

Parking Details:		
	Parking Spaces (General)	Parking Spaces (Disabled)
Existing	3	-
Proposed	3	1

OFFICERS' REPORT

Reason for Referral to Committee: The application has been referred to the Development Control Committee for determination following consideration of the application by the Members Briefing Panel [Clause 3(ix)]

1.0 SITE

- 1.1 The application site is located on the western side of Avenue Road, at its junction with Elsworthy Road and Queen's Grove. The site is currently occupied by a 2 storey plus attic detached single-family dwellinghouse set back from the street with hard landscaped forecourt and parking to the front and two vehicular crossovers onto Avenue Road. There is a 2.0m high boundary wall along the frontage with Queens Grove and part of the frontage to Avenue Road.
- 1.2 The site is not located in a conservation area and the house, which dates from the inter-war years, is not listed. A former property at No. 73 was demolished in 1939 but was never reconstructed as a result of the commencement of the Second World War, thus the site now effectively occupies a double plot. An enclosure housing a swimming pool now stands adjacent to the main house. There are a number of trees close to the boundary of the site.
- 1.3 The St John's Wood Conservation Area lies to the south-west of 38 and 37a Queens Grove and the corner of the Elsworthy Conservation Area lies to the east of the junction of Elsworthy Road with Avenue Road diagonally opposite the site. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal involves demolition of the existing building and the erection of a single-family dwellinghouse comprising basement, lower ground, ground, first and second floor level (the second floor would be a roof storey), erection of a new boundary wall and gates, hard and soft landscaping and associated works.
- 2.2 The building would be located in a more central position on the double width plot than the existing house and would have a width of 23.5m to the main facade (compared to 15m at present), plus a setback single-storey wing of 5m in width. The majority of the house would be 17.8m in depth, though a single storey orangery would project 10.7m beyond the main rear wall of the house on the southern side.
- 2.3 A two storey basement (depth of between around 8.5m – 9.8m) is proposed that would be under the footprint of the house and also extend beyond the rear wall of the house into the rear garden.
- 2.4 The proposed house would have 11 bedrooms (including 2 guest bedrooms) and 4 bedrooms for staff, several rooms for leisure activities, including a swimming pool and a series of other habitable rooms and areas for staff.

2.5 The proposal has been amended during the course of application such that the existing crossovers on to Avenue Road are to be used, originally it had been proposed to relocate the access point to Queens Grove, and a driveway created to provide access to the basement parking to the rear of the house. This basement parking area would be served via a car lift and would have 3 car parking spaces plus 5 cycle spaces.

2.6 Revisions

- Amendments were made during the course of the application as mentioned above, these include:
- Revisions to the details design and materials;
- Omission of first floor element to set back north-west wing;
- Revisions to configuration of roof storey;
- New first floor window to proposed north-west elevation;
- Omission of proposals for an access on Queens Grove and provision of driveway;
- Addition of pedestrian gate on Avenue Road; and
- Amendments to vehicle access arrangements during construction.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

Application site

3.1 The application site itself has no recent planning history of particular relevance, the last planning permission being in 1984 for the erection of a replacement cover to the swimming pool (8400150).

3.2 There have been a number of applications for works to trees on the site.

3.3 Planning permissions granted in 1939 and 1949 for the erection of a house and garage with flat over were never fully implemented.

Nearby sites

3.4 87 Avenue Road

Planning permission was granted for renewal of planning permission 2007/2356/P dated 06/07/2007, for the replacement of existing two storey dwellinghouse by a three storey dwellinghouse with basement and sub-basement levels, rear garden patio with glazed rooflight and a forecourt car lift in July 2010 (2010/2713/P).

3.5 85 Avenue Road

Planning permission was granted for the erection of a two-storey plus basement and attic single family dwelling (Class C3) following the demolition of existing building in November 2009 (2009/4159/P).

3.6 77 Avenue Road

Planning permission was granted subject to a legal agreement for the erection of a new three-storey single family dwellinghouse (Class C3), following demolition of existing three-storey single family dwellinghouse in May 2010 (2010/0351/P). The proposed dwelling included a two storey basement, but has yet to be implemented.

3.7 64 Avenue Road

Planning permission was granted for the erection of a new 4 storey (including attic and basement level) dwellinghouse, following the demolition of existing dwellinghouse in August 2007 (2007/2831/P).

3.8 42 Avenue Road
 Planning permission was granted for the renewal of planning permission granted on 26/07/2005 (2005/1921/P) for the demolition of existing single storey side extension and erection of a basement and ground floor side extension and a single storey, full width, ground floor rear extension, including excavations to erect a swimming pool, gym, sauna, and guest room with ancillary facilities, in a new basement and sub-basement at the rear in May 2010 (2010/0727/P).

3.9 38-40 Avenue Road
 Planning permission was granted for the erection of two three-storey detached single dwelling houses with basement accommodation and associated landscaping, following the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse in March 2007 (2006/4510/P).

4.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

4.1 **Environment Agency**
 No comments.

4.2 **City of Westminster**
 No comments.

4.3 **Councillor Don Williams**
 Concerns regarding proposal and requests that the application be reported to Committee for determination. He has received numerous objections from constituents in his ward objecting to the impact upon their residential amenities causing unfair blight.

4.4 **Elsworthy Residents Association**

- Overdevelopment of the plot causing loss of open space and loss of gaps and views between buildings that are important to the area.
- View from Elsworthy Conservation Area will be changed from green open space to that of a large building.
- Large basements require artificial lighting, constant ventilation and represent unsustainable development.
- Construction would involve inconvenience to residents over long periods, such as loss of pavements or cycle lanes.
- An additional crossover in Queens Grove would be hazardous.
- The moving of the vehicular crossover closer to a hazardous road junction on Avenue Rd is impractical and dangerous and with restricted sightlines due to positions of street trees and lampposts, as well as adding to congestion at peak times.

(Officer Note: Scheme since amended such that it is no longer proposed to move the vehicular access on Avenue Road).

4.5 The application was advertised in the press on 09/06/11 and a site notice displayed from 03/06/11 to 24/06/11.

4.6 **Adjoining Occupiers**

	Original	R1
<i>Number of letters sent</i>	8	8
<i>Total number of responses received</i>	2	16
<i>Number of electronic responses</i>	1	14
<i>Number in support</i>	0	3

Number of objections	2	13
----------------------	---	----

(Officer note: It should be noted that since consultation on the original and revised proposals, the applicant has made further revisions to remove the vehicular access to Queens Grove and the moving of one vehicular crossover access on Avenue Road from the proposed scheme.)

Original proposal

4.7 2 letters of objection were received on the following grounds:

- The storey heights are large due to the scale of the house, thus creating a bulkier (all elements are increased by up to 40%) and higher building than its neighbours. The proposal would be out of scale with Queens Grove properties.
- The proposal lacks distinction given the prominent position and large building that the plot can accommodate.
- The site has a width of two plots, thus a single house would be overbearing and out of scale with the style and character of the neighbourhood.
- Wish to see a construction method statement and engineers' calculations to assess structural impact on neighbouring property.
- Information testing for the presence of water courses known to be in the area should be available prior to considering the application.
- The development may take 3-4 years to build, which would be disruptive.
- The applicant should be required to complete the development from commencement within a given time frame.
- The vehicle entrance on Queens Grove would generate more traffic on a busy rat run and unnecessary congestion. Access should be from Avenue Rd.
- The vehicle movements generated by such a large house would change the style and strategy for the street.
- Drivers and chauffeurs would wait by the service entrance with their engines running on Queens Grove.
- The car lift should have a cavity wall enclosure to prevent noise and vibration to nearby premises.
- The street plane trees should be protected against harm.
- No objection to the principle of redevelopment.

Revised proposal

4.8 3 letters were received supporting the proposal for the following reasons:

- The proposal and landscaping is appropriate for a large corner site.
- Very well designed and a significant improvement on the existing house and thus the quality of the area.
- The design is well considered and would enhance Avenue Rd and Queens Grove.
- The building would sit well with its neighbours and Avenue Rd as a whole (e.g. its style).
- Supporting documentation is very thorough.

4.9 14 letters of objection were received on the following grounds:

- Proposal is a gross overdevelopment of the site from a single house to a house with a double basement that will create a commercial type activity for entertaining and possibly business.

- Oppose the development on its architecture and the amount of construction activity it would cause.
- No vehicular access should be allowed from Queens Grove as it is an overburdened congested side street invariably with cars parked on both sides of the road and is used as a rat run. Traffic builds up on from the junction with Avenue/Elsworthy Rd (often for five minutes or more) which is an accident black spot and the proposed access would worsen the situation.
- The Queens Grove access would be unnecessary when two vehicular access points exist on Avenue Rd and would not be commensurate with the requirements of domestic residential activity and should not be allowed.
- Combined with likely redevelopment of St John's Wood Barracks, the implications would immobilise Queens Grove unless access is restricted.
- All other properties on Avenue Road have their access only from Avenue Road itself and this property should as well. Plenty of room exists on the double plot to provide parking.
- No construction access should be allowed from Queens Grove, but should be restricted to Avenue Road
- Construction traffic on Queens Grove would be likely to coincide with the heaviest time for traffic during the morning rush hour and has a tight turn in for large vehicles from Avenue Rd which will hold up traffic (unlike Avenue Rd entrances) and cause gridlock.
- Other similar projects have been completed using Avenue Road for construction access without causing problems.
- There should be a full traffic study to test whether the proposal is appropriate.
- Impact on the character of the area and nearby conservation area by changing the transport arrangements to individual properties, the long-standing perimeter wall is of great character and distinction and should be considered for listing.
- Case should be referred to Committee for determination

4.10 Officers held a meeting on 21/12/11 with residents of Queens Grove and Councillor Don Williams to discuss the concerns raised regarding the transport impacts of the development. Further letters were received from this group on behalf of residents of 17 properties on Queens Grove:

- The group do not object to the principle of the redevelopment of a single dwelling, but have concerns regarding the proposed vehicular access onto Queens Grove and the potential impact of demolition and construction, should there not be a binding Construction Management Plan.
- There has never been any access to this property from Queens Grove historically, with its two access points being from Avenue Rd.
- It is contended that the proposed Queens Grove access would be used for service access, such as day-to-day deliveries and refuse collection, plus for staff access.
- Queens Grove is a sensitive street that suffers congestion, particularly at the nearby road junction, and is used as a 'cut through.'
- The size of the proposed house is such that the number and nature of vehicles using the access would be more akin to a commercial operation than a typical single dwellinghouse. The associated noise and vibration is likely to cause unnecessary harm to nearby Queens Grove residents (contrary to CS5 and DP26 of the Camden LDF).
- The material increase in the number of vehicle movements on Queens Grove would exacerbate local traffic issues. This traffic would be more appropriately handled on the strategic route of Avenue Road, rather than the residential street of Queens Grove, as has happened at other recent developments along Queens Grove and at the redevelopment of Adelaide Road School.
- The introduction of a new crossover in Queens Grove and not on a main front elevation would not be atypical to the streetscene, interrupt the historic boundary treatment and

harm the character of Queens Grove, most of which falls within the St John's Wood Conservation Area.

- The Queens Road access would cause harm to amenities of Queens Grove residents, harm to residential character and the highway network.
- Residents have requested that the applicants remove the third access to the proposed property from Queens Grove.
- There is concern that the substantial works necessary to construct the proposal (particularly the excavation of the double basement) could cause significant harm to residential amenities in the surrounding area if not planned and managed. The proposed construction phasing/vehicle routing has been revised to show access only from Avenue Road, which would avoid traffic being routed via the sensitive residential area and the congested residential street of Queens Grove. This is welcomed; however it is insufficient as it does not part of a Construction Management Plan. This should be provided and secured by a legal agreement.
- The proposed construction arrangements highlight how inappropriate Queens Grove would be for a permanent access.
- Request that the application be considered at committee and that members visit the site to understand the objections raised.

5.0 **POLICIES**

5.1 **The London Plan 2011**

5.2 **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010**

- CS1 (Distribution of growth)
- CS4 (Areas of More Limited Change)
- CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
- CS6 (Providing Quality Homes)
- CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)
- CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards)
- CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)
- CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity)
- CS17 (Making Camden a Safer Place)
- CS18 (Dealing with Our Waste and Encouraging Recycling)
- CS19 (Delivering and Monitoring the Core Strategy)

- DP2 (Making Use of Camden's Capacity for Housing)
- DP3 (Contributions to the Supply of Affordable Housing)
- DP6 (Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Homes)
- DP16 (The Transport Implications of Development)
- DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport)
- DP18 (Parking Standards and Limiting the Availability of Car Parking)
- DP19 (Managing the impact of parking)
- DP20 (Movement of Goods and Materials)
- DP21 (Development Connecting to the Highway Network)
- DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)
- DP23 (Water)
- DP24 (Securing high quality design)
- DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)
- DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)
- DP27 (Basements and lightwells)
- DP28 (Noise and vibration)

5.3 **St John's Wood Conservation Area Statement
Elsworthy Conservation Area Statement
Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

6.0 **ASSESSMENT**

6.1 The principal consideration material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Principle of redevelopment
- Design
- Sustainability
- Basement considerations
- Amenity
- Transport
- Trees and landscaping
- Lifetime Homes

Principle of Redevelopment

6.2 The principle of replacing the existing dwelling with a new one is acceptable in terms of housing policy (Policies CS6 and DP2).

6.3 The uplift in habitable floorspace (including staff accommodation) would be less than 1,000sqm, thus the proposal would not trigger the need for affordable housing contributions (Policies CS6 and DP3).

Design

6.4 The existing house is not in a conservation area and is not listed. It is an average quality early 20th Century dwelling, albeit with an attractive double bay bow rear elevation. It is part of the second major phase of development in the area in the early-mid 20th Century and there are other dwellings from this time in the surrounding area that are better examples of the architecture of the area, thus it is not considered to be a non-designated heritage asset and there are no objections in principle to the principle of demolition as part of the proposals for redevelopment.

6.5 The existing site contains a two-storey red brick dwelling (No.75) dating from the early/mid 20th Century. The site is the amalgamation of two original plots following the demolition of No.73 in 1939. It should be noted that other houses exist in the vicinity with larger plots around double the width of those typical along this part of Avenue Road, such as at Nos. 52 and 69.

6.6 The proposal would reintroduce a stronger street frontage to the site compared to the existing arrangement, which has only had a house occupying one half of the plot since the demolition of the original. The façade would be constructed on essentially the same line as the existing property, though the main facade would have a width of 23.5m (compared to 15m at present). The roof and parapet would be slightly higher than the existing house.

6.7 Although there is scope for this plot to accommodate a somewhat larger building given the plot's size and position on a corner, officers have sought to reduce the sense of scale and bulk of the proposed building in order to reduce its prominence in the streetscene. Officers were originally approached with a rather more imposing rendered building with a strong central bay which continued to the roof storey. This has been revised by adopting a

generally less elaborate style with two bays to break down the width; a lower, less extensive pitched roof with dormer windows and smaller chimneys; and a lowering of the previous parapet. The north-western recessed wing has been reduced to a single-storey to reduce the apparent width of the frontage and maintain a suitable gap between the houses and a more modest central porch. The elevations are now proposed in brick rather than render and the detailing is more restrained.

- 6.8 These changes have successfully addressed early concerns raised by officers about the dominance of the main façade and have resulted in a proposal that it is considered would more successfully relate to the character of the area; it would not be out of place against some of the arts and crafts buildings found locally.
- 6.9 It is not considered that the proposed building and the single-storey orangery would impact adversely on the views or gardens along Queens Grove, considering the height of the proposal and the separation across large amounts of garden from properties on Queens Grove. It is noted that a number of corner properties, including those on the opposite side of Queens Grove have extended along their flanks creating a pattern that is common in the area.
- 6.10 It is not considered that the boundary wall to Queens Grove is such as to merit listing.

Sustainability

- 6.11 The proposed dwelling would achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 rating, which complies with the standard set out in Policy DP23. It is estimated that the development would achieve a 25% average reduction in emissions as a result of a variety of measures, including the use of photovoltaic panels (20sqm) and solar thermal panels (10sqm). A Sustainable Urban Drainage System is proposed (including permeable paving, green roofs and attenuation tanks for temporary water storage) and composting would take place. It is recommended that conditions be imposed on the permission to secure further details of the SUDs and to secure the other sustainability measures.

Basement considerations

- 6.12 A basement impact assessment has been provided in accordance with the provisions of Policy DP27 and Camden Planning Guidance (CPG No.4). These analyse the impact the proposed development would have structurally upon nearby premises, the land and the impact upon the water environment.
- 6.13 The report states that the basement construction and underlying foundations are unlikely to encounter groundwater, however, the basement would be constructed using a secant bored piled wall (using alternating hard and soft piles) lined with a material such as 'Caltite' which would minimise the influx of any ground water to the excavated area. A capping beam would be constructed at ground level during excavation. Other temporary props, heave protection and wall linings would be used during the construction process. The contractor would minimise ground movements during the construction and excavation process. Reinforced insitu concrete, including lining walls and columns would be used to construct the basement. Ground, lower ground and basement slabs would prop the piled walls. The basement slab would be supported by pilecaps.
- 6.14 The construction process would commence with the demolition of the structures and enabling works on the site, erection of tree protection structures and installation of temporary site office at the front of the site. Piling around the basement area and the installation of the capping beam would then take place, followed by excavation and strutting of the basement area starting from the rear. A crane would then be installed and

the substructure installed, starting at the front, then moving to the pool area at the rear and the swimming pool slab and strutting would be installed. Next, the superstructure works for the house and the substructure works for the pool would take place. The next phase would involve the remaining structure works, external works, dismantling of the crane and site offices and completion of the development.

- 6.15 A submitted ground movement report states that some ground movement is inevitable with a project of this size involving a large basement and that there is potential for some damage to be caused, however, the analysis anticipates that damage to the two closest structures at 38 Queens Grove and 77 Avenue Rd would be no more than 'slight' under category 2 of the Burland scale, comprising impacts such as no more than the need for some redecoration and repointing. A maximum of 28mm horizontal movement and 19mm vertical movement is anticipated from the pile wall installation and excavation (significantly reduced by the time it reaches nearby structures) , though in practice factors such as the corners of the excavation, the overall unloading of the ground and the stiffening effect of nearby structures would reduce movement and impact. Services under the adjacent pavements and carriageways may also be affected. Some small but insignificant generally vertical movements may also impact on Nos. 37, 37a and 39 Queens Grove and 71 and 79 Avenue Road. It should be noted that the assessment was made in respect of the existing house at 77 Avenue Road, however, planning permission exists to erect a new house at this site (see history) and the report does not anticipate the need for remedial works if such works go ahead. The report highlights the importance of careful supervision during the works in minimising ground movements and a condition is recommended in this respect. Shorter piles in the final design, if feasible, would reduce the impacts.
- 6.16 A hydrological assessment identified that, beneath a top layer of made ground (depth around 1.4m), lies a layer of stiff silty, sandy, gravelly clay (1.5-3.4m thick). This is thought to be reworked London Clay that may have been displaced by the ancient lost River Tyburn. Beneath this lies London Clay which is stiff and silty. The River Tyburn now lies in a culvert/drain and is thus not expected to cause significant surface or sub-surface flow across the site, however, its original course ran north to south broadly along the line of the current Avenue Road but passing through the site, thus it is possible that a buried river channel may cross the site and acts as a flow path. Also, while not forming part of the shallow aquifer perched water from rainfall and other sources may collect in the made ground and lead to limited subsurface flow downhill within it, as it would not penetrate the impermeable London Clay below.
- 6.17 The hydrological review concludes that the excavation of two large basements adjacent to each other at this site and no.77 does not present any cause to believe that the sub-surface water flow regime would be adversely affected, however if this development were to prove to interrupt the sub-surface water flow channel and insufficient measures are taken to ensure the continuity of flow around the development the blocking of water could cause water build up upstream, including potential flooding of the adjacent basement at no. 77 and drying of ground downstream. A condition is recommended to ensure that this issue is adequately investigated and any remedies implemented prior to the development being carried out.
- 6.19 The site is in Flood Zone 1 under PPS 25 categories. Although the site is identified as being at low risk from *ground* water flooding, Avenue Road is listed in Camden Planning Guidance as being at risk of *surface* water flooding following flooding in 1975 and 2002 when excessive rainfall caused inundation of the main sewer system in the area leading to flooding of streets and lower floors of residents' homes. The submitted flood risk assessment identifies the site as being 'highly vulnerable' to the effects of surface flooding under PPS 25 criteria, however raising of the ground floor level by 0.25m and construction of a wall of at least 0.45m height around the proposed basement lightwells to prevent

overland flooding. This is recommended to be conditioned in this case, in order to protect the house from flooding (particularly basement areas where staff accommodation is proposed). Railings are proposed around the lightwells, rather than the grilles urged by CPG4, however given the generous setback to the front of the house behind a perimeter wall and the general arrangement of the front of the property, this is not considered to be a concern in this instance (and has been accepted at nearby premises).

- 6.20 In terms of remedial measures to address the flow of water, it is recommended that a surface land drain with a gravel filled trench or perforated pipe extending around the perimeter of the drainage system is proposed and that a perimeter drainage system be installed to maintain water flow if it proves to be the case during construction that there is still an active flow channel associated with the former River Tyburn that would be impeded by the basement construction. It is recommended that such details be required by the afore-mentioned condition.
- 6.21 Camden Planning Guidance (following PPS 25) requires volumes and peak flows of water to be no greater or reduced relative to the previous state of the site. Options are shown involving the provision of a green roof above the basement, permeable paving to sections of terracing and driveways, site drainage leading to a attenuation tank (this would need to have capacity to store at least 70cu m of surface water and attenuated to 5l/sec) before discharging to the main sewer, in addition to the retention of areas of existing garden space. It is recommended that a condition be attached to any planning permission requiring submission of full details of a Sustainable Drainage System.
- 6.22 The report does not anticipate any significant impact to the water available to trees on or near the site and that those trees to be removed would not result in any significant ground swelling.

Amenity

- 6.23 A BRE sunlight and daylight assessment has been produced which assesses the impact of the development on the closest nearby properties at 56 Queens Grove, plus 71 and 77 Avenue Road. The report indicates that the impact would be within BRE guidelines for daylight (Vertical Sky Component) and sunlight (Annual Probable Sunlight Hours), with the exception of one window at ground floor level at No.77 which would fail to receive the minimum level of winter sunlight as a result of the development. This is not considered to justify refusal of the scheme given the position of the window in the flank wall facing onto the boundary, the fact that this room has good outlook and the general impact on this property would increase winter sunlight to other windows. It should also be noted that the development would have no impact on the sunlight and daylight levels for the new house which has planning permission at No.77.
- 6.24 The bedrooms and lounges to the staff accommodation within the development would comply with BRE Average Daylight Factor guidance, providing a good standard of accommodation to its occupants
- 6.25 It is not considered that any aspect of the development would be intrusive to the outlook of nearby residential premises.
- 6.26 Representations have been received concerning the potential for noise and vibration from the proposed car lift towards the rear of the site. Car lifts operate successfully elsewhere in the Borough without creating excessive noise, it is recommended that a condition is attached to any permission requiring further details of noise from this equipment.

- 6.27 It is not considered that the amount of activity created by comings and goings of vehicles to the site, albeit a house with 11 bedrooms plus 4 staff bedrooms and extensive facilities, would be such as to cause any significant loss of amenity to nearby residents.

Transport

- 6.28 Three parking spaces are proposed in the basement of the proposed development (the application form states that 3 parking spaces exist at present on the site) and a disabled parking space at the front of the development. The site is located in an area with good public transport accessibility (PTAL 4), however in this case it is considered it is inappropriate to resist proposed parking levels which are not stated as increasing existing levels (other than in respect of provision of a disabled parking space, which is acceptable in terms of policy). However, it is recommended that the development be 'car capped' via a legal agreement, such that the occupiers would be ineligible for resident parking permits which accords with policy.
- 6.29 The number of cycle spaces proposed of 5 comfortably meets the requirements required by Camden Parking Standards and is acceptable. A condition is recommended to ensure their provision.
- 6.30 In order to tie the development into the surrounding urban environment, a financial contribution is recommended (secured by legal agreement) for the Council to repave the footway adjacent to the site and to make good any damage caused to the public highway and changes to vehicle crossovers.
- 6.31 It is no longer proposed to move one of the crossovers on Avenue Road further south-west along the street frontage as this had caused concerns regarding proximity to nearby road junctions and visibility. Therefore the two existing crossovers on Avenue Road would be used.
- 6.32 A number of representations have been raised in respect of the creation of an access on to Queens Grove. In response to this, the applicant has amended the proposal further by removing this access from the proposals. Access to the basement area would now be via a driveway on the site leading from the two existing crossovers on Avenue Road to the car lift serving the basement parking area at the rear of the proposed house. The driveway has been designed to be no wider than is necessary to enable vehicular access and is shown flanked by planting that would prevent casual parking at the side of the driveway. This arrangement is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.33 The construction period for the development is shown in the application as being 22 months from commencement of initial work to practical completion. Access to the site would take place from Avenue Road using the existing points of access on to Avenue Road (this follows revisions from some use of the proposed access on Queens Grove and a new access on Avenue Road, closer to the road junction). A phasing plan has been provided showing the anticipated stages of excavation and construction and construction access (these are briefly referred to above in the section that considers the basement issues). This is considered acceptable in principle, however it is recommended that a Construction Management Plan be secured via a legal agreement to ensure that residential amenities and traffic safety is maintained as far as is practicable. It is not considered it would be reasonable, however, to place a limit on the duration of the construction period.

Trees and landscaping

- 6.34 There are a large number of trees and vegetation on the site close to the boundaries particularly along the Queens Grove frontage where a group of mature trees are protected

by a Tree Preservation Order and around the boundaries to the rear garden, as well as just outside the site, such as mature street trees on Avenue Road.

- 6.35 The vast majority of the trees would be retained, however three small areas of unprotected small trees of poor condition and shrubs are proposed to be removed. The removal of these comprises only a small proportion of this group and they are not particularly evident from outside of the garden and thus would not damage the character of the area and no objection is raised to their removal.
- 6.36 An arboricultural impact assessment has been provided with the application. This assesses the application in light of BS5837: Trees in Relation to Construction and has been updated to take account of the access road to the side of the house (an amendment made in response to representations from some local residents to the previously proposed access on to Queens Grove). Some trees would have works within their root protection areas, but these would be minor and in line with the recommendations in BS5837 and not sufficient to damage tree growth provided measures to protect the trees recommended in the method statement are observed. Measures are also set out to minimise the impact of the laying out and use of the access road between the side of the house and the line of mature trees near the Queens Grove boundary, including custom designed no-dig specification surfacing and related construction and planting methods specifically organised to prevent significant disturbance within the root protection areas. This issue has been discussed with the Council's Tree Officers and the arrangements are considered to be acceptable subject to a recommended condition to ensure the measures set out in the applicant's Arboricultural Statement are carried out.
- 6.37 The green roof (lawn) in the rear garden on the basement roof would have a soil depth exceeding 0.5m and would meet with guidelines set out CPG4 and is considered to be acceptable. There is also sufficient rooting area around the outline of the basement to support the trees to be retained and any future replacements.
- 6.38 The design and access statement gives an outline description of the landscaping strategy proposed, including Porphyry setts to the front driveway, hedges near the boundary and the rear basement lightwell, a series of small trees and other vegetation in pots, a terrace with permeable paving, a cascaded green wall in the rear basement lightwell, a small herb garden, a formal lawn, a woodland garden path and possible play area, skylights and pavilion. The approach is acceptable in principle, however further details are required by condition.

Lifetime Homes

- 6.39 A disabled parking space would be provided at the front of the premises. A Lifetime Homes assessment has been provided with the application that shows that the proposal would comply with all relevant lifetime homes criteria.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The redevelopment of the site to provide a new large house of the style proposed is considered to be acceptable in this location. The material presented demonstrates that the proposal would comply with the Council's policies in relation to basements. The proposal would not be harmful to the area's character, the amenity of nearby properties or to traffic conditions in the area.
- 7.2 Planning Permission is recommended subject to a S106 Legal Agreement covering the following Heads of Terms:

- Car capped development.
- Construction Management Plan.
- Associated Highways Works (£56,000).

8.0 **LEGAL COMMENTS**

8.1 Members are referred to the note from the Legal Division at the start of the Agenda.