

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 24 September, 2015

Agenda Item 05

Case No. 15/1452

Location 12 Carlisle Road, Kilburn, London, NW6 6TS
Description Proposed excavation of basement level with reinforced glass panels set into the ground to form rear lightwells, demolition of existing detached garage and replacement with detached brick-built outbuilding, insertion of first floor rear window and rear patio doors and demolition and rebuilding of part of existing boundary wall to dwellinghouse (amended plans and description)

Agenda Page Number: 43

Following on from the Committee site visit on 19th September 2015 a number of points were raised which require clarification and these are set out and addressed below.

Basement

Concerns about the impact of the basement on neighbouring properties in terms of amenity and structural stability. Concerns were reiterated about a possible underground stream on the site and the site's position at the bottom of an incline. Officers appreciate this level of concern with subterranean developments however the applicant is considered to have given due consideration to these issues as set out in paragraphs 13-15 of the report.

The applicant has provided a revised construction methodology report with further details of construction methodology and how the neighbour impact during construction would be mitigated.

Concern was raised that No.16 has been permitted a basement and the proposal could result in two basements being excavated at the same time. It is acknowledged that No.16 nearby has been permitted a basement excavation under permission ref 12/1718 which has not yet been implemented. There could therefore be a situation where two basement excavations take place in close proximity which could compound any neighbour impact, however each case must be considered on its own merits. There is no guarantee that both would take place at the same time or even take place at all and it is not therefore considered reasonable to resist the proposal on this basis.

Clarification was also sought about the depth of the projection of the basement into the rear garden. The total depth of the basement beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling would be 3.3m

Garage

The concern that the un-openable garage doors would serve no purpose was reiterated. As set out in paragraphs 2-4 of the committee report, the inclusion of garage doors, notwithstanding being non-openable is considered by officers to be preferable in appearance to a window and brickwork for example which would have the potential to appear as an incongruous feature in the street scene. The structure would retain the appearance of a garage which reflects the existing situation on the site. The fact that the garage door would not be openable would not be apparent from the street scene and is considered to help the development integrate into the street scene and preserve the character of the area, particularly given similar examples nearby.

It was questioned why the garage should be demolished and party wall concerns were raised on this issue. Party wall issues would be covered by the Party Wall Act and this is not considered a material planning consideration. The demolition of the garage is considered acceptable in character terms as set out in paragraphs 2-4 of the report and the applicant at the site visit explained that the proposal would be an improvement in design terms.

Green roof

The point that the green roof was not necessary was also reiterated. Whilst the green roof is not considered essential in making the scheme acceptable in design or neighbour amenity terms, it is considered a welcome and desirable feature of the proposal. Green roofs can bring about benefits in terms of biodiversity and thermal performance of buildings for example

Amended conditions

Since the committee agenda was published, the applicant has provided amended plans identifying the re-planting of the previously removed hedge to the frontage of the property and the introduction of additional landscaping in the rear garden area in the form of 2x ornamental trees. Condition 3 requires the submission of these details, however as these details have now been provided there is no need for a condition requiring submission of further details. It is therefore recommended that condition 3 is re-worded to secure compliance with the submitted landscaping scheme as follows:

The soft landscaping, including the replacement hedge to the frontage, identified on approved plan numbered 2014/170/303H shall be provided in full prior to the first occupation of the development. Any planting that is part of the approved scheme that within a period of five years after planting is removed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season and all planting shall be replaced with others of a similar size and species and in the same position, unless the Local Planning Authority first gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of appearance and setting for the development and to ensure that the proposed development enhances the visual amenity of the Queens Park Conservation Area.

Condition 7 requires submission of details of additional tree protection measures to protect the trunk of the nearby street tree. Since the committee agenda was published, the applicant has provided these details which again makes this condition unnecessary. It is therefore recommended that condition 7 is re-worded to secure compliance with the submitted information as follows:

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the tree protection measures identified on approved plan numbered 2014/170/303H and Tree Survey Report dated 21/10/2014 ref: DS14101402.

Reason: To protect the retained trees from damage during construction and in recognition of the contribution which the retained trees give and will continue to give to the amenity of the area.