



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

Date: 23/02/2018
Our ref: 2017/7009/PRE
Contact: Nora Constantinescu
Direct line: 020 7974 5758
Email: nora-andreea.constantinescu@camden.gov.uk

79 Redington Road
 London
 NW3 7RR

www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Dear Andrew Wright,

Re: Extension of basement to include open lightwells to front and rear, closed side lightwell, demolition of rear conservatory and erection of rear extension, gate on south side, fencing enclosure and repaving on the north side, bin and cycling enclosures.

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry which was received on 21/12/2017 together with the required fee of £426.00 which was received on the 22/12/2017. This advice is formulated based on the information submitted, previous planning history and the site meeting at the application site on 09/02/2018.

1. Drawings and documents

- 1.1 The following documentation was submitted in support of the pre-application request:
 Existing drawings: LP-01 Rev 01; LP-02 Rev 00; EX-00 Rev 01; EX-01 Rev 01; EX-02 Rev 01; EX-03 Rev 01; EX-04 Rev 01; EX-05 Rev 01; EX-06 Rev 01; EX-07 Rev 01;
 Proposed drawings: PSP-00 Rev 05; PA-00 Rev 05; PA-01 Rev 05; PA-02 Rev 05; PA-03 Rev 04; PA-04 Rev 03; PA-05 Rev 04; PA-06 Rev 03; PA-07 Rev 03; PA-08.1 Rev 00; PA-08.2 Rev 00; PA-08.3 Rev 00; PA-09.1 Rev 00; PA-09.2 Rev 00;
 Other documents: Design and Access Statement; Arboricultural Report 15th December 2017; Letter Brief overview of basement works dated 6th December 2017; Pre-application request letter dated 12th December 2017; Heritage Assessment letter dated 5th December 2017; Ground Investigation dated November 2017

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal is for the reconfiguration of the existing units to include new side extensions and basement excavation and alterations to the landscaping and front boundary.
- 2.2 The applicant wishes to receive the Council's view on:
- Basement excavation

- Front, side and rear lightwells
- Demolition and replacement of rear conservatory and rear extension
- Alterations to front and side garden areas and parking provision (repaving, facing enclosures and gates)
- Cycle and bin enclosures

3. Site description

- 3.1 The application building is a 20th century, four storey detached property, including rooms in the basement and attic, located on the west side of Redington Road. The site lies within the Redington Frogna Conservation Area, and it is considered to make a positive contribution to this conservation area.
- 3.2 The application site lies within a predominantly residential area, of large detached and semi-detached houses, which varies in forms and architectural styles characteristic for the 19th and 20th centuries. The application building has been previously converted into four self-contained flats and the current proposal relates the flat occupying the rear ground and lower ground floor levels (Flat A).
- 3.3 The site has a slight gradient from front to the rear (east to west) and north to south, however the site itself is generally flat lying. Other site constraints include: underground development constraints in respect of hydrological constraints (as it identifies Bagshot Beds) subterranean (groundwater) flow and slope stability.

4. Relevant planning history

4.1 The following planning history is relevant for the application site:

- 23172 – 79 Redington Road - Alterations in connection with the conversion of 79 Redington Road, Hampstead, into three self-contained flats. – Granted 20/03/1959
- 36052(R1) – 79 Redington Road - Erection of a conservatory to the rear at ground floor and external works associated with the formation of an additional bedroom to the front at basement level. – Granted 12/08/1983

Previous permissions granted in the vicinity relevant to the current proposal:

- 2014/5705/P - 69 Redington Road - Excavation of basement under the footprint of existing dwelling house with associated front lightwell and enlargement of existing garage. – Granted 15/05/2015

Previous permissions to include front lightwells:

- 29 Redington Road - 2012/0742/P - Amendment to planning permission granted 23/11/2010 (ref: 2010/4534/P), namely for erection of rear extension at basement and lower ground floor level, enlarged terrace at rear lower ground floor level and reconfiguration of steps, replacement of windows with doors and creation of terrace with railings at rear ground floor level, installation of glazed canopy at first floor level to balcony all to rear elevation and alterations to windows and doors.- Granted 05/04/2012
- 14 Redington Road - 2009/0536/P - The amendment of planning permission for a new house (ref: 2006/1565/P, dated 31/07/2006) to increase the size of the lower ground floor and basement levels at the rear to accommodate a swimming pool. – Granted 07/10/2009
- 38 Redington Road - 2006/1733/P - The erection of a new 3-storey dwellinghouse with a basement and a sub-basement including front and rear lightwells. – Granted 02/06/2006
- 63 Redington Road – 8702802 - Change of use and works of conversion including the erection of two storey rear extension with terraces at rear ground and first floor levels excavation of the front basement the erection of a single storey side extension and alterations to the front rear and side roof levels to provide five self-contained dwelling units - Granted 4/02/1988
- 37 Redington Road – 23325 - The installation of two new windows at front basement level. – granted 20/10/1976
- 37 Redington Road - TP/33732/8952 - The erection of a studio extension to the lower maisonette at 31, Redington Road, Hampstead. – Granted 13/09/1956
- 58A Redington Road, NW3 - 23543 - The retention of the basement level and porch front extensions, the means of access to the highway and alterations to the front fenestration. – Granted 28/01/1977
- 58B Redington Road - 47980/20878- The conversion of No. 58B, Redington Road, Hampstead, into two self-contained maisonettes. Granted 27/03/1954

5. **Relevant policies and guidance**

- **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**
- **London Plan (2016)**
Policy 7.4 – Local Character
Policy 7.6 – Architecture
- **Camden Local Plan (2017)**
Policy G1 Delivery and location of growth

Policy D1 Design
 Policy D2 Heritage
 Policy A1 Managing the impact of development
 Policy A3 Biodiversity
 Policy A4 Noise and vibration
 Policy A5 Basements
 Policy T3 Transport infrastructure
 Policy CC2 Adapting to climate change

- **Camden Planning Guidance**

- CPG 1 – Design 2015
- CPG 4 – Basements and lightwells 2015
- CPG 6 – Amenity 2011
- CPG 7 – Transport 2011
- CPG 8 – Planning Obligations 2015

- **Redington Froggnal Conservation Area Statement (2004)**

5.1 The Council is reviewing and updating its Camden Planning Guidance documents to support the delivery of the Camden Local Plan following its adoption in July 2017. The update is being carried out in two phases to manage the amount of material to be consulted on at any one time and ensure that relevant revised CPG documents take into account the emerging London Plan and changes to national planning policy due in early 2018. Please refer to the Council's website for further [details](#).

6. **Assessment**

6.1 The main issues to consider in this case are as follows:

- Principle of basement development and design
- Design and heritage
- Impact on trees and vegetation;
- Amenity (impact on neighbouring occupiers);
- Transport
- Planning Obligations.

Principle of basement development

6.2 Policy A5 of the Local Plan states that “In determining proposals for basements and other underground development, the Council will require an assessment of the scheme’s impact on drainage, flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability in the form of a Basement Impact Assessment and where appropriate, a Basement Construction Plan.” Further guidance on the processes and recommendations for Basement Impact Assessments is set out within CPG4 (Basement and Lightwells 2015) and associated Camden geological, hydrogeological and hydrological study 2010 (referred to below as the ‘Arup report’). As the proposal includes excavation works to extend the existing basement, in a formal planning application you would have to submit a Basement Impact Assessment

(BIA), prepared in accordance with the processes and procedures as set out within CPG4 and the Council's Pro Forma publicly published on the Council's website.

6.3 For completeness please ensure that the report details the author's own professional qualifications. Please also note that CPG4 requires the following qualifications for the different elements of a BIA study or review:

Surface flow and flooding

A Hydrologist or a Civil Engineer specialising in flood risk management and surface water drainage, with either:

- The "CEng" (Chartered Engineer) qualification from the Engineering Council; or a Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers ("MICE"); or
- The "C.WEM" (Chartered Water and Environmental Manager) qualification from the Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management.

Subterranean (groundwater) flow

A Hydrogeologist with the "CGeol" (Chartered Geologist) qualification from the Geological Society of London.

Land stability

A Civil Engineer with the "CEng" (Chartered Engineer) qualification from the Engineering Council and specialising in ground engineering; or

- A Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers ("MICE") and a Geotechnical Specialist as defined by the Site Investigation Steering Group with demonstrable evidence that the assessments have been made by them in conjunction with an Engineering Geologist with the "CGeol" (Chartered Geologist) qualification from the Geological Society of London.

6.4 The submitted BIA will be independently assessed by a third party, at the applicant's expense, to satisfy the Council that the development would not lead to any unacceptable impacts on the groundwater flows, land stability and surface flows of the area should the development be granted.

6.5 Please note that the Council's approved provider for the audit service is Campbell Reith, which charges a fixed fee dependant on the category of basement audit. The Campbell Reith Audit will certify this category once you apply and completed the Pro Forma.

Category A - £997.50

Residential or commercial development with single storey basement where the Screening Stage of the Basement Impact Assessment indicates no matters of concern which need further investigation.

Submitted BIA anticipates no significant impact relating to:

- land stability or impacts, buildings or infrastructure;
- groundwater flow or surface water flooding and underground tunnels

Category B - £3045

Residential single basement or commercial development with single or double basement where the Screening Stage of the Basement Impact Assessment identifies matters of concern which need further investigation

Submitted BIA anticipates potential impact:

- to a listed building;
- on land stability;
- on groundwater flow;
- on potential for surface water flooding ;
- on underground tunnels or infrastructure; and
- cumulative impact on ground stability and the water environment

Category C

Exceptional development (in terms of geometry, area, depth or complexity) which may be a single or double basement with potential complications. This category would be charged at an agreed rate on a case by case basis taking consideration of the complexity.

Submitted BIA anticipates potential for significant impact:

- to a listed building;
- on other buildings and or with land stability issues;
- to groundwater flow and potential for surface water flooding ;
- underground tunnels or infrastructure; cumulative basement impacts;
- relating to significant technical issues raised by third parties

It is noted that documentation has been provided in relation to the basement excavation, however as advised on site this would be considered by the auditor in the event of a future planning application. In this way we would be able to ensure that local knowledge in relation to subsidies or other ground movements experiences by the neighbouring occupiers would provide a more comprehensive approach for the audit.

Design and heritage**Basement, front and rear lighthwells**

6.6 Policy A5 of the Local Plan notes 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.

6.7 CPG4 states that the Council will only permit basement development where it does not cause harm to the recognised architectural character of buildings and surrounding areas, including gardens and nearby trees. Furthermore, it states that basement developments that extends outside of the footprint of the building can have a greater impact than smaller schemes. Larger basement developments can reduce the area for water to runoff and soak away and also reduce the ability of the garden to support trees

and other vegetation leading to poor landscaping, loss of amenity and local character. In addition, larger basements would require more extensive excavation resulting in longer construction periods and greater number of vehicle movements to remove the soil, which would have greater impact on the neighbouring properties through noise, disturbance, traffic and parking issues. It is therefore preferred that basement extensions do not extend beyond the footprint of the original dwelling.

6.8 Policy A5 stipulates that the siting, location, scale and design of basements must have minimal impact on, and be subordinate to the host building. It also highlights that basement development should not be more than one storey, be less than 1.5 times the footprint of the host building and that they should extend into the garden no further than 50% of the depth of the host building measured from the principal rear elevation, and be set back from neighbouring property boundaries where it extends beyond the footprint of the host building. Importantly, policy A5 also states that the Council would not permit basement schemes which include habitable rooms and other sensitive uses in areas prone to flooding. The proposal includes bedrooms at the basement level and this might trigger a Flood Risk Assessment to certify the acceptability of the room's use in this location.

6.9 It is noted that the application site comprises a large villa which has been divided into flats. The policy indicates that the expansion of the basement relate to the host building and property as a whole. It does not indicate that in such circumstances the expansion of the basement should relate solely to the half of the building where the flat proposed to be altered is located. As such, the considerations of policy A5 would be assessed in relation to the whole host building.

6.10 The proposed basement excavation would increase the depth of the existing basement by 1 metre and extend to the rear beyond the existing footprint of the building by 7.7m to include the open lighthwell and planting towards the north side and extend by 4m towards the south. The rear lighthwell would have length of 3.6m and a width of 4.5m and includes stepped landscaping into the rear garden and storage space. The depth of the host building measured from the front principal elevation to the rear is 12.6m. Half of this depth would be 6.3m. The proposed excavation extends to the rear with a depth of 7.7m which is contrary to policy A5 point j. by extending into the rear garden further than 50% of the depth of the host building. Therefore, the depth of the extension should be reduced.

6.11 In response to the other points of policy A5, the proposed basement extension would not comprise more than one storey (f.) and would not be built under an existing basement (g.). The application site benefits from a large rear garden and the proposed excavation would not exceed 50% of each garden within the property (h.), nor it would extend into or underneath the garden further than 50% the depth of the garden (k.). When considering the whole host application site with an approximate area of 200sqm the proposed excavation of approximately 66sqm, would be less than 1.5 times the footprint of the host building (i.). The excavation extends with a side lighthwell up to the boundary with the adjacent neighbour at no. 77 Redington Road which is contrary to point l. The basement should be set away from the boundaries with neighbouring properties.

6.12 In close proximity to the rear elevation of the building there are some shrubs, bushes and grass which would be removed as part of the proposed scheme. However, considering that the proposed extension at ground level would replace and existing

structure, and that the lightwell includes some planting, the harm caused to the rear landscaping is not considered significant. The impact of the proposed basement development to the front landscaping would be discussed below.

Front, side, rear lightwells

6.13 The external manifestations of the basement to the front is an open lighthwell with a length of 2.5m and a width of 5m, with the ground floor bay window replicate at basement level. To the side the basement includes a lighthwell which would project up to the boundary with the neighbouring building at no. 77 Redington Road and would have an un-uniform shape with a width of 4.7m and length of 0.9 and 0.7m. To the rear the lightwell would extend by 3.7m into the rear garden with a width of 4.5m, and would include stepped planting.

6.14 CPG4 highlights 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, or the character and appearance of the surrounding area, or the relationship between the building and the street. In situations where lighthwells are not part of the established street character, the characteristics of the front garden or forecourt will help to determine the suitability of lighthwells.”* It is noted that Redington Road expands a long distance from Frogal Road to the south to West Heath Road to the north, along which the built character and form varies. It has been identified that along the south side of Redington Road a number of properties have been altered with front and rear lighthwells such as nos. 14, 29, 31, 37, 38. Similar alterations have been granted closer towards the application site at nos. 58 and 63. It is noted that the majority of the basement development do include front lighthwells have been granted historically, as the planning history shows, except for the new built developments at nos. 37 and 29. As such, considering the long expansion of Redington Road and in line with CPG4 it is considered that front lighthwells are not part of the established character and therefore any manifestations at this level should be as discreet as possible so it would not harm the character of the host building, streetscene and wider conservation area.

6.15 The front of the application site benefits from a landscaped area adjacent to the front elevation, which includes purpose built planters at higher level than the street, symmetrical to the front entrance. The front forecourt allows for parking bordered by a hedge adjacent to the street pavement. It is considered that the existing front landscape is part of the character of the host building and has amenity value to the streetscene. The proposed lighthwell due to its, depth, projection and alterations to the landscaping would unbalance the application site, giving the impression of a three storey building rather than two, which would harm the character and appearance of the host building as a whole and streetscene. Furthermore, the proposed lightwell is surrounded by railings which are considered to add clutter to the existing front elevation and streetscene. As such, the proposed lighthwell in its current design would not be supported.

6.16 You are advised that in the event of a future planning submission, a proposed front lighthwell should not project as deep as the basement floor, should be significantly smaller and follow the angles of the bay window above. Importantly, any proposed lighthwell should retain as much as possible of the existing front landscaping, and be integrated within it. In this way the opening would not be visible from the streetscene and the landscaping can be used instead of railings. Also, any alterations in this location should not alter the brick planter structure.

6.17 To the side the proposed lightwell would project adjacent to the boundary with no. 77 Redington Road which is contrary to policy A5 point I. Furthermore, it is considered that previous basement extensions along the street do not manifest on the side of the buildings at street level, and therefore such development would be out of character and would not preserve or enhance the appearance of the host building or conservation area. As such, you are advised that in the event of a future planning application the side lightwell would not be supported by officers, and this should be removed from the plans.

6.18 In relation to the rear lighthwell, as discussed above, its overall projection, including the basement, is considered be contrary to policy A5. You are advised that in the event of a future planning application this should be significantly reduced in depth in order to comply with Camden policies, as well as width in order to be more subservient to the host building. The proposed lightwell design with stepped planting would be supported in the event of a future planning application.

Demolition of existing structure and proposed rear extensions

6.19 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy D1 is relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of host building and neighbouring ones, and the quality of materials to be used.

6.20 Policy D2 stresses that the Council will seek to manage development in a way that retains the distinctive characters of conservation areas and will therefore only grant planning permission for development that preserves and enhances the special character or appearance of the area. It is added that the character of conservation areas derive from the combination of a number of factors, including scale, density, pattern of development, landscape, topography, open space, materials, architectural detailing and uses. It is noted that in this instance the building has been extended previously to the side with a two-storey side extension which has been altered through time.

6.21 CPG1 highlights that rear extensions should be designed to be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing, respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style.

6.22 The proposed extension would partially replace the existing conservatory on site and extend further towards the south, adjacent to the back access for the whole host building. The part of the extension to replace the existing conservatory in terms of bulk and scale would be considered acceptable. The proposed extended section towards the south of the site, as seen cumulatively is considered to project quite deep into the rear garden unbalancing the existing rear elevation. You are advised to reduce the depth of the rear extension in order to maintain a staggered rear elevation as the existing projection on the southern side.

6.23 In relation to the detailed design of the proposed rear extensions, it is considered that the proposed fenestration is out of character with the host building, and does not preserve or enhances its rear elevation. The glazing is considered acceptable however, you are advised to consider a more simplified design for the doors and windows.

Quality of accommodation

6.24 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan promotes high quality design of housing development that takes into account its physical context, local character, density, tenure and land use mix and relationship with, and provision for public, communal and open spaces taking into account the needs for children and older people. Under policy H1, the Council aims to secure a sufficient supply of homes to meet the needs of existing and future households.

6.25 CPG2 highlights that new residential units should provide a high standard of living accommodation for the prospective occupiers whilst maintaining the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties. In line with the National Housing Standards 3 bedroom flat on 2 floors for 4 persons should have a minimum GIA (gross internal area) of 84sqm. The proposed flat would have a floor area of 254sqm which would exceed the national standards.

6.26 In principle, the proposal to extend the existing flat would be in accordance with policies H1 and H3 of Camden Local Plan 2017. Policy H7 indicates in the Dwelling Size Priority Table that 3 bedroom flats has a high priority as a market unit within the borough which adds to the acceptability of the scheme.

6.27 The proposed layout includes living room, dining, sitting area kitchen and a small gym at ground floor level and the bedrooms with their en-suite and utility room at basement level. In terms of daylight and sunlight, it is considered that due to site constraints and the chosen layout the habitable rooms would benefit overall from an adequate level of light. Slight concerns are raised in relation to the level of light received through the glass panels for Bedroom 1, however it is considered that on balance, the retention of the garage door preserves the character of the host building, and therefore this element would be acceptable.

6.28 Significant consideration should be given to the lighthwells design in order to allow an adequate level of light for the bedrooms at the basement level. This should be considered in conjunction with comfortable levels of outlook which contribute a high standard of accommodation. You are advised that in the event of a future planning application a Daylight and Sunlight study for the rooms at the basement level might be required.

Impact on trees and vegetation

6.29 The application site does not include TPOs however the site being located within a conservation area, all trees are protected.

6.30 The submission includes a Arboricultural report which details the current status of the trees within the site garden and highlights if any impact would occur from the proposed development. The report indicates that the proposed scheme would not result in removal of existing trees with amenity value. It is noted however, that the root protection area of the Deodar tree (T1) located in the adjacent garden at No. 77 would be encroached by the proposed front lighthwell. In light of the above discussion in relation to the front lighthwell, a significant reduction in lighthwell's depth, length and width would be less likely to cause harm to the roots of T1 and therefore it is unlikely that trial pits to confirm root locations would be required as part of a future planning application.

6.31 In relation to the proposed alterations, significant concerns are raised in respect of the alterations to the front landscaping, due to the impact on the host building, streetscene and wider conservation area. Subsequently, the proposal includes an increase in the hardstanding to the front and rear of the building. Policy D1 highlights that new developments should respond to the natural assets of the site and its surroundings, such as slopes and height differences, trees and other vegetation. In line with Policy A3 any new development should not harm existing natural habitats, including private gardens. As such, you are advised that the proposed increase of hardstanding, as a result of alterations to the front landscaping would not be supported by the officers, in the event of a future planning application.

6.32 The proposal includes installation of bin storage on north side, by altering the existing planter. It is noted that trees and shrubs are located within this boundary treatment and careful consideration should be given to the alteration to the planter in order to maintain the landscaping and vegetation.

Other alterations

6.33 The application building benefits from landscaping and vegetation on the north side of the building. The proposal includes a bin storage within this planting area, projecting beyond the front elevation of the host building by 3.7m, with a length of 6m, depth of 1.1m and a height of 1.2m. The storage would be made of 90x20mm horizontal timber decking boards with 10mm gaps and plywood backboard. Due to its proposed location, bulk and scale, the proposed bin storage is considered to harm the overall appearance of the front garden and street scene. You are advised to relocate the bin storage to end up at least in line with the front line of the host building, in order to keep a more subservient and visually unobstructive position.

6.34 The proposed cycle storage would be located on the northern side of the plot, towards the rear of the building, and would replace an existing structure. The proposed cycle storage would be 2.3m high and 1.3m deep with a length of 5.37m. The proposed cycle stands would be vertical racks. In line with CPG7 Transport, you are advised that vertical racks would not be acceptable due to the damage that they can cause to the bikes and also they are not considered a secure type of cycle stand. CPG4 highlights that cycle stands should allow the bikes to be locked by both wheels and frames, and be grounded in order to be both secure and easy to use. As such, in this instance you are advised to consider Sheffield Stands in line with CPG7.

6.35 In addition, due to the proposed type of cycle stand the storage of 2.3m high would appear too bulky for such a narrow location. As such, in light of the above you are advised to consider a more subservient cycle storage by taking into account the type of stands proposed.

6.36 In relation to the re-surfacing the front driveway, you are advised that permeable materials would be more likely be acceptable.

Side enclosures

6.37 The proposal includes a 1.8m fence on the north side of the building. It would extend from the host building to the side boundary with nos. 81-83 Redington Road, with a width of 4.7m. The fence would be made of timber and would have a gate to provide

access to the cycle storage and rear garden. A similar timber gate is proposed on the southern side of the plot, with a height of 2m and width of 0.5m, due to the existing narrow corridor between the host building and the boundary with no. 77 Redington Road. Currently the rear of the building can be accessed from both sides. The enclosure is proposed to improve the privacy and security of the occupiers of the flat at the ground floor on the north side.

6.38 It is noted that the application site slopes from north to south, with the north siting at the 1.7m higher than the south side, as shown in the drawings provided. When assessing the existing pattern of development in the vicinity and the character of the area, it is noted that some of the neighbouring buildings have side fence and gates significantly set back from the front elevations, located at narrow points in-between the building and side boundaries. As such, due to the site topography, position and projection of the proposed fence on the north side this would be considered an incongruous addition to the host building which would detract from its character and harm the appearance of the building and the streetscene. You are advised that a gate located further back towards the rear of the building, where the distance to the neighbouring boundary is significantly smaller, similar to the one on the south side, it is likely to be supported in the event of a future planning application.

6.39 In relation to the south side proposed enclosure, due to its position it is not considered to be so visible from the street and therefore less harmful to its character. However its height is considered excessive and you are advised to reduce it to maximum of 1.8m.

Amenity

6.40 Policy A1 of Camden Local Plan 2017 seeks to ensure that any proposed development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to the amenity and that any development should avoid harmful effects on the amenity of existing and future occupiers and to nearby properties. CPG6 seeks developments to be designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree and that the Council will aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight caused by a development on the amenity of existing occupiers.

6.41 In relation to the excavation of the lower ground floor, as stated above, the BIA assessment would have to take into consideration any impact caused to the neighbouring amenities and propose mitigation measures if necessary. It is advised that the applicant should engage with the neighbours at an early stage, to inform them about the proposed works. In this way, the neighbours would be able to provide local knowledge of any ground manifestations within existing basement levels (if any).

6.42 In relation to the proposed alterations they are not considered to cause significant harm to the neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light, outlook or overlooking.

6.43 To the rear, the end of the neighbouring property at no. 77 Redington Road projects beyond the main rear elevation of the host building and it is slightly set back from the side boundary. As the proposal would replace an existing structure, with a similar bulk and scale, it is considered unlikely that significant additional harm would be caused to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers in terms of loss of light, outlook or overlooking.

6.44 In relation to the rear lighthwell, it is considered that some level of light spill would be experienced in the rear garden, however due to its location and projection it is not considered to cause significant harm to the visual amenity of the neighbouring occupiers at nos. 77 or 81-83 Redington Road.

6.45 In relation to the impact on nos. 81-83, due to the proposal's location, bulk and scale, it is not considered that significant harm would be caused to the neighbouring amenities. However, further consideration of amenity issues will be assessed throughout the process of the application, taking into account any correspondence which is received during the consultation process.

Transport and Planning Obligations

6.46 The use of planning obligations is an important tool in managing the impacts of development and assisting the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support the London Plan and Camden Local Plan policies. They will be used to ensure that the strategic objectives of the Camden Local Plan are met through requirements attached to individual development proposals.

6.47 As result of the proposed basement excavations, a Construction Management Plan (and review fee), as a well as highways and streetworks contribution, are likely to be required as part of a Section 106 Legal Agreement. The highways contribution would be refunded provided that, as a result of the works, the adjacent highway is left in a good state of repair.

6.48 In relation to parking, the proposal includes provision of 4 parking spaces in the front garden of the host building, however when visiting the site it appeared that only three cars can be parked on site. In the event of a future planning application the situation should be clarified. However, in line with policy T2, all new developments shall be car-free, and this requirement would be secured by s106 legal agreement. Paragraph 10.20 of policy T2 clarifies that the Councils will consider retaining or re-providing existing parking provision where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers are to return to the address when the development is completed. This can supported by affidavits from the occupiers. It is noted however that in this instance, there will be a new occupier.

6.49 Furthermore, it appears that the proposed alterations to the front landscaping would allow for a more comfortable parking provision. Policy T2 stresses that parking can cause damage to the environment as it will affect "trees, hedgerows, boundary walls and fences which are the traditional form of enclosure on Camden's streets, particularly in conservation areas", it "often requires loss of much needed public on-street parking bays to create vehicle crossovers", and areas of paving can also increase the volume and speed of water run-off, which adds to the pressure upon the drainage system and increases the risk of flooding from surface water". As such, you are advised that developments seeking to replace garden areas and boundary treatments for the purpose or providing on-site parking will be therefore resisted.

6.50 This proposal will be liable for the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Camden CIL as the additional floorspace exceeds 100sqm GIA or one unit of residential accommodation. Based on the information submitted, the Mayor's CIL

Charging Schedule and the Camden Charging Schedule, the charge is likely to be £6500 (130sqm x £50) for the Mayor's CIL and £65000 (130sqm x £500) for the Camden CIL.

7 Conclusions

7.1 Based on the information received, the advice given and subject to the BIA audit, officers can confirm that the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable, however there are still outstanding concerns relating to the proposal.

7.2 In terms of its size and detailed design of the proposed basement extension should comply with the requirements of policy A5 of Camden Local Plan. You are advised that the proposed front lighthwell should be significantly reduced in depth, width and length, to follow the bays lines and be and integrated within the existing front landscaping. Also, the rear lighthwell should be significantly reduced to comply with policy A5.

7.3 In terms of the impact of the basement works on the structural stability of the host building, and adjoining ones, hydrology and land stability, this would be independently verified by the Council's auditor at application stage.

7.4 Significant consideration should be given to the alterations to the front landscaping and to be retained as part of the proposed scheme. Also, the fencing on the northern side should be further set back to project as little as possible.

7.5 No additional on-site parking provision would be supported and in the event of a future planning application being acceptable this would be subject to a s106 agreement for car free development.

8 Planning application information

8.1 In order to ensure your application is valid, the following information will be required to support the planning application:

- Completed and signed planning application forms for Full Planning Permission;
- 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;
- The appropriate fee
- [Basement Impact Assessment](#);
- Tree Survey/Arboricultural Statement
- Daylight sunlight assessment (advisable)
- Draft [Construction Management Plan](#);
- Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.

8.2 We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would notify neighbours by putting up a notice in close proximity of the application site. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

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 Nora Constantinescu (0207 974 5758)

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

Yours sincerely,

Nora Constantinescu
Planning Officer - Planning Solutions Team