

Agenda Item 07

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 18 February, 2020

Case No. 18/3591

Location	5A-G Inc, Exeter Road, London, NW2 4SJ
Description	Demolition of existing rear extension and construction of a single storey ground floor rear extension and excavation to create a basement level to facilitate the conversion of the 3 existing ground floor self-contained flats into 3 x self-contained duplex flats at ground and lower ground floor level; new front boundary wall and new entrance gates; lowering of the ground level to side and rear; rear terraces with metal railings; new side entrance door; new windows to side elevation; new lightwell to front garden; felling of rear garden trees (ash tree T1 and a small group of sycamores G2) and replacement tree planting, subdivision of the rear garden, cycle/waste storage and associated landscaping.

Agenda Page Number: 161

1. Following the publication of the Report a further two letters of objection have been received, raising some or all of the following points:
 - Current process used by Brent to assess basement applications does not adequately safeguard neighbour interests
 - Other boroughs require the technical and engineering aspects to be considered as part of the application process
 - The proposed use of two 1100 litre wheeled "Eurobins" is also non-compliant for a property of this size (and even then the plans do not conform with the requirements for the use of such).
 - Bin containers will be unsightly and set unwanted precedent and represent a strong statement about how these basement plans would result in an over intensive use of this property contrary to national guidelines and be damaging to the local environment and the amenity of neighbours
 - unclear how a presentable and aesthetically pleasing "front garden" can be achieved
 - existing kerb damage outside of the property from works in 2015. It would be welcome if the owner would repair this damage at their own cost.
2. Council's adopted Basement SPD provides detailed guidance on the planning considerations for basement developments. At section 2.8 (p15) of the SPD it is stated that: "*It is not the purpose of the planning system to assess the structural stability of works, this is assessed through other controls including Building Regulations and the Party Wall Act*". At pp21-22 of the SPD, further information on the other regimes and controls in relation to basement development is also provided.
3. In relation to the refuse requirements and proposed provision, the Council's *Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Guidance* advises that for the seven households within the building (existing and proposed), a total of 490L of storage capacity would be required for residual waste, 840L for dry recycling and 1x 23l kerbside container each would be required. The applicant is proposing 2x 1100L Eurobins for residual and dry recycling and 6x 23L kerbside containers instead of 2x 240L and 1x 140L bins for residual waste and 3x 240L and 1x 140L bins for dry recycling. Although the proposal may result in an overprovision of capacity, to strictly adhere to the Guidance would result in additional space within the front garden being required for storage purposes (minimum width required is 3.9m as opposed to the proposed 2.6m). The proposal provides a balance between capacity and providing the front garden with sufficient soft landscaping. Moreover, the bins will be within an enclosure and behind the front boundary hedge, a significant improvement on the existing situation and enhances the appearance of the property and the conservation area. However, should Members consider that there is an overprovision in refuse storage capacity, a condition can be imposed requiring revised details.
4. Works of repair to the front kerb as a result of development is undertaken at the cost of the applicant. The front boundary wall is being replaced.
5. Members are asked to note that at paragraph 9 (p170), of the Officer's Report, the final sentence "*the*

Document Imaged

front lightwell...” should be deleted. The front lightwell is no longer part of the development because the basement has been reduced in size, hence they are no longer needed.

Recommendation:

6. Remains approval, subject to the conditions set out in the Committee report

DocSuppF