



**Date: 23/07/2018**  
**Our ref: 2018/2606/PRE**  
**Contact: Stuart Clapham**  
**Direct line: 020 7974 3668**  
**Email: [Stuart.Clapham@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Stuart.Clapham@camden.gov.uk)**

Mr Raphael Lee  
*By email*

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

[www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

Dear Mr Lee,

**Re: 31 Minster Road – Single-storey rear extension and incorporation of garage space into residential accommodation**

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property which was received on 5<sup>th</sup> June, together with the required fee of £432.69 This pre-application response has been informed by a site visit undertaken on 26 June 2018, and the submitted drawings and documents provided by email.

**1. Drawings and documents**

- Pre Planning Statement
- Existing Drawings: EX100, EX110, EX120, EX130, EX140, EX200, EX210, EX300, EX310, EX320
- Proposed Drawings: PA002, PA100, PA110, PA120, PA130, PA140, PA200, PA210, PA220, PA300, PA310, PA320, PA330.

**2. Proposal**

Advice is sought on the acceptability of the reconstruction of an existing garage for use as habitable living space (including an element of basement development), and the erection of a rear extension to the host building which would connect the reconstructed garage to the host building (following demolition of the existing conservatory-style structure). The proposed scheme also includes the excavation of a lightwell to a basement level window on the side elevation.

**3. Site description**

The site contains a detached three-storey red-brick house located on the corner of Minster Road and Westbere Road. It is not listed and not located in a conservation area. The rear of the house has a conservatory in the garden at a split level between basement and ground floor level. To the rear of the garden is a single storey detached garage (accessed from Westbere Road). Its use is considered ancillary to the main dwelling house.

**4. Relevant planning history**

### ***Application site***

**2008/3524/P** Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of a single storey rear conservatory extension following the demolition of existing conservatory extension to single family dwellinghouse. **Certificate of Lawfulness issued 10/09/2008**

### ***Neighbouring properties***

46 Minster Road. **2009/4339/P**. Erection of a single storey extension at front of garage in association with conversion of the garage to a residential accommodation ancillary to the use of the existing ground floor flat (Class C3). **Planning permission granted 20/11/2009**

37 Minster Road. **2017/5917/P**. External alterations including erection of single storey rear extension at ground floor level, enlargement of existing roof with rear dormer window, installation of 2 x side dormer roof extensions and installation of timber cladding to rear façade. **Householder permission refused 29/03/2018.**

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed side and rear dormers and rear roof extension, by reason of their design, height, massing, scale and location, would represent incongruous additions to the host building and would be detrimental to its setting as viewed from the surrounding area, contrary to Policy D1 (Design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017).
2. The proposed timber cladding to the rear façade, by reason of its material and alien appearance, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and its setting as viewed from the surrounding area, contrary to Policy D1 (Design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017).

9 Minster Road. **2011/5211/P**. Erection of single storey ground floor rear extension and a gable end roof extension including x2 juliet balconys to the rear of existing single dwelling house (Class C3). **Householder planning application withdrawn 02/12/2011**

61 Minster Road. **2016/3088/P**. Erection of a single storey extension at ground floor level, following the demolition of existing conservatory and extension all associated with the rear elevation. **Householder permission granted 11/08/2016**

57 Minster Road. **2015/1505/P**. Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension (to replace existing), infill central roof extension and side dormer roof extension. **Full planning permission granted 13/05/2015**

## **5. Relevant policies and guidance**

- **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**
- **London Plan (2016)**
- **Camden Local Plan (2017)**
  - D1 – Design

- A1 – Managing the impact of development
- A5 - Basements
- T2 – Car free development
- **Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015)**  
**Policy 2 – Design**
- **Supplementary Guidance (2015)**  
Camden Planning Guidance (CPG)
  - CPG1 - Design (July 2015 updated March 2018)
  - CPG Amenity (March 2018)
  - CPG Basements (March 2018)
  - CPG 7 – Transport (September 2011)

## 6. **Assessment**

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

- Design;
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;
- Basement development;
- Transport.

### **Design**

#### Policy

The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy D1 requires extensions to consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; the quality of materials to be used; and the character and proportions of the existing building.

CPG Design outlines the Council's approach to assessing the acceptability of extensions.

Point 4.8 of CPG Design outlines the principle that extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation unless the specific circumstances of the site, such as the context of the property or its particular design, would enable an exception to this approach.

Point 4.10 provides a range of additional considerations related specifically to rear extensions, including that they should respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, 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, and that they should allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden.

#### Assessment

##### Rear extension

The proposed replacement rear extension would measure 7.4m (L) x 4m (W), extending from the dwelling to the site of the existing garage building along the boundary with 33 Minster Road. It would be 4m longer and 0.5m wider than the existing conservatory. The

extension would be half the width of the southern elevation of the host building and single storey. However by nature of its depth would nevertheless be a large addition to the host building.

Nevertheless, its glazed frontage would ensure that the proposal would retain strong visual and functional linkages with the rear garden (which would remain substantial in size, with more than 50% remaining). This glazed frontage, combined with a generous setback from the street and a proposed green roof, would ensure that the extension would not appear as overly dominant on the host building from public or private views. As such, the principle of the rear extension is considered acceptable in design terms.

The use of Crittal-style metal-framed windows is considered appropriate for this rear garden development. While officers would be open to the use of matching red brick, the use of buff-coloured brick immediately adjacent to the main house would be considered incongruent and to compete architecturally with the host building. Alternatively, a sympathetic use of simple modern materials may be considered more acceptable.

#### Garage conversion

The proposed part-single, part-double height structure replacing the garage would be considered acceptable in height, scale and massing, considering that it would have little variance from the footprint of the existing structure. The gable-ended pitched roof would be sympathetic to the site and surrounding context, as would the use of slate as a roofing material. The proposed window to the street from the garage structure is considered too large in size and would be incongruous within the streetscene. Officers suggest revisions to put forward a more sympathetic design.

#### Lightwell to western elevation

It is proposed to insert a lightwell to the western elevation to allow replacement of the window with a door. This would be considered acceptable in design terms, subject to appropriate door materials (in this case timber would be preferred) and details.

### **Neighbour amenity**

#### Policy

Policy A1 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The Council's amenity guidance CPG6 further details that development should be designed to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight, sunlight, artificial light levels, outlook and privacy.

#### Assessment

The new front window to the double height element would create a new outlook onto the street, and not have an impact on the privacy afforded to neighbouring residential occupiers. Based on the enclosed nature of the rear garden, set-down of the extension from the street level and single storey nature of the development, no other aspect of the proposal would result in new overlooking or harm to the privacy afforded to neighbouring occupiers. The new extension would be 8.4m deep running 30cm from the boundary with No. 33 Minster Road. The extension would be 3m high, however set 0.7-1.0m below what is understood to be the original garden level. The resulting addition of a 2-2.3m brick wall would not be considered to result in harmful levels of overshadowing or sense of enclosure to the rear garden of No. 33. It is noted that this would be lower than the current boundary treatment (a 2.5m-3m high hedge). Nevertheless, drawings for the full scheme

should show the extension in the context of the height of the neighbouring garden. No other aspect of the proposal is expected to result in harmful levels of noise or artificial light pollution.

## **Basements**

### Policy

Local Plan Policy A5 outlines the council's approach to basement development. It states that the Council will only permit basement development where it is demonstrated to its satisfaction that the proposal would not cause harm to:

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

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.

The policy goes on to list the location, scale and design of acceptable basements, which are illustrated in CPG Basements (pages 9-14).

Any full planning application for a basement development on this site would need to include a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) which has been prepared in accordance with the processes and procedures as set out within CPG Basements. Furthermore, the site is subject to underground constraints (subterranean groundwater flow and slope stability).

The BIA should include the following stages:

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

Further details on BIAs can be found in CPG Basements. For completeness, please ensure that the report details the author's own professional qualifications, noting the varying qualification requirements within CPG Basements for the different elements of a BIA study.

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 land stability, groundwater flows and surface flows of the area should the development be granted.

Please note that the Council's preferred provider for the audit service is Campbell Reith. When an audit is required, Campbell Reith charges a fixed fee dependent on the category of basement audit, outlined in Appendix A of Camden's BIA audit service terms of reference.

As the BIA will require a third party audit, it will be expected that your report is in line with the Council's Pro Forma. You will need to complete the Basement Impact Assessment Audit Instruction Form on Camden's website; please see Section B for a full list of items to be included in your BIA. You will need to fill out this section of the form and return to us alongside any formal submission.

### Assessment

The proposal would incorporate three aspects of basement development, comprising the basement excavation to the front of the garage conversion, creation of a lightwell to the western side of the host building, and some minor excavation required for the lowering of the level of the garage and the rear extension so align with the current kitchen.

### Basement underneath converted garage

The basement would measure 8m x 3m and contain an office and a bathroom. It would be single storey, not built under an existing basement, and is significantly smaller in footprint than the host building. In these respects it would be considered acceptable. It would however come forward to the boundary with the street, encroaching on the full depth of the 1.2m front curtilage forward of the garage. In line with point k. of policy A5, any basement would need to be set 0.6m back from the street. The proposed 1m lightwell to the northern elevation of the converted garage would be appropriate in depth, discrete in siting, and entirely contained within the enclosed rear garden.

### Lightwell to western elevation

The proposal includes the excavation of a lightwell to a basement level window on the western elevation of the host building. The proposed lightwell would extend 800mm below the current ground level, with a length of 1.5m from the elevation of the house. It would be entirely contained within the enclosed garden to the side of the property, and approximately 2.5m from the boundary wall. As such, it would be considered appropriate in scale and siting and compliant with parts f. to m. of Policy A5.

### Excavation to lower the floor level of garage and rear extension

Excavation to a depth of approximately 800mm would be required in the garden and the site of the replacement garage (in addition to the section covered by the full basement). While the acceptability of this would be subject to demonstrating points a-e of policy A5 (related to the harm of development), it would not be considered as a basement storey and not therefore subject to points f. to m. around siting, location, scale and design. As such, the principle of this aspect would be considered acceptable subject to the outcome of a Basement Impact Assessment.

## **Transport**

Local Plan Policy T2 aims to mitigate the impact of new development on the transport network. The policy encourages the redevelopment of parking spaces for alternative uses.

### Assessment

The conversion of the garage space to residential habitable space would be acceptable, subject to a contribution to the council for reinstatement of the raised kerb, with a preliminary estimate of £3,000.

In analysing the Basement Impact Assessment, the council will consider if a Construction Management Plan is necessary to minimise the transport and environmental health impacts of development. In doing so, it will consider the scale of development and the particular spatial and logistical constraints of the site. A preliminary review of the site and plans would suggest that a CMP would not be required for this site.

Both the highways contribution and the approval of a Construction Management Plan would be secured through a Section 106 Legal Agreement if planning permission were to be secured.

## **7. Conclusion**

The principle of the development is largely considered acceptable. Alterations would be required to the siting of the basement under the garage conversion, and the size of the window to the street elevation. Further consideration of the proposed building materials is required to ensure that they are sympathetic and complement, rather than compete with, the host building. To this end, the use of buff-coloured brick is not considered appropriate, particularly for the rear extension component.

The acceptability of the basement aspects of the scheme would be subject to the outcome of an independently-audited Basement Impact Assessment (details of which are highlighted in the relevant section above).

## **8. Planning application information**

8.1 If you decide to submit a planning application for the proposed scheme, I would advise you to submit the following for a valid planning application:

- Completed form – Householder planning application
- An ordnance survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red
- Floor plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- 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
- Basement Impact Assessment (in line with guidance CPG Basements)
- The appropriate fee (£206)
- Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.

8.2 We would strongly encourage you to share and discuss your proposals with your neighbours before submitting a planning application. We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would put up a notice on or near the site and advertise in a local newspaper. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

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

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

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact Stuart Clapham on 020 7974 3688.

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

Yours sincerely,

Stuart Clapham

Junior Planner

Planning Solutions Team