

2018/2342/P - 6 Albert Terrace

Agent Response to Advice from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee, dated 4th July and 1st August 2018

We respond to the PHCAAC numbered comments as follows.

1. To our knowledge the PHCAAC do not support a basement applications, in principle, and so we did not seek a pre-application discussion on this application.
2. The basement proposal has been the subject of a detailed Pre-Application Consultation and also has acknowledged all the reasons for refusal/dismissal of application 2017/2819/P. To be clear it only contemplates a lateral extension to the existing lower ground floor/basement and does not contemplate any extension underneath that.
3. Yes, the property is recognised as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal, however, does not impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area as it below ground and not visible from the wider area.
4. The extension complies with **all** the criteria of the Local Plan Policy A5. To avoid unnecessary repetition I would invite the PHCAAC to read the combined Design and Access Statement & Planning and Heritage Statement. This document systematically applies each criteria to the proposal to ensure that the proposal complies. This process has had the benefit of the pre-application consultation process through out.
5. Specifically, as is clear from Appendix B of the combined Design and Access Statement & Planning and Heritage Statement the proposal does not exceed 50% of the front, side or rear garden. (Please note that the boundary wall sits within the ownership of the property and that the property boundary is therefore the external face of this wall.)
6. We disagree with the PHCAAC claim that *“a number of existing trees would be lost”*. The number of trees at the property is actually to be increased as a further mature tree is proposed in the front lightwell. Three small trees of *“low value”* are proposed to be removed to facilitate the works and would be replaced like for like. Camden Tree Officers *“agree that these trees are of low amenity value and can be classified as category C, and that similar replacements would be acceptable”*. We also clarify that the basement extension will have the requisite 1000mm of planting zone above to enable any future flexible use above as a garden.
7. The PHCAAC refers to the Planning Inspector dismissal of the recent Appeal on this property (APP/X5210/W/18/3192767). The dismissed proposal was for a two-storey basement, with a far greater volume and area, to the current proposal so we are unclear as to why that same ruling is relevant to this more modest proposal. The proposal to lower the existing lower ground floor level by 430mm to create a 3m floor to ceiling height would increase the amenity value of these rooms;

increase the daylight into these rooms and would have no visible impact upon the conservation area.

8. We confirm that as part of this planning application process the BIA will need to be independently verified to which we are agreed.
9. We also confirm that as part of this planning application process the CMP will need to be confirmed and agreed.

A copy of this response has been sent to Elaine Quigley, the application's Planning Officer, and to Richard Simpson, Chairman of the PHCAAC.

We trust these comments are of assistance.

Yours faithfully

Humphrey Kelsey
13th August 2018