2007.

Other side of the street

Nos.14 – 22 are two storey townhouses of a similar architectural style as the application site. They all feature mansard roof extensions.

No.14 - PEX0000358 - The erection of a mansard roof extension to provide additional two rooms to a single family dwelling. Granted 02/10/2000.

No.16 – 8802605 - Erection of an additional storey at roof level. Granted 16/03/1989.

Nos.18 & 20 – 2004/4225/P - The erection of mansard roof extensions to Nos. 18 and 20 Spencer Rise. Granted 29/11/2004.

No.22- 2008/1419/P - The erection of mansard roof extension and rear ground floor single storey infill extension to single-family dwellinghouse. Granted 03/06/2008.

No.32 – 31115 - Erection of an additional storey. Granted 24/10/1980.

No.38 – 9501088 - Retention of mansard roof extension as a variation of planning permission granted 10/01/1991 (Ref: 9003467) Refused 21/09/1995. Appeal allowed 15/07/1996.

5. Relevant policies and guidance

[National Planning Policy Framework 2012](#)

[The London Plan March 2016](#)

[Camden Local Plan 2017](#)

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

Policy A5 Basements

Policy D1 Design

Policy D2 Heritage

Policy T4 Promoting the sustainable movement of goods and material

[Camden Planning Guidance](#)

CPG1 (Design) 2015

CPG4 (Basements and Lightwells) 2015

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011

CPG7 (Transport) 2011

CPG8 (Planning obligations) 2015

[Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan 2009](#)

6. Assessment

The principle considerations are considered to be the following:

- Design (impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host building and wider Dartmouth Park conservation area);
- Amenity (impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of outlook, daylight, privacy and noise);
- Basement excavation;
- The impact of the proposal on the local transport infrastructure; and
- Impact on trees.

7. Design

The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions are proposed. Policy D1 of the Local Plan requires development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, which improves the function, appearance and character of the area; and Policy D2 states that the Council will preserve, and where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas and listed buildings.

Camden's Development Policies Document is supported by CPG1 (Design) and the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement.

Roof extension

Three design options have been put forward for a new roof extension. These are:

1. Pitched roof to match the roof line and height of that seen at no.1b. Includes front roof terrace.
2. Mansard with pitched roof (to match height of no.1b) with 2 x front dormers.
3. Mansard with flat roof and 2 x front dormers.

Although there are a number of roof extensions seen along the street, the conservation area statement specifically notes that Spencer Rise is one of the few streets in the conservation area which is marred by isolated mansard roof additions which have made their host building too prominent in the street. Furthermore, the mansard roof additions on Spencer Rise are specifically listed as a negative feature of the conservation area.

With this in mind, any proposed roof extension must be very carefully considered in terms of design, position, bulk and materials. It must be set back behind the front parapet to reduce its visual prominence and should be traditional in appearance, constructed in accordance with the design guidance in CPG1 (Design), paragraphs 5.14 – 5.19. The rear butterfly parapet should be retained, with the new roof starting from behind this parapet at existing hopper-head level, forming a continuous slope, up to a maximum of 70 degrees (see figure 6 on page 44 of [CPG1](#)).

For this reason, a traditional mansard roof extension, set back from the front parapet, with two front dormers which respect the window hierarchy of the floors below is considered to be the most appropriate in this instance.

Rear extension

Camden Planning Guidance document CPG1 (Design) advises that extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation unless the specific circumstances of the site, such as the context of the property or its particular design, would enable an exception to this approach. Specific guidance relating to the construction of rear extensions is provided in paragraphs 4.9 – 4.15. Paragraph 4.12 describes how in order for new extensions to be subordinate to the original building, their heights should respect the existing pattern of rear extensions, where they exist.

In most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged.

The application building currently features a two storey closet wing extension with a pitched roof which follows the line of the butterfly roof valley. It is set down from this parapet by approximately half a storey. The existing closet wing extension is the same size and design as those seen at nos.3 and 5, which are of the same architectural style as the host building.

The proposal includes the erection of an additional storey on top of the closet wing which would be built up to the eaves of the new roof extension and would follow the same pitch as the existing roof slope. It would be constructed of matching materials. Although the detailed design is considered acceptable, the erection of an additional storey in this location would not be supported in principle. It would not be set down one full storey below the original eaves level, would overwhelm the host building and is not considered to be a subordinate addition.

It is noted that no.7 features a three storey closet wing; however, this property is a storey taller than the application building and therefore does not set an example for similar development at this site. Likewise, nos. 19-25 have two storey closet wing extensions which are almost built up to the same height as the butterfly parapet. However, no planning records exist for these, and they appear to be an original feature of this group of buildings.

For these reasons, the erection of a second floor rear extension would not be supported at application stage.

Basement extension

The pre-application proposals include the excavation of a new basement floor covering the plot of the application building with two lightwells to the front and rear. The proposed drawings have annotated these as glazed walk-on skylights.

The basement excavation would have minimal impact in design terms due to its limited visibility. The main consideration would therefore be the impact of the lightwells on the

character and appearance of the host building and wider conservation area. CPG7 (Basements) provides detailed design guidance regarding the installation of lightwells and states that where basements and visible lightwells are not part of the prevailing character of a street, new lightwells should be discreet and not harm the architectural character of the building, the character and appearance of the surrounding area, or the relationship between the building and the street. In situations where lightwells are not part of the established street character, the characteristics of the front garden or forecourt will help to determine the suitability of lightwells.

The size and position of the lightwells are considered acceptable; however, as discussed on site, it is recommended that the front lightwell is revised to a simple metal grill which would be more in keeping with the character of the house and area.

8. Amenity

Policy A1 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered and would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, outlook, noise, daylight and sunlight.

Due to the location and nature of the proposals, the basement excavation and roof extension are unlikely to cause harm to neighbouring amenity (subject to any amenity issues associated with excavation works). The proposed rear extension may have some impact on daylight reaching neighbouring windows; however, as discussed above, this extension is not considered acceptable in design terms.

9. Basement

The proposals involve the excavation of a new basement floor beneath the footprint of the entire ground floor measuring approximately 7.3m wide, 18.7m long and 4.8m deep; with small covered lightwells to the front and rear.

Policy A5 of the Local Plan states that the Council will only permit basement development where it is demonstrated to its satisfaction that the proposal would not cause harm to:

- a) neighbouring properties;
- b) the structural, ground, or water conditions of the area;
- c) the character and amenity of the area;
- d) the architectural character of the building; and
- e) the significance of heritage assets.

The siting, location, scale and design of basements must have minimal impact on, and be subordinate to, the host building and property. Basement development should:

- a) not comprise of more than one storey;
- b) not be built under an existing basement;
- c) not exceed 50% of each garden within the property;
- d) be less than 1.5 times the footprint of the host building in area;

- e) extend into the garden no further than 50% of the depth of the host building measured from the principal rear elevation;
- f) not extend into or underneath the garden further than 50% of the depth of the garden;
- g) be set back from neighbouring property boundaries where it extends beyond the footprint of the host building; and
- h) avoid the loss of garden space or trees of townscape or amenity value.

The Council will require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:

- a) maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties;
- b) avoid adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment;
- c) do not harm the structural stability of the host building, neighbouring buildings or the water environment in the local area;
- d) avoid cumulative impacts;
- e) do not harm the amenity of neighbours;
- f) provide satisfactory landscaping, including adequate soil depth;
- g) do not harm the appearance or setting of the property or the established character of the surrounding area;
- h) protect important archaeological remains; and
- i) do not prejudice the ability of the garden to support trees where they are part of the character of the area.

The Council will not permit basement schemes which include habitable rooms and other sensitive uses in areas prone to flooding.

Although the proposed basement is mostly in accordance with the requirements of policy A5, the proposed depth of 4.8m (with an internal floor to ceiling height of 4.1m) is considered excessive and it is recommended that it is reduced by at least 1 metre.

The application site is located in an area subject to underground development constraints due to the potential for surface water flow and flooding. Given this, you are advised to thoroughly examine the requirements of Policy A4 of the Local Plan and CPG4 prior to submission. The development would require a comprehensive and accurate Basement Impact Assessment to be submitted with the formal application demonstrating no significant harm to the application site, neighbouring sites or those surrounding.

The BIA will need to include the following stages:

- Stage 1 - Screening;
- Stage 2 - Scoping;
- Stage 3 - Site investigation and study;
- Stage 4 - Impact assessment; and
- Stage 5 - Review and decision making.

At each stage in the process the person(s) undertaking the BIA process should hold qualifications relevant to the matters being considered. The Council will only accept the qualifications set out in paragraph 2.11 of CPG4.

Independent verification of Basement Impact Assessments, funded by the applicant, is now also required (since CPG4 was updated in September 2013) in the following situations:

- Where a scheme requires applicants to proceed beyond the Screening stage of the Basement Impact Assessment (i.e. where a matter of concern has been identified which requires the preparation of a full Basement Impact Assessment);
- Where the proposed basement development is located within an area of concern regarding slope stability, surface water or groundwater flow; or
- For any other basement applications where the Council feels that independent verification would be appropriate (e.g. where conflicting evidence is provided in response to a proposal).
- A full scoping study is required as part of any application, identifying the potential impacts for each of the matters of concern.

Please note that the Council's preferred provider for the audit service is Campbell Reith. When an audit is required, Campbell Reith charge a fixed fee dependant on the category of basement audit, outlined in [appendix A](#) of Camden's BIA audit service terms of reference.

Construction Management Plan

It is important that effective measures are taken during demolition and construction works to ensure that damage is not caused to the host building, neighbouring buildings or the surrounding highways.

The Council will generally require a construction management plan for basement developments to manage and mitigate the greater construction impacts of these schemes. Construction management plans will be required for schemes on constrained sites, in conservation areas, for listed buildings, or in other areas depending on the scale of the development and the conditions of the site.

The main highways issue in this case is the potential impact of construction / delivery vehicles associated with the basement excavation on the local highway network. It is suggested that a draft Construction Management Plan (CMP) is submitted with any application setting out how construction matters would be dealt with, for example deliveries, how material will be stored, and construction waste removed from site etc.

A draft (based on the Camden [pro-forma](#) found online) should be submitted with the application, with the full CMP to be secured via S106 legal agreement. Chapter 4 of CPG4 (Basements and lightwells) provides more information [here](#).

A financial contribution would be needed to cover the costs of reviewing the Construction Management Plan, details of which will be confirmed at the full planning application stage.

This financial contribution will also need to be secured by a Section 106 planning obligation if planning permission is granted.

The CMP Implementation Support Contribution will be used to fund the specific technical inputs and sign off that are required to ensure that the obligation is complied with and ensure that the planning objectives we are seeking to secure are actually achieved.

Some highway licenses would be required to facilitate the proposed works. The applicant would need to obtain such highway licences from the Council prior to commencing work on site. Any such licence requirements should be discussed in the CMP. Details for the highway licences mentioned above are available on the Camden website [here](#).

10. Transport

Highway Works Contribution

The summary page of Development Policy DP21 states that 'The Council will expect works affecting Highways to repair any construction damage to transport infrastructure or landscaping and reinstate all affected transport network links and road and footway surfaces following development'.

The proposed works could lead to damage to the footways and carriageway directly adjacent to the site. Camden may need to undertake highway remedial works following completion of the proposed development and if necessary, a financial contribution for highway works would be secured as a Section 106 planning obligation. A highways cost estimate would be requested from our Highways Delivery Team once the final submission has been reviewed at the full planning application stage.

11. Impact on trees

Consideration should also be given to the existence of trees on or adjacent to the site, including street trees, and the root protection zones needed by these trees. As the proposed development would be in very close proximity to the existing tree within the front garden, the Council would require an arboricultural report to be submitted as part of any future planning application. This will need to provide information about:

- species, spread, roots and position of trees,
- which trees you are proposing to fell,
- which trees will be affected in any way by the proposed development, and
- the measures that will be used to protect them during construction.

You will need to provide the information in the form of the documents and plans listed below in line with BS5837:2012 (trees in relation to design, demolition and construction):

- a pre-development tree survey
- a tree constraints plan
- an arboricultural impact assessment
- an arboricultural method statement including a tree protection plan

12. Conclusion

The principle of a mansard roof extension is likely to be supported (subject to its detailed design); however, the Council would not support the erection of a first floor extension in this location. The height of the basement should be reduced by at least 1m in order to ensure that it reads as single storey in height.

13. Planning application information

If you submit a planning application which addresses the outstanding issue detailed in this report satisfactorily, I would advise you to submit the following for a valid planning application:

- Completed form – householder planning application.
- An Ordnance Survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red.
- Floor plans at a scale of 1:100 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Roof plans at a scale of 1:100 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:100 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Section drawings at a scale of 1:100 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Design and access statement
- Basement impact assessment (and proforma)
- Draft construction management statement
- Sample photographs/manufacturer details of proposed brick cladding
- The appropriate fee
- Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.

We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would put up a site notice on or near the site and, advertise in a local newspaper. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

It is likely that that a proposal of this size would be determined under delegated powers, however, if more than 3 objections from neighbours or an objection from a local amenity group is received the application will be referred to the Members Briefing Panel should it be recommended for approval by officers. For more details click [here](#).

This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact Laura Hazelton on the number above.

Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Yours sincerely,

Laura Hazelton

Planning Officer
Planning Solutions Team