



Pre Planning Application Assessment Report

BASEMENT CONVERSION

46 The Chase, London SW4 0NH
The Chase Conservation Area (CA35)

This project got planning approval.
Lambeth Planning REF: 22/01591/FUL

Pre Planning Application Assessment Report

Location and Conservation Area: The property is located on The Chase, a long residential street linking Wandsworth Road and Clapham Common North Side in Clapham, London SW4. The surrounding area was developed with substantial houses in the 1870s and is now designated as The Chase Conservation Area (CA35), recognized for its special architectural and historic character. Houses in this area (including No.46) are typically Victorian villas and semis constructed in London stock brick with decorative features such as brick porches, bay windows and Dutch gables. Lambeth Local Plan Policy Q22 (Conservation Areas) requires that any development here “*preserve or enhance*” the area’s character and appearance, and this assessment notes that No.46 is not listed but falls under conservation area controls. An appraisal of the street describes a range of styles unified by high-quality Victorian design, which the proposal seeks to respect.



Figure 1: Front facade of 46 The Chase, a semi-detached Victorian villa within the conservation area, featuring stock brick with bay windows and historic detailing.

Existing Property: No.46 is a semi-detached three-storey Victorian dwelling with an existing basement extending under most of the house footprint. The property is paired closely with its neighbours (No.48 to the north, and No.44 to the south). It has

a front garden/forecourt (including an existing garage access) and a rear garden with mature landscaping. Being in a conservation area, the street frontage features greenery and traditional boundary treatments, contributing to the locale's character.

Recent Planning History: The site has seen prior improvement works in line with its residential use. Notably, a loft conversion with three rear dormer windows and two front rooflights was approved in 2022, indicating the Council's acceptance of sensitive alterations (including modest front rooflights) in this conservation setting. Neighbouring properties have also undergone alterations: for example, No.44 The Chase recently received permission for an extension (as documented in a 2021 Heritage Statement), and No.1 The Chase was granted a new-build scheme including a basement and front lightwell. These precedents demonstrate that Lambeth Council has supported development on The Chase where heritage impacts are carefully managed. The planning background therefore suggests a context in which well-designed upgrades – maintaining the Victorian character – are generally permissible.

Proposed Development Overview

The proposal for No.46 The Chase is a comprehensive residential improvement project. In summary, the development entails upgrading and expanding the existing basement level and making associated alterations to the building, alongside sustainability enhancements. The key components of the proposed scheme are:

- **Basement Enlargement:** Excavation to deepen and enlarge the existing basement by approximately 1.0 metre, increasing floor-to-ceiling headroom and usable area. This will remain *within the footprint* of the house, except for new lightwell areas (no full-width subterranean extension under the gardens is proposed).
- **Front Lightwells:** Formation of two new lightwells at the front of the property to provide natural light and emergency egress to the enlarged basement. These lightwells will be modest in size and covered with flush metal grilles at ground level (rather than visible railings), in order to minimize visual impact on the street scene. The lightwells are located in the front forecourt adjacent to the house façade, designed to appear as traditional pavement/grille openings typical for basement windows in historic areas.
- **Lowering of Basement Floor:** Internally, the basement floor slab will be lowered by ~1m to achieve improved floor-to-ceiling height. The overall basement depth below ground will

increase accordingly, necessitating underpinning of existing foundations (addressed in Section 4 below).

- **Garage Conversion:** The existing on-site garage (currently with a vehicle access door on the frontage) will be converted into a utility room as part of the dwelling. The external garage door will be removed and replaced with a new timber door or window assembly in a style sympathetic to the house's period character. This improves the frontage by installing high-quality joinery (likely a double-leaf timber door or glazed panel) more in keeping with the rest of the façade, while the use of the space changes from car storage to functional household utility space.
- **Dormer Window Upgrades:** Two rear dormer windows (at roof level) will be replaced with new units. The new dormer windows will match the existing size and style (or be slightly improved in design/insulation) to preserve the appearance. They will be timber-framed and aligned with the existing roof profile, ensuring no additional overlooking or bulk is introduced beyond the already approved dormers. This aspect of the proposal essentially refreshes the roof extension elements in a sensitive manner.
- **Photovoltaic Panels:** Installation of a set of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels on a flat roof section of the building. These panels will be low-profile and positioned on a flat or shallow-pitch roof (likely atop the dormer or rear roof flat area) so that they are not prominent from street views. The PV array will contribute to on-site renewable energy generation, improving the property's sustainability credentials in line with local and London-wide climate policies. Care will be taken that panel placement does not detract from the building's appearance – typically they will be flush with the roof surface and not visible from the public realm.

Overall, the scope of works modernizes the home (improving space and energy efficiency) while maintaining its external character. The front façade changes are minimal (new lightwell grilles at ground level and a timber infill in place of a garage door), and all materials for visible elements (timber joinery, metal grilles, slate/lead detailing on dormers, etc.) will be selected to harmonize with the Victorian aesthetic. No increase in building footprint or height is proposed, and the works predominantly affect the sub-surface (basement) and interior. The design intent is to achieve the homeowner's needs for space and sustainability without causing harm to the heritage value of the site or its surroundings.

Lambeth Local Plan Policy Assessment

The proposal has been reviewed against the relevant policies of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021), with particular attention to policies on basement development, heritage conservation, flood risk, and sustainability. The following is an assessment of compliance with key policies:

- **Basement Development (Policy Q27):** Lambeth's Local Plan includes a specific policy Q27 dealing with basement extensions. This policy states that the Council will *"support basement and associated development (light wells, basement area excavation, etc.) where applicants can demonstrate that no unacceptable impacts will result"* to a range of considerations – namely groundwater flow, land stability, surface water/flooding, nearby trees/landscaping, cumulative basement effects, waste and carbon emissions, and heritage assets. The proposed basement works at No.46 have been carefully designed to meet these criteria:
 - **Extent and Design:** The new basement will not extend beyond the existing ground-floor footprint of the house, aside from the small front lightwell voids. This adheres to policy limits that basement footprints should not exceed the original building footprint and that a majority of garden land should remain undeveloped at ground level. In this case, *over 70% of the front and rear garden areas will remain at their original ground level*, easily satisfying the policy requirement of retaining at least 70% of undeveloped garden. The basement is a single storey in height and is situated entirely beneath the existing structure (no "full width" subterranean addition under the open garden), which is in line with Lambeth's generally cautious approach to residential basements.
 - **Lightwells:** Policy Q27 part (e) provides guidance on lightwells in front gardens, emphasizing that they should only be provided where needed for daylight to the basement, should be designed sensitively, and should *"minimise the visual impact through good design (in many cases, especially in conservation areas, this is likely to mean lightwells with pavement grilles rather than open lightwells with balustrades)"*. The proposal complies with this: the two front lightwells are necessary to provide natural light and emergency escape to habitable basement rooms, and they have been designed with discreet flush pavement grilles (no above-ground railings). The lightwell openings are modest and will not result in significant loss of front garden landscaping – they will be integrated into the forecourt area without harming the visual

integrity of the building or the streetscape. By following the policy's design recommendations, the scheme ensures the lightwells will have minimal heritage impact.

- **Structural and Environmental Safeguards:** In compliance with Policy Q27, a comprehensive **Basement Impact Assessment (BIA)** has been undertaken (see Section 4) to address geology, hydrology, and engineering impacts. This fulfils the requirement that basement proposals submit a Basement Impact Assessment by a qualified professional covering groundwater, stability, flood risk, etc. The findings of the BIA demonstrate that the basement can be constructed without causing unacceptable risk to the environment or adjoining structures. Groundwater will be managed with proper waterproofing and drainage; structural design (underpinning and retaining walls) will maintain land stability; and the minor increase in basement floor area will have negligible cumulative impact (particularly given that it's largely within the existing envelope). Waste generation (excavated soil) and carbon emissions have been considered – the construction strategy (Section 6) includes measures to cart away spoil efficiently (reducing lorry trips) and the incorporation of on-site PV panels will mitigate operational carbon footprint. Thus, the proposal meets Policy Q27's tests for acceptable basement development.
- **Conservation and Design (Policies Q22 and Q5):** Being inside The Chase Conservation Area, the development is subject to heritage and design controls. Policy Q22 (Conservation Areas) requires that any alterations preserve or enhance the special character of the area. The proposed works have been designed with a sensitive approach: externally, changes are minimal and sympathetic. The front façade retains its appearance aside from replacing a garage door with a timber element that will better match the Victorian style (arguably an enhancement, as a solid garage door is often an alien feature on historic facades). The new basement lightwell grilles will be flush and subtle, largely invisible unless one is immediately adjacent to the property, thereby preserving the visual continuity of the front garden and area. At the rear, the replacement dormer windows will use matching traditional materials (painted timber, slate etc.) and occupy the same openings, thus there is *no additional visual bulk* on the roof – the character of the rear roofscape (which is not prominently visible from public viewpoints) remains unchanged.

Policy Q22 also often refers to adherence to conservation area appraisal guidance. The Chase Conservation Area (CA35) is noted for its uniform yet distinctive 19th-

century architecture. The proposal does not introduce any discordant elements: no changes to the main elevations' masonry or decorative features are proposed, and the building's original features (windows, bays, roof form) are respected. In terms of scale and massing, the development is entirely subterranean or internal, so the external scale of the building is unchanged – satisfying Policy Q5 (Local Distinctiveness) which requires extensions to respond positively to the scale and character of the host building. Overall, the character and appearance of the conservation area will be preserved. Any *temporary* visual impacts from construction (scaffolding, etc.) will be short-term and fully reversible.

Additionally, the inclusion of PV solar panels is done in a manner consistent with design policies: Policy EN4 (Sustainable Design and Construction) encourages renewable energy integration, and conservation area guidance typically permits solar panels when not harming key views. In this case, panels are on a flat roof section set back from the front; they will not be readily visible from street level and thus do not detract from the historic character. In sum, the proposal accords with the heritage policies – it preserves the conservation area's character, with a likely neutral or slight positive impact (due to design improvements like the garage façade treatment).

- **Flood Risk and Drainage (Policy EN5):** Lambeth's Policy EN5 (Flood Risk) and supporting guidance (including the London Plan) seek to ensure developments avoid and mitigate flood risks. Although a full Flood Risk Assessment is not formally required for this scale of householder development in Zone 1, the proposal has considered flood and drainage implications (see Section 5). The site is in Flood Zone 1 (low probability of river flooding), so the main concerns are groundwater and surface water. The basement design incorporates waterproofing and pumped drainage (dual protection system) to address any seepage, complying with the requirement that basements be safe from flooding. Policy EN5 also requires sustainable drainage measures (SuDS) – the scheme will maintain ample permeable garden area and provide suitable drainage for the new lightwells to ensure no increase in runoff leaving the site. By adhering to these measures, the development aligns with EN5's objective of managing flood risk on-site.
- **Sustainability and Energy (Policies EN3, EN4):** The project demonstrates a commitment to sustainability in line with local policy. Policy EN3 encourages on-site renewable energy and reduction of carbon emissions; the addition of photovoltaic panels on the roof directly responds to this by generating clean electricity for the household. Policy EN4 requires sustainable design and construction practices – the design will upgrade the building's fabric where possible (e.g. improved insulation in the new basement walls/floor, high-

efficiency lighting and services in the renovation). During construction, waste will be minimized and materials reused/recycled where feasible (as outlined in the Construction Management Plan). The retention and adaptive reuse of the existing structure (rather than complete redevelopment) is itself a sustainable approach, conserving embodied energy. Thus, the development is consistent with the Council's sustainability policies and the broader London Plan objective of making homes more energy-efficient and resilient.

In conclusion, the proposal appears well-aligned with Lambeth Local Plan policies. It respects heritage constraints (Policy Q22), meets the stringent criteria for basement digs (Policy Q27), addresses environmental considerations (EN5 for flooding, EN4 for sustainability), and maintains good design principles (Q5/Q7 for extensions). The forthcoming application would include detailed documents (heritage statement, BIA, construction plan, etc.) to demonstrate this compliance, giving the Council confidence that the scheme can be permitted without policy conflict.

Basement Impact and Geotechnical Considerations

A **Basement Impact Assessment (BIA)** has been prepared by consulting engineers Richard Tant Associates (dated April 2022) to evaluate the structural, geotechnical, and hydrological effects of deepening the basement. The BIA, along with site investigation data (borehole and trial pit logs) and a suggested method of construction (drawings 5306-SM01 to SM04), informs the approach to ensure the basement extension is safe and will not adversely affect the property or its neighbours. Key findings and considerations are summarized below:

- **Ground Conditions:** The site lies on typical Lambeth subsoil strata. A borehole was sunk (Appendix A of the BIA) which revealed approximately 1.2 m of made ground (fill) overlying sandy gravel down to ~3.4 m depth, then clay strata extending to at least 8 m depth. The existing basement of No.46 is shallow (covering the majority of the footprint but not very deep), and the proposed deeper excavation (approximately an additional 1 m) will likely penetrate into the top of the clay layer. Groundwater was encountered in the borehole at about 7.61 m depth (rising to ~7.02 m), far below the planned excavation level. This indicates that the water table is well under the proposed basement floor – roughly 3–4 m below the new invert level – which significantly reduces risks of water ingress during and after construction. Additionally, trial pits dug on site (at locations around the existing foundations) were found to be dry and confirmed the soil profile from the borehole. In summary, the ground

investigation shows stable soil conditions (dense gravel and stiff clay) and no near-surface groundwater, which is favourable for basement construction.

- **Structural Methodology:** The basement will be constructed using a carefully engineered underpinning and excavation sequence to guarantee stability.
- - *Stage 1: Preliminary works* – isolate or divert any services under the area to be excavated; then install temporary works to enable safe excavation. This includes casting temporary mass concrete pads and thrust blocks to support needles, and casting a new reinforced concrete strip footing at the current ground-floor level to serve as the first part of the new front wall (for the lightwell). Steel needles and horizontal props (waling beams) will be installed through the foundation walls to support the structure while underpinning takes place.
 - *Stage 2: Underpinning excavation* – in a hit-and-miss sequence, short sections of the existing basement wall footing will be removed (every other bay) and underpinned with mass concrete and reinforced concrete (R.C.) underpin blocks. The underpins extend down to the new lowered basement level. Once one set of underpin “pins” cures, the intermediate sections are excavated and underpinned similarly, so that eventually the entire perimeter is underpinned. Lower-level horizontal props are installed as needed during this stage to brace the new underpins until the floor slab is placed. Essentially, the existing foundation is replaced with a new deeper RC foundation wall in segments, maintaining support throughout. The front lightwell walls will be formed in a similar staged manner (the BIA notes new lightwell RC walls will be built also using hit-and-miss technique alongside underpinning).
 - *Stage 3: Base slab and final structure* – After the perimeter underpins are complete, a new 150 mm thick reinforced concrete basement floor slab will be poured at the lowered level across the footprint. This slab will tie into the new underpinning footings, forming a robust retaining box. Once the slab concrete has cured, a steel frame will be installed in certain locations (e.g. to support the internal structure and trimmed portions of the underpinned walls).
 - These steel beams/columns are designed to carry any loads from the house above (for example, where interior walls or chimneys might have been affected by the excavation). After the permanent structure is in

place, all temporary props and needles will be carefully removed. The basement fit-out can then be completed (insulation, waterproof membrane, finishes, etc.).

This staged method ensures that at no point is a large section of the existing foundation unsupported – the hit-and-miss underpinning keeps the structure stable, and the temporary supports handle loads until the new concrete and steel take over. The method has been devised by structural engineers and will be finalized by the contractor's temporary works engineer, but it provides confidence that the excavation can be executed without structural collapse or undue movement.

Notably, the underpinning is confined to the walls of No.46 itself; no shared party wall with a neighbour is being underpinned (since No.48 is slightly set apart and No.44's structure is not directly tied into No.46's basement). The BIA confirms that No.48 is approximately 1 m away from the edge of the proposed basement, and No.44 about 4.5 m away, so neither adjacent building's foundation will be disturbed by direct excavation. The new reinforced concrete underpinning walls are engineered to carry not only the load of No.46, but also to resist lateral soil pressures, water pressure, and surcharge from neighbouring buildings' foundations as. In essence, the basement will form a stiff RC box that upholds ground stability around it.

- **Ground Movement Analysis:** The BIA includes an analysis of potential ground movements and their effect on neighbouring structures and utilities. Given the underpinning method described, any settlement is expected to be very small. The report notes that typically a 2.5 m deep underpin could experience around 5 mm of settlement with standard practice, but here they will use an expanding admixture in the underpinning concrete dry-pack (the filler between new underpin and old footing) to ensure a tight fill. With this mitigation, the expected vertical movement is reduced to <3 mm, which is essentially negligible. Short-term ground heave from unloading soil is also calculated to be negligible due to the relatively small area of excavation. Horizontal movements of soil are likewise predicted to be very minor – on the order of the same magnitude (<3 mm at the excavation face, diminishing to zero within about 1.5 m from the wall). Since the nearest neighbour (No.48) is ~1 m away, the horizontal movement at that distance would be close to 1–2 mm, which is trivial. The BIA concludes that these limited movements correspond to a "Burland Category 1" damage level (which means negligible to very slight impact – at most hairline cracking) for the adjacent structures. In practical terms, the neighbouring properties are not expected to experience any observable damage because of the basement construction. Nonetheless, as good practice, a condition survey of adjoining structures can be done

before work, and movement monitoring can be implemented during construction to verify actual movements stay within predicted ranges.

- **Waterproofing and Groundwater Control:** Although the water table is deep, the design takes a belt-and-braces approach to waterproofing. Per the BIA, two lines of defence against water ingress will be provided. First, a waterproof membrane or cementitious tanking will be applied to the outside of the new underpinning walls (Type A waterproofing). Second, an internal cavity drainage system (Type C) will be installed on the inside of the basement perimeter. This system includes cavity drain mats that collect any minor seepage and channel it to a sump pump system at the basement low point, which will pump water out to the drainage system. The engineers expect only a very slight amount of groundwater, if any, to ingress (since soils were dry above 7 m depth). The pumped system is mainly a contingency to handle rainwater that might enter lightwells or any unforeseen moisture. The dual system conforms to best practice for residential basements (aligned with BS8102 waterproofing standards). Additionally, because the basement doesn't extend under the garden, natural land drainage in the remaining soft areas will continue unimpeded, and the basement's impact on the broader groundwater flow is minimal. The BIA explicitly analysed subterranean water flow and found no significant risk of diverting groundwater in a way that could affect other properties or cause flooding – any perched groundwater will be managed by the tanking and pump, and there is no aquifer depletion or concentrated flow change given the small scale of excavation.
- **Slope Stability:** The site is relatively level (no steep slopes nearby), but the BIA considered land stability as required. The new basement retaining walls (the underpinned walls) and base slab will act to support the vertical and lateral loads of soil, preventing any slope movement or ground collapse. Essentially, once built, the basement is a rigid inset retaining structure that holds back earth as effectively as the prior ground did. Since the surrounding terrain is gentle and there are no embankments or significant gradients at No.46, there are no slope stability issues; the BIA confirms that this aspect has been assessed and “discharged” (no concern remains).
- **Impact on Utilities:** A drainage survey (CCTV inspection of underground pipes) was conducted to map existing drains. The survey found no public sewer or major drainage line running immediately adjacent to the house that would be affected by the new lightwells or underpinning works. The nearest public sewers are likely in the street and will remain undisturbed (the front lightwells don't extend to the pavement). The BIA notes that with the

anticipated negligible ground movement, there should be *no impact on underground utilities* such as water/gas mains in the street or drains. Nonetheless, the contractor will liaise with utility companies and take precautions (e.g. vibration monitoring) if needed. Any house connections (water, gas, etc.) will be re-routed or temporarily supported during the works to prevent breakage.

- **Basement Use and Layout:** The enlarged basement will remain as part of the single-family dwelling, containing habitable rooms (exact use to be determined, e.g. media room, bedroom, etc.) and served by proper light and ventilation via the new lightwells. No separate dwelling or excessive occupancy is proposed – thus, from a planning perspective, the use is ancillary to the main house. Fire safety and egress are accounted for with the lightwell escape windows and an internal stair. These details will be refined at Building Regulations stage but are mentioned here as part of demonstrating the basement will be fit for purpose and safe.

In summary, the geotechnical and structural evaluation confirms that the basement extension at No.46 can be executed **safely and without harm** to neighbouring properties or infrastructure. The design follows a conservative approach (underpinning only this house, assuming neighbours have no basements to ensure worst-case design loads) and includes measures to handle groundwater and maintain stability. All findings point to a well-managed excavation: estimated settlements under 3 mm (negligible), no adverse impact on groundwater flow or flooding, and structural integrity maintained throughout by the phased underpinning scheme. The project will be overseen by qualified structural engineers, and a Party Wall Agreement will be in place with adjoining owners to formalize monitoring and protections. With these provisions, the basement impact is assessed to be acceptable, complying with Lambeth's requirements for basement development.

Flood Risk, Drainage and SuDS Implications

Although the site is in Flood Zone 1 (lowest risk of river or tidal flooding), careful consideration has been given to potential flood and drainage issues associated with the basement development. The Environment Agency Flood Map classifies Zone 1 as having less than 0.1% annual probability of flooding, so no sequential or exception test is required for this proposal. However, Lambeth policy and good practice require that surface water and groundwater aspects are addressed, especially for subterranean structures. The relevant points are as follows:

- **Fluvial/Tidal Flooding:** As noted, Zone 1 status means no significant risk from the River Thames or other watercourses. The site is well above any river flood plains. A formal Flood Risk Assessment is typically not mandatory for householder developments in Zone 1, but key information has been included in the BIA and this assessment to demonstrate awareness of any flood issues. No historical river flooding incidents are known for this location.
- **Groundwater Flooding:** The possibility of groundwater flooding (water table rise) is very low here. The borehole data (Section 4) shows the water table at roughly 7 m below ground level, which is far deeper than the new basement (which will be ~3 m below ground). Additionally, trial holes on site were dry. This suggests that even during wet seasons the groundwater does not reach near-surface layers in this locale. The BIA explicitly analysed groundwater flow and concluded the new basement would not obstruct any critical groundwater paths or cause water to accumulate abnormally. The double-layer waterproofing strategy (membrane + cavity drain with sump pump) provides security that, even in the unlikely event of a rising water table or localized perched water, the basement would remain protected. The sump pump system is designed to automatically discharge any water that might collect, thus preventing any risk of internal flooding. (It will have non-return valves to stop backflow and can be specified with battery back-up for power outage scenarios, per best practice.)
- **Surface Water Drainage:** Currently, rainwater on the property is handled via roof gutters and downpipes discharging to the combined sewer (common in London) and by natural infiltration into the soil in garden areas. The proposal does not significantly increase the impermeable area of the site – the building footprint remains the same. The only new openings are the two front lightwells, which increase permeable area slightly (since they are voids in the ground), albeit those voids will collect water that must be drained.

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) principles will be applied to ensure runoff from the site does not increase and ideally is reduced or slowed. Specifically, the lightwells will be designed with drain gullies at their base, which will connect into the property's drainage system. Rain that falls into the lightwells will be captured and piped – likely it will be directed into the existing drainage line that served the house (with discharge to the combined sewer) or into a new soakaway if feasible. Given the small scale, a direct connection to the existing system is expected, but it will be attenuated if required (e.g. via a sump pump that discharges at a controlled rate). The design team will also explore opportunities for permeable surfacing in any

hard landscaping being replaced. For example, if parts of the front driveway or pathway are to be re-laid after construction, permeable pavers or gravel bedding could be used to encourage infiltration on-site.

- **Flooding from Sewers/Infrastructure:** The risk of sewer surcharge flooding (e.g. during heavy rain the combined sewer surcharges) is present across London but is not known to be acute in this specific area. The basement will have a sump and pump for its drainage, which typically includes a one-way valve, reducing the risk of sewer backflow into the basement. Furthermore, the drainage survey found no public sewer running through the front garden (where the lightwells are), so there is no direct risk of damaging a sewer or having one leak near the basement. The proposal will be referred to Thames Water if necessary for build-over consent, but early indications show that existing mains are safely distant.
- **Stormwater Management and Policy Compliance:** Lambeth's Local Plan (Policy EN5 and Annex 5) along with the London Plan (Policy SI 13) require that developments aim for greenfield runoff rates and incorporate SuDS hierarchy measures. While those targets are more applicable to major developments, this scheme will still incorporate proportional measures. The remaining garden areas (front and rear) ensure that a good portion of rainfall can soak into the ground naturally. Post-development, at least 70% of the rear garden remains permeable soft landscape, which easily meets policy expectations. Any new landscaping will use topsoil and planting that enhances absorption (no extensive new hard surfacing is proposed beyond what already exists for the driveway). Water butts can be installed on downpipes to harvest rainwater from the roof for garden use, which is a simple SuDS measure.

Overall, the runoff volume from the site is not expected to increase, and peak discharge rates will be effectively the same as existing (with a slight delay introduced by the new collection/pump system). This means the development will not add to surface water flood risk in the area. During construction, the contractor will implement measures to manage runoff and sediment (per the CMP, e.g. not pumping silty water into drains without filtration), to protect the drainage system.

In conclusion, flood risk is very low and well-mitigated. The design and mitigation measures ensure that the new basement will be dry and safe, and that the development will not increase flood risk to others. The site's Zone 1 status and the engineering precautions in place give confidence that the proposal satisfies the requirements of a safe development in terms of drainage. A concise Flood Risk &

Drainage Strategy document can be provided with the formal application to demonstrate these points to the Council, likely confirming that no adverse flood impacts will arise.

Construction Management and Logistics

Construction activities for the proposed development will be significant (particularly the basement excavation) but will be managed under a robust Construction Management Plan (CMP) to minimize disruption to neighbours and ensure safety. Key aspects of the construction management and logistics plan include:

- **Site Access and Traffic:** The property fronts onto The Chase, which is a residential street. Site access for construction will be through the front of No.46 (the forecourt/driveway area), as no rear access exists. All deliveries and removals will occur from the street. The CMP proposes an allocated loading/unloading area on The Chase immediately in front of the site. Parking along that kerb segment will be suspended as needed to allow construction vehicles to park temporarily. This area will also serve as a holding bay for vehicles that arrive, so they do not block traffic. The contractors will coordinate with Lambeth's Highways department to obtain any necessary licenses for skips or hoarding on the road.
- **Vehicle Movement Coordination:** A strategy is in place to schedule heavy vehicle movements outside of peak traffic hours. The Chase is moderately trafficked, so deliveries will be arranged for mid-morning or early afternoon, avoiding rush hour and school drop-off/pick-up times. Furthermore, deliveries will be staggered such that multiple lorries do not arrive simultaneously (preventing congestion). The CMP notes that construction vehicles on standby can wait on The Chase in the designated zone, rather than circulating the area. All suppliers and subcontractors will be given a pre-defined route to the site (likely via major roads like Wandsworth Road) to avoid smaller residential lanes and reduce disturbance. The site is about 0.6 miles from Wandsworth Road Station and other main routes, so it is accessible. Traffic marshals (banksmen) will be present during critical operations (e.g. when a truck is reversing into position) to ensure safety of pedestrians and to guide vehicles.
- **Working Hours:** Construction operating hours will strictly follow Lambeth's standard permitted times – typically 08:00 to 18:00 on weekdays, 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays, and no work on Sundays or bank holidays. The CMP explicitly states no vehicles, or noisy activities will occur outside these

hoursfile-cimzjm5yec4aus1v14vyeh. This condition will be communicated to all contractors to ensure compliance and minimize any off-hours disturbance.

- **Excavation and Waste Removal:** Excavating the basement will generate a substantial volume of spoil (mostly soil). To handle this efficiently, the contractor plans to use a combination of skips and “grab lorries.” A skip (or a demountable skip container) will be located at the front of the site – possibly on the driveway or immediately on the road outside (with permission) – into which excavated material will be placed. Periodically, a grab lorry (a truck with a hydraulic arm) will be scheduled to visit the site; the grab lorry can remove the contents of the skip directly by picking up the soil and loading it onto the truck. This method allows rapid removal of large quantities of spoil without having to swap multiple skip bins, thereby reducing the number of trips. Each grab lorry can carry away many tons of material in one visit. The CMP indicates that licensed waste carriers will be used and that debris spills will be cleaned immediately (a designated worker will sweep/clean any mud from the road during operations). All waste will be disposed of at appropriate facilities, and records of waste management will be kept (aligning with the Site Waste Management Plan section of the CMP).
- **Materials Delivery and Storage:** Construction materials (steel beams, cement, excavation props, etc.) will be delivered on rigid trucks or transit vans. As noted, there will be a holding area on The Chase for deliveries. The contractor will ensure that delivery drivers call ahead so that site staff can be ready to receive goods promptly, minimizing idling time. Materials will be off-loaded either directly into the site or into the front garden area. Given the limited space, just-in-time delivery will be practiced: only materials needed for the immediate next phase will be delivered, to avoid large stockpiles. Certain bulky materials (e.g. reinforcement steel, waterproofing membranes) will be temporarily stored on site in the front area or in the excavated basement (once it’s formed) if weather safe. The CMP encourages site workers to use public transport (Clapham Common Underground is ~10 min walk, several bus routes nearby) and notes that workers will not be given parking spaces, to prevent adding parking pressure. This will also leave more room for material storage on the forecourt instead of personal vehicles. Construction plant (mini excavators, concrete mixers, pumps) will be located within the site boundary where possible and only brought to site when needed.
- **Neighbour Communication:** A key part of managing works in a residential setting is keeping neighbours informed. The applicant will engage with immediate neighbours (Nos. 44 and 48, among others on The Chase) prior to

and during construction. Letter drops or meetings will be used to explain the timeline and key stages (especially any particularly noisy or disruptive operations). A liaison contact (site manager phone/email) will be provided so residents can easily communicate concerns. The Party Wall process with adjoining owners (under the Party Wall etc. Act 1996) will also ensure that neighbours have input on certain aspects (like condition surveys, vibration monitoring, etc.). The CMP emphasizes that concerns of neighbouring residents will be taken into account, and all operatives will be briefed on respecting the amenity of the area.

- **Environmental Controls (Noise, Dust, Vibration):** The contractor will implement “Best Practicable Means” to reduce construction nuisances in accordance with environmental regulations and Lambeth’s Code of Construction Practice. Specific measures from the CMP include:
 - **Dust Suppression:** Use of water spray or misting during demolition and drilling to prevent dust clouds; covering skip loads and material stockpiles (tarpaulins) to contain dust; regular sweeping of the street and cleaning of vehicle wheels before exit to avoid mud tracking. Lorries transporting loose materials will be required to be *sheeted* over each trip.
 - **Noise Mitigation:** All machinery will have modern silencers and will be well-maintained. No idling of engines when not in use. Where feasible, hydraulic or electric equipment will be used instead of noisier pneumatic/percussive tools. For example, a concrete breaker attached to a mini excavator (hydraulic) may be used to break up the existing slab, rather than a handheld jackhammer, to reduce noise and vibration. Working hours restrictions (no early morning or evening work) also limit noise impact to reasonable times.
 - **Vibration:** Heavy impacts will be minimized. Underpinning will be done carefully in small sections to avoid large vibrations. If needed, vibration monitors can be installed at adjacent buildings to ensure levels stay below damage thresholds. Large vibratory rollers are not required since no new extensive foundations externally, so vibration sources are limited.
 - **Monitoring:** The CMP mentions that dust and noise levels will be monitored periodically and that the site will register under the *Considerate Constructors Scheme*, adhering to its guidelines for

respectful construction behaviour. Any complaints will be logged and addressed promptly by the site manager.

- **Public Safety and Site Security:** The site will be secured with appropriate hoardings or fencing to prevent unauthorized access, especially given the open excavation for the basement. Typically, 2m high solid hoarding with warning signage will be erected at the front boundary (with an artistically presented finish if required by Council). During working hours, a banksman will manage any interface between construction activities and pedestrians (for instance, when cranes or telehandlers might be in use). The CMP outlines measures for keeping the public footway safe – e.g., no obstructions or if unavoidable, a temporary footpath diversion with barriers will be put in place. Site lighting will be arranged to avoid glare to neighbours at night (though night work isn't planned, any security lighting will be motion-activated and low level). Access to neighbouring properties will not be impeded at any time.

In summary, the construction phase, while involved, will be tightly managed to mitigate impacts on the community. Lambeth is likely to impose a planning condition requiring a final Construction Management Plan, and the draft CMP shows the applicant is already planning in detail for this. The approach meets Council expectations by addressing traffic (with scheduled deliveries and a dedicated loading area), environmental controls (dust/noise suppression), working hours, and community liaison. With these measures, the inevitable inconveniences of construction will be reduced as far as practicable. The result should be that the project proceeds safely, in an orderly fashion, and with maintained good relations with neighbours and the Council's enforcement teams.

Trees and Landscaping Impact

The proposal has been designed to avoid or minimize impacts on existing trees and landscaping on and around the site. An assessment of the site identifies a few vegetation features of note:

- **Rear Garden Tree (Tree of Heaven):** At the rear boundary between No.46 and No.44, there is a mature Tree of Heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*) – identified as *T1* in a recent tree work application. This deciduous tree is sizable and has branches overhanging both properties. Importantly, the proposed basement works are entirely at the front/under the house and do not extend into the rear garden, meaning the Tree of Heaven's root zone will remain undisturbed. Its roots are likely deep and spread laterally in the back gardens, far from

where excavation will occur. During construction, protective measures (per BS 5837:2012 Trees in Construction) will be put in place: for instance, fencing off the dripline of that tree so no storage or mixing of materials happens near it. The Council has already been engaged regarding this tree – permission was obtained to prune back overhanging branches by up to 3m to the boundary, ensuring the tree’s canopy is kept balanced and reducing risk of branch damage during works. The proposal does not involve removal of this tree; it will be retained and maintained. Given the distance (the house is ~4.5 m from the tree and basement even further), the Arboricultural impact is negligible. The tree’s health will be monitored but is expected to continue thriving post-development.

- **Front Garden Vegetation:** The front garden/forecourt of No.46 is relatively small and partly hardscaped for the driveway. It currently has some low hedges and ornamental planting along the front boundary and sides, as well as possibly a small shrub or tree near the house (visible in Figure 1, a Magnolia or similar in the front yard). To construct the new lightwells, some of this front landscaping will need adjustment. Each lightwell will occupy a portion of ground abutting the front wall of the house – likely displacing a bit of the planting immediately next to the house. Any shrubs in those exact spots would be removed or transplanted. However, these are minor landscape elements that can be readily replaced after construction. The plan would be to re-plant around the lightwell grilles to soften their appearance (for example, planting low groundcover or arranging planters around the grille perimeters once the project is complete). The majority of the front boundary hedge will remain intact, preserving the green curb appeal and privacy screening. The design of the lightwells (flush grilles) also means the front garden can still be used and planted over almost as before (e.g. pots can sit on the grilles, or a thin layer of gravel can disguise them if desired, since they are weight-bearing). In essence, front garden greenery will be restored to as good or better condition post-works, ensuring the visual character of the street is maintained.
- **Street Trees/Public Realm:** There are no street trees immediately outside No.46 (checking the frontage, none are located on the pavement in front of the property). Thus, no street tree will be affected by site access or hoarding. If any street greenery was present, the contractor would take care to protect it (with boxing around trunks, etc.), but in this case it’s not applicable. The public grass verges/planters are also not present on this street as the sidewalk abuts front garden hedges.

- **Tree Protection Plan:** As part of the planning submission, we can provide a simple Tree Protection Plan illustrating protective fencing around any significant trees (particularly the Tree of Heaven at the rear boundary) during construction. Construction materials storage and vehicle movement in the rear garden are not anticipated (since all work is from the front), which inherently protects the rear garden tree roots from compaction. The excavation for the lightwells will be done carefully by hand where near any retained shrubs to avoid root damage, or root-prune minor roots, if necessary, under arborist supervision (though most front plants are ornamental and not protected). All tree work (like the pruning of the Tree of Heaven) has been or will be carried out by a qualified tree surgeon under the relevant tree work consents.
- **Landscaping Enhancements:** After construction, the intent is to enhance the landscaping to compensate for any disturbance. The front area may be refreshed with new planting beds or climbers against the front wall (now with lightwells, perhaps climbing plants can drape to soften the edges). The loss of any small shrub will be mitigated by planting two, and an overall landscape plan can be agreed with the Council's landscape officer if required. The rear garden will remain as existing – construction doesn't require access or digging there, so the mature landscaping in back (lawns, trees, planting) will be preserved. There is an opportunity to improve drainage in the back garden as well by ensuring water from the rear roof and patio is properly channelled (which could help the tree and plants). Small details like top-dressing any lawn areas compacted by vibrations, etc., will be attended to.

In summary, the development has a minimal impact on trees and landscape features. No protected trees are to be removed; the one notable tree (Tree of Heaven) is retained and has already been pruned responsibly with Council approval to avoid conflict with the works. By maintaining the verdant front hedge and replanting any lost shrubs, the proposal will keep the green character of The Chase intact. The Council's policies on urban greening and tree protection are met – for instance, Policy Q10 (trees) which seeks retention of existing mature trees is satisfied. The negligible harm (temporary removal of small plants) will be offset by post-work landscaping, resulting in a development that continues to contribute to the leafy appearance of the conservation area.

Planning Probability Assessment (Likelihood of Approval)

Taking into account all the above factors – policy compliance, technical mitigations, precedent cases, and anticipated impacts – it is assessed that the proposal at 46 The Chase stands a strong chance of obtaining planning permission from Lambeth Council. The following points summarize why approval is likely and identify any potential sensitivities:

- **Policy Alignment:** The scheme has been crafted to align with the Lambeth Local Plan 2021 policies, as detailed in Section 3. Basement Policy Q27's criteria (groundwater, stability, flooding, heritage, etc.) are all satisfactorily addressed by the proposal, meaning the Council can be confident that the basement extension will not cause the kinds of harm that policy seeks to prevent. Heritage Policy Q22 is respected through a design that preserves the conservation area's appearance. There is no indication of any policy conflict – this is crucial, as policy compliance is the first filter in any approval. The inclusion of sustainability measures (solar panels, energy efficiency) further bolsters the scheme in terms of meeting broader objectives (London Plan and Lambeth's climate goals). In policy terms, the development can be described as *sustainable, sympathetic, and small-scale*, which is exactly the kind of home improvement Councils tend to support.
- **Precedent and Context:** There is precedent for similar developments in the area, which suggests the Council has accepted such changes under comparable circumstances. For example, No.1 The Chase (at the opposite end of the street) was granted permission for a new building that included a basement with a front lightwell – indicating Lambeth is open to front lightwells on The Chase when appropriately designed. Additionally, many Victorian houses in Lambeth (and London generally) have undergone basement conversions or extensions in recent years; Lambeth's own Residential Basement Study and policy evolution reflect a *conditional acceptance* of basements – they are permissible so long as impacts are controlled. Given that No.46 already has a basement (this is a deepening of existing space, not an entirely new basement), the principle is even more established. The works essentially upgrade existing accommodation rather than create something unprecedented in the fabric of the building. Nearby, the approved loft extension at No.46 itself in 2022 set a tone that the Council considers improvements here acceptable (that application likely had to address conservation area concerns for rooflights, which it successfully did). All these precedents frame the proposal as a fairly routine enhancement rather than a radical development out of character.

- **Neighbouring Amenity:** A crucial factor for likelihood of approval is whether the proposal harms neighbours' amenity (considerations under Policy Q2: amenity). In this case, impacts on neighbours are very limited:
 - There is no extension above ground, so there is no effect on neighbours' light or outlook. The building's massing remains as-is; hence no overshadowing or enclosure is introduced.
 - The new basement storey is entirely below ground – once completed, it will be imperceptible to neighbours. It doesn't generate overlooking or noise (basement rooms are internally contained).
 - The only external additions are front lightwell grilles and replacement dormer windows. The lightwells face the street and are at basement level, so they pose no privacy issue. The dormer window replacements do not change sight-lines compared to the status quo (they're the same size in the same location), so no new overlooking of neighbours' gardens is created beyond what already exists.
 - During construction, there will be temporary inconveniences (noise, construction traffic) which are addressed via the CMP. The CMP's robust measures (Section 6) – like limited hours, on-site supervision, and neighbour communication – should keep these impacts within acceptable bounds. Lambeth's planning committee or officers will weigh this temporary disturbance against the long-term benefits; given the CMP commitments, they are likely to find it manageable. Typically, conditions will be imposed to enforce the CMP and perhaps restrict particularly noisy works to certain hours, which the applicant is prepared to accept.
 - Structurally, the neighbours are protected (Party Wall awards will be in place, and the BIA shows negligible movement). The neighbours at 44 and 48 have a strong reassurance from the engineering reports that their properties won't be damaged or destabilized. If any neighbour had objections centred on structural fears, the evidence in the BIA would help alleviate those: calculations show <3 mm movements and a Burland Category 1 impact (virtually no damage). The Council's building control and engineers would review this if needed and likely concur that risk to adjoining properties is very low. In planning terms, because permanent amenity impacts are nil and temporary impacts are mitigated, the proposal should be viewed as acceptable relative to

neighbour amenity.

- **Design and Conservation:** From a design review perspective (often the Conservation & Design officer's purview), the proposal should be favourably seen. The changes are discreet and use quality materials. The conservation area will not be harmed – indeed, one could argue it will be *slightly enhanced* by the replacement of a detracting garage door with a more appropriate frontage. The lightwells are designed exactly as policy and guidelines advise (small, grille-covered, not removing significant garden area). The solar panels, if visible at all, will be minor and on a rear/hidden roof. Provided details like the new front door infill and dormer window designs are sympathetic (which they will be, likely conditioned to ensure timber, matching profiles, etc.), the conservation officer should have no major objections. This is a crucial point because if the conservation officer supports or is neutral on the proposal, it avoids a common ground for refusal in such areas (which would be harm to heritage). In this case, no such harm is identified.
- **Technical Reports and Conditions:** The application will be bolstered by the technical reports (Basement Impact Assessment, Construction Management Plan, Drainage Strategy, etc.) that demonstrate due diligence. Lambeth's validators will note that all required documents (per the Local List) for a basement application in a conservation area are provided – this includes structural method statements, BIAs, etc., which many applicants sometimes lack. By providing these up front and showing compliance, the applicant reduces reasons for refusal. The Council might still attach conditions, for example:
 - A condition to submit a detailed Construction Logistics Plan or Construction Management Plan prior to commencement (even though we have a draft, they often require a final one once a contractor is appointed).
 - A condition to implement tree protection for the Tree of Heaven and any other landscaping to be retained.
 - A condition requiring details of materials (the new front timber door design, the grille design, dormer window specs) to be approved to ensure they are of high quality and appropriate appearance.
 - A compliance condition for the solar panels to be set flush and not project above the roof slope, to avoid glare – which we already plan to

do.

These are all manageable and the applicant would be agreeable. There appear to be no insurmountable conditions or obligations that would make the project unviable or alter it substantially. No Section 106 agreement is needed (not a major development), and the CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) impacts are negligible as it's an extension to a single dwelling (likely exempt from CIL under residential extension exemptions).

- **Site Specific Constraints:** The site does not have unusual constraints that complicate planning: it's not listed, not in a floodplain, not in a critical drainage area, not subject to any Article 4 Direction (aside from general conservation area ones), and not in a strategic viewing corridor or other special designation. Access is decent (on a standard road) and the property has a front area to facilitate construction somewhat. These conditions suggest the council has no extra reason to worry. The conservation area is the main designation, and as discussed, that is handled with care.
- **Community and Political Factors:** The support (or at least non-objection) of immediate neighbours can influence the planning process. So far, assuming the applicant consults with neighbours and addresses concerns (especially about construction), it is likely that objections can be minimized or mitigated. If any objections do arise, they would likely focus on construction disturbance or fear of subsidence – issues which we can counter with the CMP and BIA evidence. Lambeth's planning committee typically would not hear a small householder case unless objections were significant; more likely it would be decided under delegated officer authority if straightforward. Given the merits, an officer would have a clear report recommending approval with conditions. The proposal aligns with the Development Plan, so there'd be little justification for refusal. In the unlikely event of a refusal, it would most probably be on a conservative interpretation of heritage impact (e.g. if someone argued lightwells fundamentally alter the character). However, considering The Chase area already has examples of lightwells and that policy explicitly allows them when well-designed, such a reason would not hold strong at appeal. The design mitigation (flush grilles, etc.) should satisfy the heritage concerns.

Overall Probability: On balance, this assessment finds that the application for 46 The Chase has a high probability of approval. The development is a sympathetic improvement to a single-family dwelling with negligible negative impacts and clear benefits (enhanced living space, improved energy efficiency). It adheres to Lambeth's

policies and guidelines, and the application will be supported by thorough documentation. Barring any unforeseen issues, we anticipate the Council will look favourably on the proposal. By addressing all technical and design considerations proactively, the application minimizes reasons for refusal. Therefore, the likelihood of planning permission being granted is rated as strong (we estimate in the order of 90%+ chance, informally speaking). The remaining 10% uncertainty typically covers minor details to be ironed out via conditions or any additional information requests, rather than outright denial.

Next Steps: It is advisable to seek pre-application feedback (if this document is part of that process) to confirm the Council officers are in agreement on key points, especially the heritage aspect. Early engagement with the planning and conservation officers can fine-tune the proposal (for instance, agreeing on the style of the garage-to-utility frontage) to ensure smooth approval. Provided that feedback is positive and is incorporated, we foresee a successful outcome when the full application is submitted.

Pre Planning Application Research by Draw Plans Architectural Design Studio
www.drawplans.uk

This project got planning approval.
Lambeth Planning REF: 22/01591/FUL