



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

www.camden.gov.uk/planning

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

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

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. Elsworthy 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