

21-23 Cressy Road

Hampstead

Planning, Design & Access Statement

Change of Use of Building from 4x Residential Units to
2x Residential Dwellings (1x2 Bed and 1x4 Bed).
Includes External Alterations to Install New Front
Wall and Automatic Gate to Parking Space and
Erection of a Replacement Single Storey Rear
Extension and Construction of a Second Floor

p.p.s.

Phillips Planning Services Ltd.
Town Planning & Development Consultants

September 2013

CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction 3

2.0 Site Description 5

3.0 Planning History 8

4.0 Planning Policy 9

5.0 Planning Analysis 13

6.0 Design & Access Statement 28

7.0 Conclusions 33

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The following planning, design and access statement has been prepared in support of this planning application for alterations and extensions to Nos. 21 & 23 Cressy Road, Hampstead. This development would be delivered alongside and complement the change of use of Nos. 21 & 23 from four units into two as already permitted by introducing improvements to the rear fenestration and a second floor extension.
- 1.2 However as the planning permission for the change of use has not been implemented yet and in order to create a cogent planning application this application seeks permission for the second storey extension in addition to the change of use from four units to two such that the two elements can be executed together should this application be approved.
- 1.3 The two buildings were changed to form for flats in 1986 and have remained in that form until 2012 when the owner of the building died and the building was sold. My client purchased the site in late 2012 in such a state that three of the units were uninhabitable (three flats contained within No. 21), with only No. 23 being in an acceptable form and still being used.
- 1.4 This planning application seeks to build upon the change in the numbers of units by providing additional floor space at second floor level and continuing the much needed renovation of the building and reorganisation of the building to provide dwellings with acceptable living conditions. As noted in the first application, three of the four flats have been confirmed as having substandard levels of space and fail to meet basic standards of access and daylight.
- 1.5 The previous application therefore rationalised the number of units from four to two and reorganised No. 21 to a more appropriate layout. Part of that development also involved the replacement of the single storey rear extension and various works to the frontage to deliver a better parking area.
- 1.6 As such the scope of this permission includes all the elements approved in the permission achieved earlier this year but introduces an extension at second storey level along with alterations to the fenestration on the rear elevation. The alterations to the fenestration will aid in tidying up the incoherent rear elevation with the second storey extension allowing for additional floor space to be achieved. This will result in an additional bedroom for No. 21 and a much improved bedroom for No. 23.

- 1.7 The second storey extension is considered to be acceptable in this case given that the existing building is to two storeys and sits within the context of predominantly three storey buildings. As such the existing dwelling is somewhat of an oddity within the street and through the application of appropriate detailing and design, would actually integrate with the street scene better following the proposed scheme. Accordingly the proposed development would neither harm the character and appearance of the street scene or the Conservation Area.
- 1.8 The following statement will consider the entire matter even though for all intents and purposes this planning permission will turn upon the second storey and its perceived impact.
- 1.9 The statement is set out as follows:

2.0 Site Description

3.0 Planning History

4.0 Planning Policy

5.0 Planning Analysis

6.0 Design & Access Statement

7.0 Conclusion

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1. Cressy Road is located towards the northern part of the Borough, just to the south of Hampstead Heath. Cressy Road is part of a coherent section of residential development to the south of the train line and north of Mansfield Road and is defined as the Mansfield Conservation Area.
- 2.2. Nos. 21 and 23 Cressy Road were previously a single, two-storey red brick dwelling with two storey high squared bays to either side of the centrally located front door (see below). The entrance to No. 21 is that to the centre of the photograph below with the access to No. 23 to the right hand side of the building.



- 2.3. This is similar in style to adjacent dwellings, but only reaches a height of two storey whereas all other surrounding properties within visual range attain three storeys in height including those directly surrounding the site. As such the overall character of the area is terraces of three storey high; red brick dwellings with repetitive articulations to the front elevations and generally unspoilt front roofscapes (see photograph below).



2.4. We understand from the Conservation Area Appraisal that the area was developed in the second half of the 19th Century and completed in around 1910. Cressy Road appears to have been one of the last roads to have been constructed and there have been no notable changes to the general area since.

2.5. Nos. 21 and 23 were previously a single dwelling but in 1986 planning permission was granted (8501420) for conversion of the building to create 1x2 bed flat, 2x1 bed flat and 1x1 bed maisonette. One of the 1 bed flats became No. 23 and the three remaining units comprised No. 21. Various internal alterations over the intervening years have resulted in some slight changes in that there are now 2x2 bed units and 2x1 bed units. Generally the external appearance is as per the permitted schemes outlined above. These are shown upon the supplied plans and are noted as having the following floor spaces and number of bedrooms/persons:

- 21- Ground Floor – 1b2p – 66.6m²
- 21 – First Floor – 2b3p – 38.2m²
- 21 – Second Floor – 2b3p – 48.1m²
- 23 – Ground and First Floor – 1b2p – 38.6m²

2.6. The current layout of the building is considered to be quite contrived involving circuitous routes to get to rooms and bedrooms without windows. The overall layout is therefore considered to be extremely poor, offering an inferior living arrangement. Having regard to the London Design Guide and the Camden Residential Development Standards, which indicatively shows us whether the sizes of the units are generally acceptable in modern terms, we see the following situation emerge:

Unit No.	Number of Bedrooms	Actual GIA	London Design Guide Figure	Over/Under
21- Ground Floor	1b2p	66.6m ²	50m ²	+16.6m ²
21 – 1st Floor	2b3p	38.2m ²	61m ²	-22.8m ² (59.7%)
21 – 2nd Floor	2b3p	48.1m ²	61m ²	-12.9m ² (26.8%)
23	1b2p	38.6m ²	50m ²	-11.4m ² (29.5%)

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

3.1. There have been changes to individual properties within the area and Nos. 21 & 23 are no exception. The planning history of the site is understood to be:

TP/197/3202 – Permission for the formation of new vehicular access to the highway at No. 21 Cressy Road. (20/10/1960)

TP/1411/1218 – Permission for the erection of a garage to side of No. 21 Cressy Road and a temporary conservatory to rear. (03/02/64)

CTP/E9/4/3/7230/R – Permission for ground floor extension to toilet area and additional habitable room to rear of dwellinghouse. (28/08/69)

CTP/E9/4/3/30879/R – Permission for the erection of a second floor rear extension and the installation of velux roof lights in connection with the provision of a self-contained flat. (22/09/80)

8501420 – Permission for conversion of ground and first floors to create one two-bedroom flat, one one-bedroom maisonette and one one-bedroom flat as shown on one un-numbered drawing revised on 14/01/86. (22/01/86)

2013/2882/P – Permission for change of use of building from 4x residential units to 2x residential dwellings (1x2 bed and 1x3 bed). Includes external alterations to install new front wall and automatic gate to parking space and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension. (30/07/13)

SUMMARY

3.2. The planning history for the building shows that the building is as expected and there appears to be no unauthorised development. The use of the building for four units was permitted in 1986 with additional built development allowed in the 1960's and in 1980.

3.3. Planning permission was granted in July of this year for the change of use from four units to two with ancillary operational development. This application seeks permission for this change of use with the addition of a second storey to the building allowing for an additional bedroom to No. 21 and an enlarged bedroom to No. 23.

4.0 PLANNING POLICY

4.1. The following planning policies are considered relevant to the above planning application.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

4.2. The National Planning Policy Framework published March 2012 sets out central government guidance in respect to planning and development.

4.3. It states under paragraph 14 that there is to be a “presumption in favour of sustainable development” and that:

“For decision-taking this means:

- *Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and*
- *Where the development proposal is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*
 - *Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or*
 - *Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted”*

4.4. Section 6 of the Framework relates to the delivery of housing. It states under paragraph 47 that local planning authorities should be seeking to significantly boost the supply of housing. Paragraph 51 sets out that LPA’s should identify and bring empty housing back into residential use.

4.5. In regards to planning applications for housing, it identifies under paragraph 49 they *“should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development”*.

4.6. As the site is located within a Conservation Area paragraphs 126 through 141 are relevant to the application.

LOCAL PLAN POLICY

- 4.7. The following planning policies were considered by the Council as being applicable to the proposed development and have been illustrated below.

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

- 4.8. The LDF consists of the Core Strategy and the Development policies document which both were adopted in 2010 and thus are prior to the introduction of the NPPF. As such some regard will have to be had as to whether policies are compliant with the NPPF, should they be found not to be then their weight will be diminished.
- 4.9. Policy CS1 sets out the overall approach to growth and development within the District. The policy sets out area of appropriate growth points, but states that limited changes will be acceptable elsewhere. The Council will also expect the best use to be made of available land. High quality design is a noted aim within the supporting text.
- 4.10. Policy CS5 concerns managing the impact of growth and development and lists seven criteria which are to be considered and generally expounds the need for high quality development and design which improves matters where possible and ensures that new development does not result in harm to the amenity of any existing resident. This is followed by Policy CS14 which concerns area of heritage importance, such as conservation areas and promotes the need for development of the highest standards which respects local context and character. The wording follows PPS5 rather than the NPPF, which is the more up to date guidance in respect of heritage assets.
- 4.11. Policy DP2 sets out how the Council will seek to maximise the supply of additional housing by ensure an efficient use of sites, resisting development in sites particularly suitable for housing and resisting alternative development of sites particularly suitable for housing. The Council will also seek to minimise the loss of housing in the borough by protecting against a net loss of residential floor space, protecting permanent housing from conversion to short stay housing and resisting development which will involve the net loss of two or more homes, unless

“ - create large homes in a part of the Borough with a relatively low proportion of large dwellings

- enable substandard units to be enlarged to meet residential space standards, or

.....”

4.12. Policy DP5 sets out how the Council will create mixed and inclusive communities by securing a range of dwelling sizes with a table setting out that within open market housing there is a desire for 2 bed units, but 3 and 4 bed units are also desirable, amounting to 60% of the total aim. The Council does not expect every development to meet this level and will be flexible in the application of this policy and will take account of:

- Character of the development, the site and the area and child density
- Development economics, financial viability and demand

4.13. Policy DP6 sets out that all housing should meet lifetime homes standards. Paragraph 6.5 does however state that the design and nature of some buildings will mean that it will not be possible to meet every element of the lifetime homes standards, but as many features as possible should be achieved.

4.14. Policy DP18 considers the issue of car parking and considers the need for car free and car capped developments within certain areas. This matter will be considered in greater depth as part of the application.

4.15. Policy DP24 is a relatively standard policy requiring a high quality design, requiring that designs are appropriate to their context. This is followed closely by Policy DP25 which concerns heritage assets and their treatment in development control terms. As with Core Strategy policies, this follows the wording within PPS5 rather than the NPPF and as such is slightly out of date and it is considered that the NPPF is more helpful in this regard.

4.16. Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that the residential amenity of neighbouring properties is not harmed by new developments. This includes all general issues of amenity, but the final four criteria state that development should:

h) an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space

4.17. The onward reference is to the Camden Planning Guidance supplementary document regarding space standards, which is itself based upon the London Design Guide space standards.

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

4.18. The following design guides have been taken into account within the formulation of this scheme:

- CPG1 (Design)
- CPG2 (Housing) – Chapters 4 & 5
- CPG6 (Amenity)

5.0 PLANNING ANALYSIS

- 5.1. This amended scheme includes the part of the scheme as submitted for pre-application consideration in addition to the introduction of a second floor extension. As permission has already been granted for the change of use of the building from four units to two this part of the scheme should be considered acceptable.
- 5.2. Accordingly the decision will rest on the impact of the second floor extension and the additional residential floor space being created. We will however cover issues relating to the change of use as the application includes those elements again.

THE PROPOSED SCHEME

- 5.3. In viewing the table at Para 2.6 it is apparent that three of the units are well below the size standards set out within the London Design Guide/Camden Guide and thus would not be approved if put before the Council today. Only one unit is acceptable.
- 5.4. Having regard to the Camden and London Design Guides, the state and layout of the building is not considered acceptable, giving substandard accommodation in terms of size and quality of the built form, which is clear upon viewing the plans, visiting the site and also from the photographs provided.
- 5.5. As such it is not considered appropriate or reasonable to renovate the building in its current configuration as the poor quality living environment would persist. We therefore propose to reconfigure the building to form what is considered to be the optimum layout by converting four units into two units. The layout of the building means that it is difficult to deliver an alternative scheme which delivers the same benefits to floor space and living conditions. As such two units is considered the highest number achievable given the aim of meeting space standards. We would also seek permission to replace the existing rear extension, which is also in a poor state of repair, with a more modern design and layout.
- 5.6. Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that new dwellings are of an appropriate standards and Policy DP2 sets out that while dwellings should be retained, one of the allowances for loss of dwelling numbers is for when floor space is not lost and existing space standards are not met. Various policies consider the issue of high quality design and

as such the proposed development would appear to be compliant with the broad basis of the policy.

- 5.7. The scheme proposes that the building would be split vertically in the manner noted within the proposed layout plans, and including the second floor extension would provide one 4b6/7p unit (No. 21) and one 2b4p unit (No. 23). This would mean that overall residential floor space is not lost only increased, but the scheme would result in the loss of two units to deliver this improvement. Having regard to the London Design Guide figures, we see the following improvements to gross space standards:

Dwelling No.	Number of Bedrooms	Actual GIA	London Design Guide Figure	Over/Under
No. 21	4b6/7p	132m ²	102-113m ²	+19m ² to 30m ²
No. 23	2b4p	83m ²	83m ²	0m ²

- 5.8. No. 21 comfortably exceeds the gross space standards for a unit of this particular size but also all individual room standards within the London Design Guide/Camden Standards. No. 23 meets the minimum standard.
- 5.9. It is quite clear that the rationalisation of the building into two units results in the provision of two units that either meet or exceed the relevant space standards set out within the London Design Guide, but also delivers vast improvements to the layout of the building as a whole. All habitable rooms now have windows with an outlook and access to natural light, rooms are more logically arranged and room sizes are more appropriate. In general this becomes a good place to live.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

- 5.10. The principle of development is considered to be formed of two parts, the first concerning the change of use of the building and the second the extension to the roof.

THE PRINCIPLE OF THE CHANGE OF USE

- 5.11. In respect of the change of use of the building, the current situation is that the building is vacant, in a state of disrepair (No. 21 especially) and incapable of accommodating any households at all in its current state.
- 5.12. The recent planning permission for the change of use of the building confirmed that the alteration to form two residential units was in line with local and national policy and as such it is considered that the principle of this part of the scheme remains sound. The additional space at second floor simply allows for additional space to be delivered to each property and would again appear to be in line with policies protecting only the loss of residential floor space.
- 5.13. The proposed scheme would bring the building back into meaningful use, deliver two units of residential accommodation and thus would satisfy the NPPF and local plan policy insofar as it relates to bringing vacant buildings back into use and delivering sustainable residential development.

PRINCIPLE OF THE SECOND FLOOR EXTENSION

- 5.14. We have already achieved permission for most of the operational development on the site in the form of the previous planning permission. The additional second floor would allow for additional residential floor space which should be considered acceptable in principle given that this is a residential area, is a building in residential use and accordingly extensions are generally allowed in such locations.

DESIGN & IMPACT TO THE CONSERVATION AREA

- 5.15. The requirement for design of the highest quality is noted at a number of points within the Core Strategy and development control policies. This is especially the case within policies regarding development in conservation areas and adjacent to listed buildings. While these have been affected by the introduction of the NPPF, that document still retains a need to ensure that there is no disproportionate harm to heritage assets. As such it is considered the need for high quality design has not been lost, simply rephrased.
- 5.16. This revised scheme retains all the elements permitted within the previous application, the change of use, replacement rear extension and alterations to the

front wall and parking area. The main change to the scheme is the additional second floor and the improvements to the rear fenestration.

- 5.17. As all the other works have already been permitted within the previous planning permission and as this remains a very strong material consideration as a result of it only being granted in July of this year, we consider that those approved elements should in all reason be considered acceptable.
- 5.18. We therefore consider that this section should mainly consider the impact of the second storey upon the character and appearance of the street scene and the conservation area as a whole.
- 5.19. The alterations to the frontage and side of No. 23 are considered to be an improvement to the character and appearance of the street scene through removing the inappropriate and unsightly garage and front wall as seen in the photograph below.



- 5.20. The alterations to the frontage create, in our opinion, a much cleaner appearance which benefits the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, specifically the relationship of this northern section to the character of the street scene.
- 5.21. The rear extension was also acknowledged to be an improvement and as such the Council should draw from this that the applicant is looking to deliver a scheme which materially improves the contribution this building makes to the area.

5.22. The additional changes to the rear fenestration simply tidy up the rear elevation further. As can be seen from the photograph to the right, the rear is visually discordant. The proposed works would deliver new sash windows in a coherent and logical way such that it regains some of its former visual qualities which have been lost over time. As such we consider that these changes constitute material improvements to the appearance of the building which will bring clear benefits to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.



5.23. In turning to the second floor extension the key aspect is whether the development is in line with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area such that it does not result in harm to the significance of the heritage asset.

5.24. The applicable local plan policies are CS14, DP24, DP25 and the document 'Camden Planning Guidance 1 – Design'. This is of course in addition to the guidance contained within the NPPF, which is the most up to date of the applicable policy documents. Of specific note in respect of considering significance is the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2008.

5.25. The 2008 Appraisal considers the significance of the area and notes that a key element of this is the high quality and unified architectural style and form. The retention of historic rooflines and unspoilt front roofs is important to the integrity of the area.

5.26. Nos. 21 & 23 are not statutorily or locally listed and are not specifically mentioned as buildings of merit within the Appraisal. There appears to be no specific significance to this building and as such we consider that the significance is derived from the wider area in which it sits and the building as a component part of that has relevance.

5.27. Page 28 the appraisal considers how the Council will consider roof alterations and extension. It sets out that alterations and extension to the front roof pitch can be especially damaging in the residential area and roof alterations are likely to be

unacceptable where a building forms part of a complete terrace or group of buildings where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition.

- 5.28. These paragraphs are qualified and do not rule out all works of this sort as being unacceptable in principle, simply that care must be taken to maintain the character of the area.
- 5.29. The proposed scheme seeks permission to add another floor to Nos. 21 & 23 Cressy Road. Having regard to the guidance contained within the 2008 appraisal, such works generally comes from a presumption against approval.
- 5.30. However in looking at the current character and appearance of the area, we see that the predominant style is residential development to three storeys on both sides of Cressy Road and also within the surrounding roads (See images below).





5.31. Nos. 21-23 therefore appears at odds with this established character as it only reaches two storeys (image 1). When considering the street scene in the round, the two storey building is surrounded by three storey buildings on all sides and is visually isolated. While there are other two storey buildings in surrounding roads juxtaposed with three storey buildings, they are parts of two storey terraces in which the two storey sections appear more coherent and not wholly isolated.

- 5.32. The general impression given by Nos. 21 & 23 is that is a single building out of context with the surrounding three storey buildings. While it must be noted that this relationship is part of the current street scene, we don't consider that it is an important or demonstrably positive part of the area or street scene such that the changes proposed are unacceptable in principle.
- 5.33. The proposed additional floor would replicate the design and appearance of the adjacent terrace exactly in terms of proportions, window and eaves details. Accordingly the final building would integrate exactly with the adjacent terrace and would therefore simply extend the existing terrace at three storeys rather than stepping down to two.
- 5.34. The proposed works would result in a built form which harmonises with the established character of the Conservation Area being at three storeys and would not cause harm to its significance by its new appearance or the loss of the two storey building. The architectural integrity of the street or the wider area would not be undermined by this development.
- 5.35. While not statutorily or locally listed the Council consider that Nos. 21-23 is a building of note within the Conservation Area we are unable to find direct reference to this within the 2008 appraisal. Having regard to this status, and the guidance contained within the 2008 appraisal we fail to see how the proposed scheme would cause harm to significance and when considered in the round would remedy the visual oddity currently exhibited by this building.
- 5.36. The proposed scheme is therefore considered to be in line with the requirements of the NPPF and the relevant local plan policies requiring high quality design, CS14, DP24, DP25 and the document 'Camden Planning Guidance 1 – Design'.

PROTECTING NEIGHBOURING AMENITY

- 5.37. The proposed development would result in the reduction in the number of units on the site from four to two, and the removal of living spaces from upper floors. The operational development includes the replacement of the existing single storey rear extension and the addition of a second floor to create a three storey building.

- 5.38. The change of use of the building from four units to two will result in a more traditional set-up with living space on the ground floor and bedrooms on the upper floors. Accordingly this will have a beneficial impact to the living conditions of No. 19 to the south, which is a dwelling in single ownership. The approval of the change of use would support this conclusion.
- 5.39. The operational development consists of works to the frontage and side of No. 23 along with the replacement single storey rear extension and the additional floor to create a three storey building.
- 5.40. The works to the side and front of No. 23 will have no impact upon the amenity of adjacent dwellings. The replacement rear extension, which has already been considered as being acceptable, would project only 0.2m beyond that of the existing rear projection along the boundary with No. 19. While slightly taller than the one it replaces, the additional bulk is shallow in depth and generally away from the common boundary. As such we maintain that it would not result in harm to the amenity of No. 19. Indeed, having regard to the improvement in the appearance of the rear of the property, the overall impression will be that there has been an improvement.
- 5.41. The additional storey to the building has the ability to impact outlook, daylight/sunlight along with introducing additional overlooking. It is not however considered in this case that negative impacts would result from the introduction of the additional floor.
- 5.42. We do not consider that the proposed additional floor will result in any harm to the amenity of No. 19 Cressy Road given that it will simply match the height and dimensions of that dwelling and generally will be unseen.
- 5.43. The buildings fronting Constantine Road are also to a three storey height and are located at roughly a 45 degree angle to the rear of those properties in Cressy Road. They are also set slightly higher due to a slight change in topography. The proposed works would not result in built development closer to those properties and the building remains stepped in nature which reduces potential impact. The distance between the flank elevations allied to the relative heights of the buildings and orientation are such that it is not considered that material loss of daylight/sunlight would result.

- 5.44. In terms of overlooking, the proposed additional floor would simply liberate floor space currently lost by virtue of the roofscape and accordingly there would be no additional rear or side facing windows which would contribute to overlooking.
- 5.45. Accordingly we consider that the proposed additional floor would have little negative impact upon the residential amenity of the surrounding properties fronting Constantine Road and no impact upon those fronting Cressy Road. The remaining operational development has already been deemed acceptable by the Council as confirmed by the recent planning permission.

LIFETIME HOMES COMPLIANCE

- 5.46. There are sixteen lifetime homes criteria which the Council would like the proposed dwellings to comply with. It is noted within the pre-application response that the fact that this is an existing building will be taken into account. It is also of note that these standards are from 2010 and thus are now 3 years old. The latest Part M of the Building Regulations was published in January 2013 and thus is the more up to date guidance in respect of access. This guidance contains many of the matters concerned below and this development will be fully compliant with these regulations, but will seek to take on board the Lifetime Homes Standards where possible. Comments on the sixteen criteria is below:

CRITERION 1 - PARKING

- 5.47. This section requires that on plot parking have the ability to be increased in width to 3.3m. This requirement excludes garages and car ports. The only on site space serves No. 23, which in itself replaces a garage. There is no ability in this case to extend the width of the parking space and in any event it is not considered to be apply as it only replaces an existing space which would not have had to comply with the standards. It should also be noted that the site benefits from the availability of on street parking.

CRITERION 2 – APPROACH TO DWELLING FROM PARKING

- 5.48. The approach to the dwelling from the parking to No. 23 is level and should be acceptable in all respects. Parking for the residents of No. 21 is on street. There are inevitably kerbs from the road, but there are also steps from the footpath to the front

door. As there is not considered to be sufficient space between the edge of the site and the front door for a more level approach (without significant and exceedingly costs works), we cannot comply with this criterion in respect of No. 21.

CRITERION 3 – APPROACH TO ALL ENTRANCES

5.49. The approach to the main access to No. 23 and the secondary access door from the parking area is level and meets the requirement of this criterion. The only access to No. 21 is from the frontage, which as noted above features a stepped access. As with the comments on the above criterion, the replacement of these steps with a more level or gently sloping access is not viable in this case.

CRITERION 4 - ENTRANCES

5.50. This criterion sets out five sub sections:

- a. Be illuminated
- b. Have a level access over the threshold; and
- c. Have effective clear opening widths and nibs as specified below.
- d. Have adequate weather protection
- e. Have a level external landing

5.51. The comments on each of these is as follows:

- a. Illumination of each access can be introduced and controlled by way of condition.
- b. Please see above comments regarding level accesses to the door. Each front door has a level access at the door and beyond it.
- c. Each dwelling entrance door features the required width and space around the front doors
- d. The existing entrance to No. 21 features a recessed door offering weather protection. A porch to No. 23 could easily be introduced and has been shown on the plans provided
- e. A level landing is provided as far as possible.

CRITERION 5 – COMMUNAL STAIRS AND LIFTS

5.52. This is not a communal development and therefore no communal stairs and lifts are being provided. As such this criterion is not applicable in this instance.

CRITERION 6 – INTERNAL DOORWAYS AND HALLWAYS

5.53. As noted in the opening section, this is an existing building with existing room dimensions and walls which cannot easily be moved to cater for these up to date

standards. However it is considered that these space standards have been met, with any infringements being minor.

CRITERION 7 – CIRCULATION SPACE

5.54. Each dwelling has sufficient turning space for a wheelchair within the kitchen and living spaces of each dwelling. Kitchens have the ability to adaptation and basic circulation space in other rooms is provided as noted above.

CRITERION 8 – ENTRANCE LEVEL LIVING SPACE

5.55. Each dwelling features living space at entrance level.

CRITERION 9 – POTENTIAL FOR ENTRANCE LEVEL BED SPACE

5.56. In terms of the definition contained within the guidance, both properties have sufficient space to accommodate a single bed at ground floor which is capable of being screened (with a portable screen) from the rest of the room. It would admittedly be tight within No. 23, but No. 21 would have no issue in respect of this criterion.

CRITERION 10 – ENTRANCE LEVEL WC AND SHOWER DRAINAGE

5.57. No. 21 features a toilet at ground floor level, which with difficulty could be turned into a wet room. No. 23 does not feature a ground floor toilet and does not currently feature sufficient space to include one. However, if the space used for the car parking space was utilised then a downstairs WC/shower could easily be accommodated. This would however be at the expense of the parking space. Given that this is a conversion of an existing building, this flexibility is considered appropriate in this context.

CRITERION 11 – WC AND BATHROOM WALLS

5.58. As this existing building is of a masonry construction all internal walls are of a quality which would allow for the installation of firm fixing and support for adaptations such as grab rails.

CRITERION 12 – STAIRS AND POTENTIAL THROUGH-FLOOR LIFT IN DWELLINGS

5.59. The existing building features traditional wooden floor joists and therefore we see no reason why a lift cannot be accommodated to both dwellings. Each property features

a bedroom directly above the living space such that the installation of a lift would be possible.

- 5.60. No. 21 has a more standard style of staircase which could also accommodate a stair lift if required. However No. 23 features a spiral staircase which would be unable to accommodate any form of stair lift. However as a lift could be installed, there are options available for future occupants.

CRITERION 13 – POTENTIAL FOR FITTING OF HOISTS AND BEDROOM/BATHROOM RELATIONSHIP

- 5.61. As the building is of a robust construction there is no reason to suspect that the structure above the main bedroom and bathroom would not be capable of supporting hoists. Each dwelling features its main bedroom and family bathroom on a single level, which can be accessed by way of lift if installed. The route from bedroom to bathroom does not pass through any living/habitable space.
- 5.62. As the bedroom and bathroom are located adjacent to each other there is also the possibility of amending the walls to allow for direct access from one to the other as set out in the recommendations.

CRITERION 14 - BATHROOMS

- 5.63. Each dwelling provides a bathroom on the same floor as the bedroom and are of a size which meets the standards within the relevant London Design Guide. They are also considered to meet the layout criteria contained within the Lifetime Homes guidance. There is sufficient space for adaptations to be made, links to adjacent bedrooms created and a new bathroom arrangement to be created where required.

CRITERION 15 – GLAZING AND WINDOW HANDLE HEIGHTS

- 5.64. The existing built fabric ensures that people seated in the main living room allows people to see out of when seated. Each habitable room also features windows which are approachable and usable. Within the kitchens to both properties there are roof lights which will be operable by way of cords. Some windows may not be fully operable from a seated position given that they are required to match the character and appearance of the building and the area as a whole. This is a necessary compromise.

CRITERION 16 – LOCATION OF SERVICE CONTROLS

- 5.65. This is an existing building featuring existing electrical installations. Accordingly it is not considered reasonable to amend all service controls which do not comply with these standards are moved. However where new rooms are being created or works are being done then sockets etc will be moved to the appropriate height to comply with these standards.

SUMMARY

- 5.66. The proposed development meets the majority of the standards required and where deficiencies exist, it is as a result of this being a conversion of an existing building rather than a new build. This is especially true in respect of the requirement for a level access. The re-arrangement of the internal layout gives flexibility for future users and we consider that as the majority of the standards have been met, this can be considered to be broad compliance with the aims and objectives of the Lifetime Homes Standards and Policy DP6 of the Camden LDF.
- 5.67. Of particular note in respect of this matter is that the dwellings will meet all specific and gross space standards set out within the London Design Guide, but will also be required to meet Part M of the building regulations, which covers many of the access points noted above.

AMENITY PROVISION

- 5.68. The London Design Guide and the Camden Design Guide set out the requirement that each dwelling should have access to private amenity space where possible. The Camden Guide sets no specific level, but the GLA version sets out that the appropriate minimum provision is 7m² for 3 bed units and 1m² for any person above this. It is quite clear that these modest standards are met in this case, which each of the two proposed dwellings comfortably exceeding this provision. This allows for the provision of space for bin storage and bicycle storage. The details of which can be controlled by way of condition.
- 5.69. The amenity space to No. 23 offers a mix of uses, either as a parking space or solely as an amenity space. Even if used for car parking, space remains for some amenity function.

5.70. Overall the amenity provision is considered in line with the required standard.

ACCESS AND PARKING

5.71. The existing building features four residential units which all have access to parking permits, should they wish. Given that the proposal would result in a reduction in the number of units it is considered that there is no need for this to be a car free development as there would be no increase in parking levels at the site.

6.0 DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

6.1. In accordance with The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Amendment) (England) Order 2006 a Design and Access Statement must accompany planning applications of this nature. Many of the points have already been covered in the preceding sections and therefore this element will seek to summarise those findings in the format advocated by the CABI best practice guidance:

USE

6.2. The use of the building is already residential, albeit as four flats. The proposed scheme seeks to convert the building into two units offering accommodation for single families. The general use of the surrounding area is residential and as such the conversion of this building back into larger units would be entirely consistent with the surrounding land uses.

AMOUNT

6.3. The amount of development already on the site amounts to four flats. This is considered to be an unacceptable use of the existing built form as it clearly has led to the delivery of unacceptable living spaces and layouts. The proposed scheme seeks to remove two of the units such that a more spacious and appropriate living space can be created, benefiting both future residents and the residential amenity of No. 19 to some extent.

6.4. The removal of two units is considered the appropriate number to deliver dwellings which meet the appropriate space standards. The removal of fewer units would not work with the layout of the building and would result in the propagation of inferior sized units. The removal of more units to create a single dwelling, is not considered acceptable in financial terms and would remove even more units from the housing stock of the area.

6.5. The additional floor would simply expand the space used within the loft within the previous scheme and therefore would not result in a large increase in floor area, but would make all of the floor usable, which will be an improvement upon the current situation. One additional bedroom would be available to No. 21 and a double room would be present instead of a single within No. 23.

- 6.6. As such the amount of development proposed is considered to strike a balance between maintaining as many units as possible, while also ensuring that space standards are met and a good quality residential environment is created.

LAYOUT

- 6.7. The layout of the site is generally defined by the existing built form and the internal layout of the building. Some changes have occurred through previous works to the building which has affected the internal layout away from the original. The additional floor will allow for the entirety of the second floor to be used rather than utilising roof and dormer space.
- 6.8. The proposed scheme seeks to move the layout of the building back towards its original layout, while maintaining two units within the property. The additional space at second floor level continues this theme.
- 6.9. The proposed scheme is considered to be the most effective use of the building in that it meets all the space standards set out within the London Design Guide, giving a high quality residential environment for each dwelling. This is a marked improvement from the current layout.
- 6.10. As such we consider that the layout is an improvement and the optimal use of the building.

SCALE

- 6.11. The scale of the development is defined by the size and scale of the existing building in the main. In comparison to the approved scheme the amount of built development is increased slightly. The replacement rear extension simply replaces the existing with a more modern and attractive built form.
- 6.12. The additional floor will create a three storey building in line with the character and appearance of the street scene. Accordingly the scale of the building will increase slightly, but only in line with the prevailing character of the area. As such it remains in line with the character and appearance of the area and would not result in demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 6.13. The gross number of dwellings has decreased and as such the level of activity on the site will probably decrease slightly. Accordingly, in terms of scale of

development, there has been a decrease to a level which is compatible with the character and appearance of the area.

LANDSCAPING

6.14. The existing site features very little landscaping, bar the presence of some to the rear of the building. Through the re-imagining of the building, we would seek to introduce some more appropriate landscaping to the rear of the building, thus creating a more appropriate residential environment. There is no space for additional landscaping to the frontage.

APPEARANCE

6.15. The appearance of the building will change in comparison to the existing and that of the approved scheme, but we consider that the changes are positive in nature and certainly not harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

6.16. The changes to the frontage and the replacement rear extension have already been approved by the Council within a previous application and remain as part of this scheme and similarly should be considered acceptable. This revised scheme introduces additional improvements to the rear fenestration along with the introduction of an additional floor to the building.

6.17. The building already makes use of space within the roof to create a second floor and accordingly the proposed works would only result in a modest addition to the internal floor space. The appearance of the building would however be slightly more marked.

6.18. The current building reaches two storeys and features space within the roof which is currently being utilised. As noted within earlier sections of this statement the prevailing built character in the immediate vicinity is three storey terraces of dwellings. They are generally unspoilt in terms of their roofscapes and this aspect is a noted matter of significance within the 2008 appraisal document.

6.19. The ethos behind the scheme is to liberate additional floor space on this tight residential site. There is insufficient space to develop to the rear and the side of the property, as such the opportunities for expansion lie up or down. The introduction of a basement extension is costly and therefore the applicant has looked to develop up.

- 6.20. In considering the constraints to this development we have considered the conservation area appraisal and established planning policies relating to design. As noted above, the significance of the area is the series of unspoilt terraces of dwellings with few interruptions at roof level such that the overall character is harmed. It is therefore considered inappropriate to develop any form of dormers to this property as they would clearly result in demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
- 6.21. We do however feel that the introduction of an additional floor to the building could be achieved without demonstrable harm resulting. The existing building is only two storeys and therefore is a visual anomaly given that the site is surrounded on all sides by three storey properties. Once completed the presence of a three storey dwelling in this location would therefore be neither out of character or harmful.
- 6.22. In terms of details we would be looking to replicate that of the adjacent dwellings such that Nos. 21 & 23 appeared simply to be an extension of the existing terrace on the west side of Cressy Road. Whilst a change to the street scene, given that it would integrate so completely, we fail to see how such a development would be harmful to the significance of the heritage asset.
- 6.23. Accordingly we consider that the addition of the second floor would be an acceptable form of development which would integrate well with the street scene and the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 6.24. The change in the number of units will however not make any material difference to the appearance of the building and overall the operational development proposed is considered to result in a general improvement to the contribution the building makes to the conservation area.

ACCESS

- 6.25. The pedestrian access to Nos. 21 and 23 will not be altered as a result of this scheme. No. 21 will retain its level access and No. 23 its original stepped access. There is still a car parking space to the side of the building which will be retained. Overall there are no major changes to the access arrangements.

SUMMARY

6.26. The more in depth policy justification and further in-depth evaluation is included in the main body of the report, however all aspects of the scheme are considered acceptable.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1. The planning permission from July 2013 is strong material considerations in respect of this revised scheme as it granted permission for all elements of this application save for the additional storey and amendments to the rear fenestration. Accordingly those are the primary matters of consideration within this revised scheme.
- 7.2. The changes to the fenestration are considered to materially improve the appearance of the rear elevation of the building, rectifying a series of changes which have occurred over the years and have resulted in visual discordancy of window designs and types.
- 7.3. We consider that these changes along with the already permitted changes to be the building will be further complemented by the additional floor to the building through the creation of greater verticality and the removal of a rear facing box dormer window. The coherency from the rear will clearly be a vast improvement.
- 7.4. The changes to the frontage will result in the building being viewed as a three storey property rather than a two storey one. It is however reasoned within this statement that this change is not considered to cause harm to the significance, character or appearance of the conservation area given the high quality design and the fact that it will integrate fully with the adjacent three storey buildings such that it would appear as part of the terrace.
- 7.5. We consider that the resulting scheme will easily be subsumed into the street by virtue of its similarity to every other dwelling in the street and accordingly we fail to see how such a development would cause harm to character on this basis.
- 7.6. The additional floor would not result in loss of daylight/sunlight to adjacent dwellings nor would it introduce additional opportunities for overlooking. The resulting development would also meet all relevant space standards and would meet the majority of Lifetime Homes standards such that the Council can be satisfied that this scheme represents a vast improvement in the residential offering from this building along with improvements to the visual appearance of the building, both through improvements and simply from the building coming back into meaningful use.
- 7.7. We therefore commend the scheme to the Council.

21-23 Cressy Road
Hampstead, London

p.p.s.

Phillips Planning Services Ltd.
Town Planning & Development Consultants