

Planning Statement

42 Elsworthy Road, Primrose Hill, NW3
3DL

January 2019

Prepared by William Kumar MRTPI

Five Development Consultancy LLP

5DC

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared on behalf of Mr and Mrs Austin ('the applicant'), to provide an assessment of the proposed scheme of works for the reconfiguration, extension and various alterations to no. 42 Elsworthy Road ('the Site'), an unlisted building located within Elsworthy Road Conservation Area.
- 1.2 The scheme represents an opportunity for a development of significant design quality without the commercial constraints that often impinge on delivery of excellent architecture, sustainable design and creative spaces. The applicant is passionate about delivering a space in which his family can grow and live, but also to deliver something that will preserve and enhance the Conservation Area through high quality design, materials and form.
- 1.3 Marek Wojciechowski (MW) architects are award winning architects who have worked extensively within Camden and they have been specially commissioned with a brief to deliver a functional living space coupled with elegant modern design which respects and responds to the existing house and surrounding area, whilst maintaining the provision of 3 dwellings on site.
- 1.4 This statement should be read in conjunction with the MW Design and Access Statement document, submitted with this statement the 'DAS'. This document contains the introduction and story as to how we arrived at the proposed design, including design proposals in the form of drawings and visuals and how we have sought to respond to pre-application feedback. These documents should be considered in conjunction with the plans and reports submitted as part of this planning application as set out in Appendix 1.

2. The Site

- 2.1 A more detailed overview of 42 Elsworthy Road and the context in which it sits can be found in the DAS. Essentially the site forms a detached house over 6 storeys, lower ground, ground, first, second, third and loft. The site currently consists of 3 self-contained residential flats/maisonettes which are awkwardly arranged. The current configuration and appearance of the site has been a result of a number of ad hoc internal and external alterations over the previous years which is covered in the planning history section below.
- 2.2 The front of the house is currently paved with standard flag paving stones and on the western flank there is an unsightly garage door which protrudes forward. There are various plants and Wysteria growing across the property. The main stairwell is positioned almost in the centre of the building with a rather industrial balustrade detail, again, which detracts from the appearance of the house. The eastern flank facing the street has a tired appearance and is largely obscured from any view by the large tree which exists in the front of the site. The existing side extension to the west of the property, forms a poorly design and visually uninteresting two storey brick addition.
- 2.3 The eastern flank is not really visible from any vantage points within the Conservation Area given its close relationship with the adjoining property. In general, the western flank is not clearly visible on Elsworthy Road due to the dense foliage, shrubbery and trees on the garden. However, as you turn the corner onto Lower Merton Rise it is more prominent and the timber and brick single storey additions behind can be clearly seen. These elements are not considered to contribute to the Conservation Area, in fact they detract from the setting and appearance of the house, there is no cohesive form between the various additions.
- 2.4 The southern side of the site consists of the rear façade of the house, forming a vertical bay window formation, with the eastern flank being flush. Again, this viewpoint is largely obscured by existing foliage and trees on the boundary of the garden. The garden to the rear and western side is relatively large and goes against the grain and plot ratios of other dwellings along the street to the east, especially as it occupies such a prominent corner plot.
- 2.5 The applicant is now in a position of ownership to deliver a comprehensive scheme which would regularise the configuration of the existing units and deliver the original intention of the building, being a prominent residential dwelling, using a high quality extension design to re-instate the original massing of the building along the western side elevation.

3. Planning History

- 3.1 The site was constructed prior to the Town and Country Planning Act coming into force in 1947 and would have originally been built and occupied as a single residential dwelling house. There are no records on Camden's planning website which relate to the conversion of the original single dwelling into multiple dwellings. Apart from the works to convert 2 self-contained flats into a single unit (see below) there is no other relevant planning history.
- 3.2 Planning permission was granted on 5 July 2011 (LPA Ref: 2011/2793/P) for: *'Conversion of 3 x self-contained flats into single unit (Class C3) and alterations including installation of roof light to rear elevation'*. This application effectively altered the building from being arranged as 4 self-contained flats into 3 self-contained flats. A subsequent application was then approved on 28 November 2011 for alterations for the amalgamated maisonette including the provision of a roof terrace, skylights etc (LPA Ref: 2011/5940/P).
- 3.3 The July 2011 permission has been implemented.
- 3.4 A TPO approval was also consented (2017/2568/T - (TPO REF C1165)) on 13/07/2017, to fell 2 x False Acacias.

4. Proposed Scheme

- 4.1 The proposed scheme seeks to demolish the existing latter extension on the western elevation and replace with a part one part two storey side extension. The extension seeks to provide a solid detailed brick base at ground floor level, which acts as a plinth giving way to the first floor. The upper level is formed of a lightweight timber framed structure, which joins the host building via a glazed link to delineate old from new. The combination of the two materials seeks to soften the appearance of the extension but without losing the integral feel of solidity that the host building provides.
- 4.2 The extension would present a much more subsidiary appearance from Elsworthy Road, reading as a single, less dominant element which is set back some 3m more than the existing arrangement of a former protruding ugly garage. The return side of the elevation facing onto Lower Merton Rise, provides a more active and stimulating design, creating a positive symmetry of the existing side elevation.
- 4.3 The rear of the eastern wing would be reconstructed and effectively infilled whilst retaining the main elements of the façade facing Elsworthy Road. In addition, the provision of a basement floor under the existing lower ground level of the house is to be provided, with associated lightwells. The proposed basement would not extend out beyond the original rear building line. The basement lightwells are provided for at front and rear with the front lightwell being of shallow depth, following the angles of the bay window and being set back from the street, resulting in minimal if any impact on the street scene.
- 4.4 The building to plot ratio as a result of the extension does not alter materially, and the western extensions have been rationalised and reduced in terms of footprint and pulled back further from the main host building elevation.
- 4.5 The internal area of the building would be reconfigured to provide for 2 bed home in the eastern wing with the main central and western wings of the building providing for a 4+ bed house. The flat in the eastern wing is a generously sized 2 bed home and is in accordance with London Plan standards. Both units benefit from large private gardens to the rear. Both the units are accessed from the front garden via the existing and a proposed new return stairwell.
- 4.6 The main existing façades of the house are largely unaltered to the rear and front of the house, with some minor fenestration alterations on the western side providing a more organised and rational approach to this elevation, referencing the likely original configuration.
- 4.7 The amount of soft landscaping has increased by 5% in terms of land area and the areas of hardstanding have been significantly reduced by 72 sq m in area.
- 4.8 Further information and description of the proposed scheme is included in the DAS and Heritage Report.

5. Planning Policy

- 5.1 This section gives a brief overview of the relevant National, Regional and Local Planning Policies against which this planning application should be assessed.

Revised National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

- 5.2 The NPPF was recently published and sets out the overarching national planning framework under which local and regional plans should sit. The policies provided are generally more on a strategic level and do not specifically deal with householder extensions and conversions. However guidance is given to ensure good design is achieved alongside social, environmental and economic improvements to be captured through the planning system.

London Plan

- 5.3 Policy 7.4 requires development to have regard to the form, function and structure of an area and that it should improve an areas visual or physical connection with natural features. Regard should be had to scale, proportion and mass of existing spaces and is informed by the surrounding economic environment.
- 5.4 Policy 7.6 requires buildings to be of the highest architectural quality, with details and materials that complement but not necessarily replicate the local architectural character and that do not cause any harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings.

Camden Local Plan 2017

- 5.5 The Camden Local Plan sets out the Council's planning policies and replaces the Core Strategy and Development Policies planning documents (adopted in 2010).
- 5.6 ***Policy G1 Delivery and location of growth*** The council will seek to deliver growth by securing high quality development and supporting proposals that makes the best use of the site in terms of design, sustainability, amenity and heritage.
- 5.7 ***Policy H1 Maximising housing supply*** Housing is the priority land use within the borough.
- 5.8 ***Policy H3 Protecting Existing Homes*** The council will resist development that would involve the net loss of two or more homes.
- 5.9 ***Policy H7*** Sets out the aims of the council in terms of housing supply. The policy outlines that a flexible approach is to be taken having regard to the character of the development, the site and area.
- 5.10 ***Policy D1 Design*** High quality design will be sought that respects the local context and character and preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets. Details and materials are to be of high quality and complement the local character as well high quality landscape design and outdoor amenity space.

- 5.11 ***Policy D2 Heritage*** Loss of or substantial harm to a designated heritage asset will not be permitted. Development is required to preserve or where possible, enhance the character or appearance of the area and to preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character and appearance of a conservation area.
- 5.12 ***Policy A1 Managing the impact of development*** Seeks to protect quality of life of occupiers and neighbours and will ensure that their amenity is protected.
- 5.13 ***A4 Noise and vibration*** Planning permission will not be granted for development likely to generate unacceptable noise and vibration impacts
- 5.14 ***Policy A5 Basements Basement*** development will only be permitted where the proposal would not cause harm to neighbouring properties; structural/ground/water conditions of the area; character and amenity of the area and the significance of heritage assets. The council requires assessment of the scheme's impact on drainage, flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability in the form of a Basement Impact Assessment. The policy sets out more detailed criteria on the criteria for size and siting of basement development.
- 5.15 ***Policy T2 Parking and Car-Free Development*** All new developments are expected to be car-free. 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.
- 5.16 ***Policy T3 Transport infrastructure*** Seeks to obtain improvements in transport infrastructure.
- 5.17 ***Policy CC2 Adapting to climate change*** Development is to be resilient to climate change and should adopt appropriate adaption measures such as protecting green spaces, not increasing surface water run off and demonstrating sustainable development principles.

Camden Planning Guidance

- 5.18 Camden planning guidance provides further more detailed information to support existing policies, those relevant to this scheme are:
- CPG 1 – Design 2015 (Updated March 2018)***
- 5.19 The Guidance provides further design policy covering a range of topics including housing and amenity. More detailed guidance is provided in relation to side extensions, in general they should be:
- 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;
 - respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks;

- respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space;
- not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;
- allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden; and
- retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area.

5.20 Specifically side extension should be no taller than the porch and set back from the main building.

CPG Basements (March 2018)

5.21 The guidance gives detailed advice on how the planning policies relating to basement development will be applied. It is noted within the CPG that basements should not comprise of more than one storey, being between 3-4 metres, however a proportion of the basement will be allowed to be deeper to provide for a swimming pool subject to the usual criteria. The proposed basement development must not exceed 50% of each garden within the property and be less than 1.5 times the footprint of the host property and no more than half the width of the host building footprint into the rear.

5.22 New lightwells shall be discreet and not harm the architectural character of the host building.

CPG 7 – Transport 2011

5.23 This guidance provides information on all types of detailed transport issues.

CPG 8 – Planning Obligations (July 2015 updated March 2018)

5.24 Most of this guidance is related to larger schemes where S106 contributions are required. However, the guidance sets out how the Council will seek to use legal agreements to make development car free or car capped, limiting the number of new residents being able to obtain on-street parking permits.

Conservation Area

5.25 Elsworthy Road CAAMS states in para 12.6 that alterations and extensions to existing buildings should be carefully considered, be subsidiary to the existing building and not detract from its character by becoming over-dominant. It goes on to state in para 12.7 that:

“where alterations and extensions of a sympathetic scale are appropriate, attention to detail and an imitative, historicist approach are to be encouraged without allowing pastiches of historical features that may reflect current tastes, but are less appropriate to the style and detailing of the original building.”

- 5.26 At the end of the row, No 42 is a single detached house built in 1880 in a dark brick. The house occupies a large plot, on which Nos 2 and 4 Lower Merton Rise were built in the late 20th century. No 42 shares a similar scale to No 25 Elsworthy Road, situated diagonally opposite. Built by the architects Batterbury and Huxley prior to Willett's developments, it is marked by contrasting red brick and painted stucco. These two properties form part of Sub-Area 2, because they adhere to the formal Victorian style of this area rather than to the looser Free Style of Willett's houses.
- 5.27 The sub area is therefore defined as an eclectic mix of foreign architectural influence and traditional Victorian character. The streetscape is well managed with set back frontages. The site at the corner of Lower Merton Rise, presents a juncture from the eastern streetscape which is more uniform and dense, consisting of more terrace housing, to the western streetscape which is characterised by larger houses on large plots, which different design styles.

6. Planning Assessment

- 6.1 This section assesses the proposed scheme in accordance with the development plan and any other relevant material considerations.
- 6.2 A pre-application process was undertaken with Camden Council. This involved a significant design evaluation process which sort to arrive at the current scheme through a number of design iterations. The submitted scheme seeks to address all comments set out the pre-application response letter dated 6 February 2018 (see Appendix 2). More detailed information about the design amendments in response to the letter are set out in the Marek Wojciechowski Architects Design and Access Statement.
- 6.3 The main issues to consider as part of this application are set out in the pre-app response and are replicated below.

Principle of Development

Principle of Basement Development

- 6.4 A Basement Impact Assessment is submitted with the proposed application and the report is written in accordance with relevant guidance and policy. The report conclusions set out that there would be no adverse basement impact relating to groundwater flow, surface water flooding, underground tunnels or any other technical issues as a result of the proposed scheme.
- 6.5 The proposed basement excavation has an area of 277sqm and extends almost exclusively underneath the main host building which has an area of 220sqm. This is less than 1.5 times the footprint of the host building, the basement is one storey and does not extend into the garden further than 50% of the depth of the host building (measured from the principal rear elevation).
- 6.6 The basement accommodates no habitable rooms for the main host building. It does include a pool and associated plant room, for which we have submitted a Noise and Vibration Assessment, to assess its impact in line with policies A1 and A4. The submitted EMTEC Noise Survey presents recommendations which the applicant is willing to implement as part of the scheme and be conditioned as part of any planning permission.
- 6.7 The 2bed mainsonette includes 2 habitable rooms (bedrooms) on the basement level, however the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and therefore the area is not prone to flooding.
- 6.8 The lightwells are of an appropriate depth and are concealed by planters and grills where possible.

Principle of Side Storey Extension

- 6.9 As referred to above, there were a number of design iterations undertaken prior to submitting the application. The proposed design seeks to re-instate the character and

massing of the original building without dominating the host building. It seeks to do that with the solid brick base revealing into a softer more lightweight timber/glazed structure, which is set back from the host building and sits below the height of the porch in accordance with the Design CPG.

- 6.10 The concept provides curious form and refinement which responds in a novel way to the host building. This side elevation with its 3 pitches of triangular wooden hoods responds positively to the side elevation, picking up symmetry of the original host building chimney breasts. The front elevation with its recessed mass and flat chamfered roof responds well to the host building when seen from the front and does not dominate or compete.
- 6.11 The scheme is considered to be a thoughtful and sensitive response to the host building which fits in well to its contextual surroundings and addresses the large garden more sensitively. The design has been well tested and has had a thorough process of evaluation and repositioning along the way. On this basis, the proposed scheme is considered acceptable in principle by way of design.

Impact on Trees and Vegetation

- 6.12 A Tree Report has been submitted with the planning application which assesses the impact on trees and vegetation. The scheme would necessitate the removal of five trees. One of these trees is considered dangerous and low value (Category U) and removal is needed for safety reasons, a further 3 trees are categorised as C1 being of not particular merit. One of the five trees is a B category tree, which are good trees with a slightly poorer form than a category A tree. It is proposed that the replacement tree planting and landscaping would more than mitigate for this tree's loss.
- 6.13 The report also sets out appropriate method statements and procedures for the protection of trees during the construction process, in order that there is minimal (if any) impact on the existing mature trees as a result of the basement. Further information on the landscape strategy is provided within the design and access statement, however the amount of hardstanding reduces significantly compared to the existing position.

Infill Side Extension

- 6.14 The extension would be similar in height, bulk and scale to the existing and would retain the two separate structures as existing to include an internal lightwell to serve the rooms at lower ground and basement levels.
- 6.15 The existing side extension is slightly set back from the main front elevation of the building, and the proposal retains this position. The detailed design and materials of this extension would match the host building, and this element is therefore considered acceptable.

Quality of Residential Accommodation

- 6.16 The existing site provides for a large one bedroom flat, a 3 bedroom flat and a 5 bedroom flat. The proposed scheme will seek to deliver a 2 bed unit and a 4+ bed unit. The scheme would therefore lose the one bed unit which is not considered a priority

dwelling size. The proposed mix is therefore considered acceptable in line with the dwelling priorities set out in policy H7 which advocates a flexible approach.

- 6.17 The application is accompanied by a Daylight study which demonstrates that all habitable rooms have adequate light. Both proposed dwellings are in accordance with London Plan standards in terms of room and dwelling size. Both dwellings would benefit from dual aspect elevations. Furthermore, both dwellings will benefit from enhanced outdoor amenity space by virtue of the rear garden provision for both units, where as previously only the lower ground floor benefitted.
- 6.18 A noise report has been submitted which sets out the acceptable levels for a noise as a result of the basement plant. The proposed development would accord with these findings.

Neighbouring Amenity

- 6.19 The proposed development is not considered to have any impact on neighbouring residences. The infill side extension retains the existing mass and height and does not proposed any additional windows to the façade. Therefore there is no impact on overlooking, daylight / sunlight or visual impact. The side extension is located a significant distance away from other residences. Again, on this basis – there is no impact on overlooking, daylight / sunlight or visual impact to the dwellings on Lower Merton Rise. The Basement Impact Assessment covers any issues relating to neighbouring properties as a result of any subterranean development.
- 6.20 In terms of noise and disturbance a draft Construction Management Plan and Construction Traffic Management Plan will be submitted as part of the planning application. It is proposed to submit a full and detailed plan, once a contractor has been appointed, via a Section 106 legal agreement mechanism subject to planning being granted. Aside from construction there would be no other noise impacts resulting from the scheme over and above the existing situation of the building being in residential use.

Transport and Highways

- 6.21 The proposed development will be car free in line with Policy T2 and any future occupants would not be entitled to apply for off street proposes to retain the off-site parking space. It is anticipated that the current occupier would return to site and on this basis the off street parking space is to be retained.
- 6.22 Cycle parking is provided on site, with sheltered accommodation, in accordance with the requirements of Policy T2.

Impact on Conservation Area

- 6.23 The site is an unlisted building located within Elsworthy Road Conservation Area. An assessment of the heritage impact has been undertaken by Architectural History Practice in the enclosed Heritage Report. The site falls within Sub-Area 2: King Henrys' Road, where the principal building of interest is the grade II listed Church of St Mary the Virgin.

- 6.24 The property has been subject to a range of alterations over time. The proposed scheme presents an opportunity to reinstate the original historic side extension massing as well as regularising the appearance of the building as a single dwelling house by removing the second entrance in the existing annex extension. The replacement design would complement the vernacular of foreign and Victorian architecture in the street scene and this aspect of the proposals will enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Other alterations to the front of the house and better quality hard landscaping will also improve the design and appearance of the area.
- 6.25 The extension will also improve the ancillary relationship between the existing side extension and the house, which currently competes, as it is not set back and the garage element protrudes in front of the building line. The adopted design provides a contemporary approach, whilst utilising traditional materials, reinforcing a distinction between the original properties and the later addition. This is considered to be an appropriate approach. The existing landscaping, trees and shrubbery on the corner of the Elsworthy and Lower Merton Rise provide a significant screen in so much as the extended low rise elements to the side are not seen from the long views.
- 6.26 A contemporary approach has been adopted to the proposed extension and re-modelling of the lower floors. Contemporary extensions at the rear/side of traditional properties are well-established in this part of the conservation area and will have a very limited impact upon the interest of the building and are, overall, considered to be consistent with its contribution to the significance of the conservation area. The proposed changes to the fenestration are consistent with the uniformity of the Victorian style and are considered acceptable when viewed in context with the proposed side extension.
- 6.27 The application proposals will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

7. Summary

- 7.1 It is our professional view that the proposals comply with the development plan and that the material benefits of the scheme, in terms of the high quality design, improvements to the Conservation Area and improved living space, would also ensure that the developed should be approved.
- 7.2 The applicant has engaged early in the design process with Camden, and local residents, in order to develop the scheme so that it is of a high design standard and has been tested through a number of design iterations. The result is a scheme that would enhance the conservation area and will improve the visual appearance of the host building.
- 7.3 There are no adverse amenity impacts as a result of the scheme and any impacts during the construction phase are covered in the relevant Construction Management Plans.
- 7.4 On the basis that all other aspects of the scheme comply with the relevant Local Plan policies, planning permission should be granted without delay.

Appendix 1 – Submitted Plans and Reports forming the Planning Application

- (i) 16092 Design and Access Statement prepared by Marek Wojciechowski Architects (October 2018)
- (ii) 172843 Structural Engineers Method Statement prepared by Form (including Basement Impact Assessment at Appendix 1 prepared by Create).
- (iii) M&E
- (iv) Noise Impact Report prepared by Emtec QF9166/PF6268/RP1 (September 2018)
- (v) Heritage Statement prepared by Architectural History Practice (October 2018)
- (vi) Tree Impact Report prepared by John Cromar Arboricultural Company 1-38-4325/2 (September 2018)
- (vii) Daylight and Sunlight Report prepared by Malcolm Hollis 61680/16/SJP/SMM (October 2018)
- (viii) Draft Construction Management Plan prepared by RPS JCG23900 (July 2018).

Drg. No.	Title
D_01	Demolition Ground Floor Plan
D_02	Demolition Lower Ground Floor Plan
D_03	Demolition Basement Plan
D_04	Demolition First Floor Plan
D_05	Demolition Second Floor Plan
D_06	Demolition Third Floor Plan
D_07	Demolition Roof Plan

P_01	Proposed Ground Floor Plan
P_02	Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan
P_03	Proposed Basement Plan
P_04	Proposed First Floor Plan
P_05	Proposed Second Floor Plan
P_06	Proposed Third Floor Plan
P_07	Proposed Roof Plan

P_09	Demolition and Proposed Southeast Elevation
P_10	Demolition and Proposed Southeast Street Elevation
P_11	Demolition and Proposed Southwest (Side) Elevation
P_12	Demolition and Proposed Northwest Elevation
P_13	Demolition and Proposed Northeast Elevation
P_16	Demolition and Proposed Section C-C
P_19	Demolition and Proposed Section F-F
P_20	Demolition and Proposed Northeast Elevation Section

Appendix 2 – Pre-Application (Ref: 2017/4340/PRE) Response Letter



Date: 06/02/2018
Our ref: 2017/4340/PRE
Contact: Nora Constantinescu
Direct line: 020 7974 5758
Email: nora-andreea.constantinescu@camden.gov.uk

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

42 Elsworthy Road
London
NW3 3DL
Dear Mr. William Kumar

www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Re: Erection of two-storey side extension following demolition of existing extensions, creation of a basement and lightwells to front and rear, infill side extension, reconfiguration of existing 3 residential units, and alterations to front boundary wall.

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry which was received on 10.07.2017 together with the required fee of £3,654.00 which was received on the 03.08.2017. This advice is formulated based on the information submitted, previous planning history and site meeting at the application site.

1. Drawings and documents

1.1 The following documentation was submitted in support of the pre-application request:

- Pre-planning 10th July 2017: Section five - Appendixes A, B, C, D
- Pre-planning Rev A: 20th December 2017
- Pre-planning Rev A: 7th February 2018

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
- Two storey side extension on west side
- Infill extension on north-east side
- Reconfiguration of existing 3 residential units

2.3 Various options have been submitted in relation to the design of the proposed two-storey side extension on the west side, which have been discussed as part of the

Internal Design Review Panel with designers, conservation and planning officers. The current written advice refers to the latest revisions.

3. Site description

- 3.1 The application site is a five storey detached building with rooms at the lower ground floor and attic, located on the northern side of Elsworthy Road. The site lies within Elsworthy Conservation Area. . The property is identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area as well as nos. 28-42 (consec), and 44-68 (consec). The Elsworthy Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAAMS) details that *“No 42 is a single detached house built in 1880 in a dark brick. The house occupies a large plot, on which Nos 2 and 4 Lower Merton Rise were built in the late 20th century. No 42 shares a similar scale to No 25 Elsworthy Road, situated diagonally opposite. Built by the architects Betterbury and Huxley prior to Willett’s developments, it is marked by contrasting red brick and painted stucco. These two properties form part of Sub-Area 2, because they adhere to the formal Victorian style of this area rather than the to the looser Free Style of Willett’s houses.”*
- 3.2 The application site comprises a corner plot building with a large and leafy garden which contributes positively to the setting of the application building, the streetscene and wider conservation area. The garden includes several trees, shrubs and bushes as well as a tree which is covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) – a Mature Plane located on the corner side with Lower Merton Rise. Another two trees located in the front garden (2 x False Acacias) have been deemed acceptable to be removed due to the damage cause to the host building and adjacent one.
- 3.3 The historic plans submitted within the Design and Access Statement accompanying this proposal show the building being extended to the west since 1890’s, which has been altered through time as shown in 1930, 1970 and 1980’s maps. Currently the existing side extension comprises part two-storey, part single-storey elements which includes a garage at the ground floor level, and habitable accommodation above and to the rear.
- 3.4 The site has been divided into 3 self-contained flats as described within the site description of planning application 2011/5940/P. The planning statement provided with the current pre-application states that the building is still divided into 3 flats, however Council Tax records show solely two units. In the event of a future planning application, clarification shall be provided in relation to the existing division.

4. Relevant planning history

- 4.1 The following planning history is relevant for the application site:
- 2011/2793/P - Conversion of 2x self contained flats into single unit (Class C3) and alterations including installation of roof light to rear elevation. – Granted 05/08/2011

- 2011/5940/P - Alterations to a 3-storey maisonette including the installation at roof level of 2 additional rooflights to west flank elevation, 1 to the north rear elevation and 1 to the east flank elevation. The replacement of a window with French doors at first floor level on the east elevation to gain access to new roof terrace. – Granted 18/01/2012
- 2017/2568/T - (TPO REF C1165) SIDE GARDEN: 2 x False Acacias – Fell – Approved works 13/07/2017.

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 H1 Maximising housing supply
Policy D1 Design
Policy D2 Heritage
Policy A1 Managing the impact of development
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
- **Elsworthy Road Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2009)**

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;
- Basement and lower ground floor excavation design;
- Extensions design
- Impact on trees and vegetation;
- Quality of residential accommodation;
- Amenity (impact on neighbouring occupiers);
- 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 construct a 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 CGP4 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.

The submitted BIA will be required to 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.

6.4 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 applied 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

Basement and lower ground floor excavation design

6.5 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.

6.6 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 extend 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 to not extend beyond the footprint of the original dwelling.

6.7 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, 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.

6.8 The plan form and the hierarchy of spaces within the host building starts at the upper level, as the main entrance indicates. Seen from front elevation, the building appears to have a lower ground floor level, which slopes gradually towards the rear to the same level as the garden level, referred to in the documentation provided as ground floor. The basement excavation would result in a basement floor level, lower ground and ground floor level.

6.9 The proposed basement excavation would have an area of 277sqm and would extend mainly underneath the host main building including its extensions with an area of 220sqm, which is less than 1.5 times the footprint of the host building. It would include one storey and would not extend into the garden further than 50% of the depth of the host building when measured from the principal rear elevation. It is advised that any lightwells that abuts the boundary with No. 40 Elsworthy Road should be set in form the boundary in line with policy A5. The excavation should avoid loss of garden space or trees of townscape of amenity value.

6.10 The basement would accommodate non habitable spaces in relation to Unit 1 and the Unit 3. The basement plan also shows a pool and associated plant room. In the event of a future planning application, the plant room has to be accompanied by a Noise and Vibration Assessment in order to assess its impact in line with policies A1 and A4. Furthermore, as the basement includes habitable rooms for Unit 3, in line with policy A5, it would have to be demonstrated to the council's satisfaction that the proposed unit does not extend in an area prone to flooding.

6.11 The external manifestations of the basement are two lightwells to the front elevation, one to the rear and one to the east side of the building part of the infill extension. The proposed main front lightwell would have a depth of 2m and a width of 5m adjacent to the main staircase. The second front lightwell would have depth of 1m and a width of 2.4m, the middle one a depth of 3m and width of 1.4m, and the rear lightwell a depth of 1m and width of 2.63m.

6.12 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". It is noted that along the street there are some buildings that have front lightwells, however it does not appear that this type of feature is part of the prevailing character. As such, it is advised that the size of the main front lightwell being in such a prominent location should be reduced in depth and follow the angles of the bay window, in order to reduce its impact on the front elevation and streetscene. The other lightwells due to their proposed dimensions appear subordinate and would be less visible from the streetscene.

6.13 Furthermore, it is unclear from the drawings submitted if the lightwells are enclosed with glazing or open to be enclosed by metal grilles. It is advised that, careful consideration should be given to the lightwells' design as these can significantly impact the appearance and character of the building. You are advised that railings around lightwells in the front of the property are unlikely to be supported. It is suggested that lightwells that are enclosed with metal grilles would be more appropriate for the main front lightwell, whilst the others can be bordered by landscaping and planting.

Two-storey side extension on west side

6.14 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.

6.15 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.

6.16 CPG1 highlights that 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. Specifically to side extensions it states that they should be no taller than the porch and be set back from the main building.

6.17 Elsworthy Road CAAMS states in para 12.6 that alterations and extensions to existing buildings should be carefully considered, be subsidiary to the existing building and not detract from its character by becoming over-dominant. It goes on to state in para 12.7 that *"where alterations and extensions of a sympathetic scale are appropriate, attention to detail and an imitative, historicist approach are to be encouraged without allowing pastiches of historical features that may reflect current tastes, but are less appropriate to the style and detailing of the original building."*

6.18 The design of the side extension has been amended several times to respond to the Officer's concerns. The current pre-app response would relate mainly to the two latest revisions, referred to as first and second revision.

6.19 The Design and Access Statement provided highlights that the host building has been extended shortly after it was built with an extension up to 9m in height, with 10-12m deep and 5.5m wide, with a largely solid base of 3m height, glazed roof of 3.5m rising to 5.4m. Historic maps indicate that after 1970 the original extension has been replaced with 3 separated smaller ones, as existing. The concept design of the first revision is based on the precedent of this original structure, with a heavy brick base and lightweight top through thin still frame fixed permanent louvers, considered by the applicant to be a modern interpretation of the original extension.

6.20 The extension would have a width of 7m and be set in from the host building's front main elevations by 1.1m, and 1.4m from the rear one. The extension would have a brick base of 4m high on the side elevation and 3.2m to the front, with a lightweight metal top of 3.66m high, with an overall height of 7.2m. The proposed extension would be formed by three symmetrical triangular shapes on the side elevation and two to the front, which together result in a dynamic roof form.

6.21 The concept design of this revision proposes an interesting shape and detailing which it is considered to respond in an original way to the host building. The shape and form of the extension appears to respond positively to the existing side elevation, with tall brick base to support three gabled structures over triangular bays which would sit symmetrically in relation to the existing chimneys breasts, making reference to the original extension. However, when seen from the front the symmetry of the two triangular elements combined with a large width (almost the same as the main house) appears out of context with the host front elevation, streetscene and corner plot. Furthermore, due to the proposed extended use of metal, the extension appears rigid, cold and out of character with the host building and wider area. It is therefore suggested that the width of the extension should be reduced, combined with an asymmetrical top projection, which would better articulate the upper level with the main building, to include softer materials such as timber which is acknowledged in the Conservation Area CAAMS as being characteristic for the area.

6.22 It is noted that the first revision would not include external extensions of the lower ground floor level towards the existing TPO.

6.23 The second revision presents a lower extension in height, which follows a similar approach as the first one in terms of having a heavy brick base measuring 7.3m in width, 5m high to front elevation and 6.5m to the side, and the top significantly smaller in height up to 2.4m, set in from the facades of the base. The extension would have a flat roof with an overall height of 6.6m measured from the ground floor at the side and 5.5m measured from the front. As seen from the front, the high brick base with the repetition of three elements appear to be well articulated with the host building, and responds to its front elevation characteristics. However, the proposed width still dominates proportionally the host building and it is suggested that this be revised to be reduced. The repetition of the squared forth elements with flat roof at the upper level does not appear to be well integrated with the building's existing side elevation. As such, it is suggested that the form of the proposed front elevation should be retained and the side elevation should be revised to integrate elements from the first revision, with gables over each of the bays of the flank. It is considered that a combination of the two roof forms of the first and second revisions would result in an interesting collective form.

6.24 The extension appears to sit on a wide hard surface which steps down from the garden, surrounded by planters. Please see assessment below in relation to the impact on trees and vegetation.

Impact on trees and vegetation

6.25 Currently the building benefits from hard standing at the front, side and rear which terminates towards the west and rear with trees and vegetation including the Plane Mature tree (T4) that is covered by a TPO. The pre-app submission includes a letter from an arboricultural consultant which states that any excavation beyond the existing footprint of the building would be detrimental to the survival of the protected tree. It also highlights that a floating structure would not cause harm to the root protection area subject to further details.

6.26 Whilst it is acknowledged that the suggested root protection area of the TPO is based on a well established formula, it is possible that, considering the close proximity of the tree to the boundary wall and street pavement, it is likely that roots would have migrated towards the more hospitable environment such as the garden.

6.27 Furthermore, the current revision indicates alterations to the ground levels at the lower ground floor level, to the front, side and rear of the building to provide hard standing, with steps and planters up into the garden. These alterations appear to include digging down from the existing garden level and would encroach on the TPO's root protection area. It is therefore advised that in order to establish an accurate root protection area, in the event of a future planning application, trial pits should be dug prior to the submission of any application and should inform the findings and conclusions of the accompanying Arboricultural report.

6.28 You are also encouraged to give more thought to the integration of the hard and soft landscaping surrounding the proposed extension and its successful integration with the existing garden space, as required by policies D1 and D2.

6.29 The proposal includes a car lift in front of the building which replaces a significant section of grassed area, which appears to extend from the ground floor to the lower ground floor level. It is considered that the level of detail provided in relation to this proposed alteration is limited in order to assess its impact on the host building, streetscene and wider area.. It is highlighted however, that the existing greenery in the front garden forms part of the character of building and contributes positively to the streetscene and wider area. You are advised that this element of the scheme would not be supported should an application be submitted which includes the removal of a grassed area and replacement with hardstanding in the front garden.

6.30 It is noted that under tree works application 2017/2568/T it has been confirmed that the 2 x False Acacias cause significant harm the structural stability of the host building and adjacent one and their removal was considered acceptable. A condition was attached to the tree application permission for a new tree to be planted within 5m of the removed tree unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local authority. You are encourage to include details for this new tree in the event of a future planning application. .

Infill side extension to north-east

6.31 The proposed side extension on the north-east side would replace the existing two storey structures which extend at the ground floor and upper floor levels. The extension would be similar in height, bulk and scale to the existing, would retain the two separate structure as existing to include an internal lightwell to serve the rooms at lower ground and basement levels.

6.32 The existing side extension is slightly set back from the main front elevation of the building, and the proposal would retain this position. The detailed design and materials of this extension would match the host building, and due to its size, scale and bulk is considered subservient to the main building and would preserve its character and appearance. This element of the scheme is considered acceptable. .

Quality of residential accommodation

6.27 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 of 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.

6.28 It is unclear from the documentation provided what the current arrangement of the 3 units within the existing building. In order to determine the acceptability of the proposed reorganisation, a more coherent existing floor plans should be provided in the event of a future planning application. The proposed scheme includes the provision of 2 x 2bedroom self-contained flats and 1 x 5 bedroom unit.

6.28 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 Space Standards 1bed 2 person flats should have a minimum GIA (gross internal area) of 50sqm. The proposal includes unit 3 with an area of 61sqm and unit 2 with an area of 50sqm, and therefore both would comply with the national standards.

6.33 In principle, the proposal to reconfigure the layout of the existing 3 units is in accordance with policies H1 and H3 of Camden Local Plan 2017. Policy H7 in the Dwelling Size Priority Table indicates that 1-bedroom flats and more than 4-bedroom units are lower market priority. Whilst it is unclear what the current layout of the existing units is within the host building, it is advised that careful consideration should be given to the units organisation as it should respond to community needs and provide 2-bedroom or 3-bedroom flats which have a high market priority, or includes a mix of large and small homes, in line with policy H7. Please note that the Council will generally resist development proposals for self-contained general needs housing that contain only one-bedroom and studio flats.

Daylight/sunlight

6.34 The proposed 2 x 1 bedroom units would be located at the basement and lower ground floor levels, within the east side of the main building and infill extension. Both units would be served by two lightwells to the front and rear and another one in the middle, all extending on two levels. It is suggested that the proposed lightwells due to their location, proposed design and dimensions would not provide an adequate level of daylight and sunlight to the habitable rooms proposed at the basement and lower ground floor levels, and it is likely to result in substandard habitable accommodation. You are advised to reconsider the layout prior to the submission of any future planning application. The application should be supported by a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment to demonstrate that the flats receive adequate levels of daylight and sunlight.

6.35 The proposed 1 x 5 bedroom unit would be located at lower ground, ground, 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors. Due to the size of the unit, its dual aspect and number of windows that serve each of the habitable rooms it is considered that this flat would receive sufficient levels of daylight and sunlight.

Outlook

6.36 As in relation to daylight/sunlight, significant concerns are raised in relation to the outlook of the proposed 2x 1 bedroom units. From the information provided it appears that these units would have poor outlook which would result in poor quality of residential accommodation. The layout of the flats should be reconsidered prior to the submission of any future planning application, supported by detailed sections to show viewing angles through the windows/lightwells.

6.37 Due to its grand and wide expansion, there are no concerns in relation to the quality of accommodation for the proposed 1 x 5 bedroom unit in relation to outlook

6.38 It is suggested that a better level of accommodation would be achieved by combining the two flats proposed into one.

Noise

6.39 It is advised that you should consider noise transfer levels between the units as well as noise and vibration from the proposed plant room at the basement level. You might want to engage with noise consultants to ensure the noise and vibration would not affect the quality of accommodation proposed.

Other alterations

6.32 It is noted that the proposal includes alterations to the front boundary wall, to enlarge the front gate by removing a pillar which separates the vehicular access from the pedestrian access. Elsworth Road CAAMS states that "the boundary walls, gate posts and fencing whether in stone, wood or iron along the majority of frontages are an important facet of the character of the area overall and of the different sub-areas specifically. The Council will resist the loss of original boundary treatments and the iron and wooden elements and planted greenery associated with them where this forms part of the area's character." It is unclear at this stage if the pillars which form the vehicular and pedestrian access ways are part of the original boundary treatment. In the event of a

future planning application further information would be required to be submitted in order to justify any changes to the existing front boundary wall.

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.

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).

6.41 The nearest residential properties are located no. 40 Elsworthy Road and no. 2 Lower Merton Rise. Due to the existing pattern of development as well as the size, bulk, scale and detailed design, the proposed extensions are not considered to cause significant harm to the neighbouring amenity. 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

6.42 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 Camden Local Plan are met through requirements attached to individual development proposals.

6.43 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.

6.44 In relation to parking, the current situation on site has to be clarified in the event of future planning application. In line with policy T2, all new developments would be car-free. 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 be supported by affidavits from the occupiers. As such, the proposal includes provision of car-lift to accommodate two cars at the lower ground and ground floor levels. If the current

occupiers do not intend to return to the site, the provision of car lift would not be considered acceptable and contrary to policy T2.

6.45 In addition, you are advised that due to the close proximity of the proposed car lift to the public highway an application for Approval in Principle should be submitted to the Highways Authority, in the event the planning permission is granted. Details can be found [here](#).

6.46 In the event permission is granted the s106 agreement would secure car-free development to prevent additional pressure to the public highway in line with policy T2.

6.47 The reconfiguration of the units would require provision of cycling facilities in line with London Plan which includes 1 space per 1 bedroom unit and 2 spaces for all other units, which would give a requirement for 4 cycle parking spaces. In the event of a future planning application cycling provision should be provided in line with policy T1.

CIL

6.48 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 £19050 (381sqm x £50) for the Mayor's CIL and £190500 (381sqm x £500) for the Camden CIL.

Affordable housing

6.49 In line with policy H4 of Camden Local Plan 2017, affordable housing contribution would be required for all developments that provide one or more additional homes and involve a total addition to residential floorspace of 100sqm GIA or more. In the event of a future planning application you will need to confirm that the site is occupied by three authorised units. Otherwise, you should consider the policy requirements.

7 Conclusions

7.1 Based on the information received and the advice given, 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, location, detailed design, the basement extension, should comply with the requirements of policy A5 of Camden Local Plan. The impact of the basement works will be based on the findings in the BIA that will be independently verified by the Council's external auditor mainly determined by the Campbell Reith Audit's assessment of the BIA report to show to ensure that there would be no impact caused to the adjacent properties. As such, it is very important that the supporting documentation in the form of the BIA report to be prepared by professional bodies and address all the relevant issues involved in the construction of the basement.

7.3 The proposal puts forwards a comprehensive design approach in relation to the west side extension, and as discussed above, further consideration relating to the design which takes elements of both the first and second revisions could result in a characterful

and expressive extension which respects and enhances the character and appearance of the host building and conservation area.

7.4 Significant consideration should be given to the quality of accommodation proposed by Units 1 and 2 in relation to the levels of daylight/sunlight and outlook for the future occupiers. Confirmation shall be provided in relation to the existing occupancy and division of the building.

7.5 Careful consideration should be given to the extent of hardstanding being proposed and landscaping to the front and side of the building and extensions in order to ensure that the proposal would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposed car lift in front garden would not be supported in the event of a future planning application.

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 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed';
- Floor plans to show the current self-contained arrangement;
- Roof plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed';
- Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed';
- Section drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed';
- Design and Access Statement;
- The appropriate fee
- [Basement Impact Assessment](#);
- Noise and Vibration Assessment (advisable)
- Tree Survey/Arboricultural Statement
- Daylight/sunlight assessment;
- 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