

CM/DT/PD10193

email: [david.taylor@montagu-evans.co.uk](mailto:david.taylor@montagu-evans.co.uk)

10 May 2018

London Borough of Camden  
Planning Department – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
5 Pancras Square  
London  
WC1H 9JE

**FAO Charles Thuairé**

Dear Charles

**LAND ADJACENT TO JACK STRAW'S CASTLE, NORTH END WAY, HAMPSTEAD, LONDON, NW3 7ES  
PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE - 2017/2064/P**

We write in response to your email of 8 March 2018, which outlined further comments and clarified the outstanding matters in respect of the planning application for land adjacent to Jack Straw's Castle (ref. 2017/2064/P).

The applicant, Albany Homes, and project team have carefully considered the comments that have been raised and we summarise our responses below. This letter is accompanied by a number of appendices comprising responses from technical members of the project team.

**Residential Standards**

We note the comments regarding the submitted Daylight Report and the assessment of the lower ground floor kitchen/diners, in that they are both assessed to fall below the 2% minimum guideline as set out in the BRE. We maintain that the lower ground floor rooms would receive adequate daylight for a primary living space, as the BRE methodology does not allow for the small window on the staircase to be included in the ADF test, even though it would add to the level of daylight that the room receives. Other relevant assessments within the BRE guide shows how over 98% of the room areas would receive access to direct sunlight.

Notwithstanding, a minor amendment to the plans is proposed, which seeks to increase the width of the lightwell by 15 cm, thereby increasing the level of daylight (and sunlight) that the lower ground floor rooms would receive. In addition to this, the internal layout of the rooms has been amended and both rooms now meet the BRE's 2% minimum standard for this type of room.

The increase in the lightwell results in a minor shift in the layout of the car parking spaces immediately adjacent the proposed buildings. WSP have confirmed that this minor change would not affect the manoeuvrability within the car park, the ability to reverse out of spaces or the ability to enter or exit the car park.

The proposed changes include a revised Plans and Elevations drawing (Rev. L) (**Appendix 1**) and a revised *Hard and Soft Landscape Proposals* (Rev. M) (**Appendix 2**), which are both enclosed. In addition to this, Point2 have prepared a short addendum to their assessment (**Appendix 3**) which explains the changes and

provides a new diagram showing the results of the assessment. WSP have also clarified in writing (**Appendix 4**) that the new layout does not impact on access.

## **Trees**

In an email of 1 November 2018, the LBC Tree Officer, Nick Bell, referred to a discrepancy between the submitted Tree Survey and Tree Report. This has been rectified and is provided at **Appendix 5**.

The Tree Officer stated that the tree protection measures are considered sufficient to demonstrate that the retained trees will be adequately protected throughout development, provided appropriate working methods are employed and subject to the imposing of a condition. We have confirmed with our client that the proposed conditions are acceptable, subject to their drafting. We believe that matters relating to trees are therefore now satisfied in this application.

The issue was also raised in respect of the removal of the two dead cherry trees. This is a recommendation as the trees are 'U' category (removal). Notwithstanding, there is no actual need to remove them for construction or to implement the scheme. As they are in third party ownership, it would be up to the relevant landowner to implement their removal.

## **Ecology**

The London Wildlife Trust (LWT) provided comments through an email from Tony Wileman on 20 October 2017. Comments relating to ecology referred to the requirement for a construction access area outside of the development boundary and confirmation on the removal of two cherry trees, any ivy and other vegetation.

Greengage Environmental has reviewed the comments raised and provided a response in a letter dated 22 March 2018 (**Appendix 6**). This sets out that an access corridor would be required and is proposed in the form of raised scaffolding, which would result in a temporary minor disturbance in the area, but no long term impacts to vegetation. This could be secured by a condition under a Precautionary Method Statement.

The letter also sets out that the cherry trees may be retained and that the proposals would result in the loss of approximately 12 sqm of ivy coverage. Greengage has set out an approach to the removal, which would ensure that any long term minor impacts upon the SINC would be mitigated. An ivy trellis/wire system will be erected on the west facing façade of the building that adjoins the boundary wall, facing onto the SINC. The location of the trellis is marked on the revised Hard and Soft Landscape Proposals. The height of the trellis would be limited to 1.2m. An example of the trellis, provided by Scotscape is provided at **Appendix 7**.

Overall, the letter concludes that the proposed development as a whole would result in minor net gains in biodiversity at the site.

## **Basement Impact**

Following the issue of the independent audit on 14 December 2017, the project team's engineers have been liaising directly with Campbell Reith to address the outstanding matters and provided a revised BIA on 21 December 2017. From your understanding, you consider their only outstanding matter to be a request for a summary email, highlighting which sections of the report have been updated and any changes proposed to the methodology.

GEA provided this summary to Campbell Reith on 21 December 2017 (the same date as the submission of the BIA). The summary comprised:

*"We have amended Section 10.2.2 and 11.1 within the report. We also modelled the underpins being installed separately to the bulk excavation, as well as the two working together (as per Issue 4) and ran a building damage assessment for both scenarios. We have included the Building Damage sheets and contour plots within a revised appendix."*

We understand that nothing is outstanding on matters of basement impact.

## **Transport**

The Transport Officer noted that he would be unwilling to accept the revised cycle parking proposals. These were to be considered to be better than the unorthodox internal stores, although not secure or safe in the bicycle shed previously proposed.

The project's transport consultants have considered how the proposed cycle storage facilities can be improved. It is now proposed to include a double bike locker, both of which have capacity for two cycles, therefore providing a total of four cycle storage spaces.

The details are set out in a revised *Hard and Soft Landscape Proposals* drawing (ref. 06-681-200-01 Rev M), prepared by EnPlan. It provides a photograph of the double bike locker, which is supplied by 'cyclehoop', and includes details of its dimensions. The locker provides a robust and weatherproof storage facility, with large easy access doors and durable locking system. The two units can be bolted together and bolted into the ground to ensure maximum security. Further details of the locker can be found in the product specifications which are also enclosed at **Appendix 8**.

The Transport Officer has also noted that the loss of car spaces is acceptable on this site "given the context and on the basis that the existing and proposed parking rights are controlled by a S106". It would be useful, at this stage, to discuss the Section 106 Heads of Terms relating to transport, and any other matters, as well as how this needs to be linked into the separate application to amend the car parking condition (ref. 2017/2171/P).

## **Detailed Design**

It is noted that Council Design Officers have expressed concerns regarding the detailed design of the two homes. We maintain that the proposals are an appropriate design response to the adjacent listed building, as set out in the accompanying Planning and Heritage Statement prepared by Montagu Evans. The proposal preserves the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area. This notion is supported by key stakeholders that have consulted during the pre-application process, including Historic England and Twentieth Century Society. Both Historic England and the Twentieth Century Society raised objections to the previous proposals for the site.

## **Summary**

We trust that the above is useful in answering the queries that have been raised by yourself and other consultees during the application process. If you have any further questions, or any other matters arise, please do not hesitate to contact either David Taylor (020 73127404 / [david.taylor@montagu-evans.co.uk](mailto:david.taylor@montagu-evans.co.uk)) or James Huish (020 7312 7484 / [james.huish@montagu-evans.co.uk](mailto:james.huish@montagu-evans.co.uk)) at this office.

Yours Sincerely,

*Montagu Evans*

**MONTAGU EVANS LLP**

- Enc.    Appendix 1 – Architectural drawing (ref. 1370/3RevL);  
Appendix 2 - Hard and Soft Landscape Proposals (ref. 06-681-200-01 Rev M);  
Appendix 3 – Internal Daylight Amenity to Proposed Units, letter dated 27 April 2018;  
Appendix 4 – Revised Site Layout / Car Park Accessibility Note, WSP;  
Appendix 5 – Tree Survey Report (minor revision), RGS  
Appendix 6 – Ecological Planning Condition Response, letter dated 22 March 2018;  
Appendix 7 – Scotscape Wire Trellis example;  
Appendix 8 – Cyclehoop Double Bike Locker Specifications.