

SEYMOUR WALK RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION



Mr Chris Banks,
The Programme Officer,
Banks Solutions,
21 Glendale Close,
HORSHAM
West Sussex RH12 4GR

12th November 2014

Dear Mr Banks,

**The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea Basements, Conservation & Design and
Miscellaneous Matters Examination**

I refer to your letter of 1st October addressed to the Chairman of our association. I have been asked by our committee to respond accordingly.

Whilst there are three documents (ID/23; 24; 25) upon which comments have been sought we believe that the only material document is ID/23 – Main Modifications to Basements Submission Planning Policy.

We are also of the view that much of the proposed New Wording in ID/23 is helpful and provides the necessary clarification of the relevant drafting. However there are a couple of paragraphs that we feel merit a response:

ID/23 Para. 34.3.58:

*“Where a basement has already been implemented following the grant of planning permission or through the exercise of permitted development rights, the policy does not allow further basement floors or basement extensions that would exceed 50% of the garden or open part of the site. **This provision would not apply to a basement which forms part***

of the original property, or where a later addition, was constructed prior to 1st July 1948. This is to ensure consistency and fairness of approach."

We don't believe that this proposed wording does actually provide clarity. One interpretation is that if there is a basement that is original or built pre 1948 then an extension could be permitted of more than 50% of the garden which is clearly at variance with the objectives of CL7.

At the meeting of the Chelsea Society held on 3rd November 2014 Mr Jonathan Bore (head of planning RBKC) confirmed that the Council will permit one floor of basement development below an existing basement/lower ground floor, if that basement was in existence prior to 1948. Where it will not allow a further basement floor is when the existing basement/LGF was built after 1948 with either planning permission or permitted development. This is clearer in our view.

ID/23 New Para. 34.3.73:

This drafting relates to the requirements of CTMPs. Our view is that it also needs to make reference to the following matters which are of concern to residents:

1. The CTMP should impose defined noise levels at the site boundary and monitoring procedures to control the same.
2. The CTMP should take account of the requirements of local residents to service and access their properties during the works as well as the requirements for emergency vehicle access and take account of other developments in the immediate vicinity that may or may not be subject to planning control.
3. Basement development may be resisted or more strictly controlled in certain locations where, either due to its situation (eg. close to a hospital or school), or where access to the site is severely restricted, and the construction works would result in an unacceptable level or period of disruption for residents, businesses and the wider community.

We trust that these comments are helpful.

As requested I attach a further paper copy of this letter that has also been sent by e mail.

Yours faithfully,


NIGEL LAX
For Seymour Walk Residents Association

cc. A. Goodens, Chairman SWRA; Committee