

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT MAY 2013

JOB NO: 39638

111A West End Lane, West Hampstead, London, NW6 4SY

This design and access statement (DAS) accompanies the Planning Application and conservation area consent for the reconstruction of the front bay window following subsidence damage to 111A West End Lane, West Hampstead, London, NW6 4SY. The DAS has been written to meet the requirements of the local planning policy.

The property is a semi-detached house of three storeys, plus a basement beneath the hall to the property, entrance to which is a portico to the right hand side. The property has been divided into a number of self-contained flats. It is said that the property was built circa 1890, being of solid brick construction. There is a single storey flat roof bay window to the front.

The property faces West End Lane, the right hand flank wall facing Messina Avenue, which falls away from West End Lane.

The site is predominantly level. Boundaries are defined to the front small garden area by a low level, with the right side external wall forming the boundary with the public footpath along Messina Avenue. Access is gained to the front garden via the front iron gate. Access can also be gained into a small, rear walled garden area, via a boarded gate, at the rear of the property.

The front of the property suffered damage due to clay tree subsidence, with encroachment of roots from a Sycamore tree to the front of the property and a Cockspur-thorn to the right hand side of the property, the trees being in the ownership of and/or under the control of London Borough of Camden. Damage was first noted around late July 2009.

The trees which initiated the subsidence to the front of the property have now been removed. The sycamore to the front of the property, was removed in or around August 2011 and the Cockspur-thorn reduced in height thereafter, before its removal in October 2012. A Pyracantha was also removed in early 2012.

The degree of movement, damage and distortion which occurred to the front bay was considered beyond economic repair and was required to be re-built. The fact that the front bay was considered to require such extensive works is supported by the decision to provide temporary propping to such, prior to the commencement of the works.

Having determined the need to rebuild the front bay, the requirement for new foundations complying with the Building Regulations requires ensuring that foundations are constructed so that ground movement caused by swelling and shrinkage did not impair the stability of any part of the building. In that regard due recognition as to the depth of desiccation, the presence of roots, combined with the level of movement recorded by previous monitoring and the presence of remaining vegetation which could be considered as having potential influence on the building, noting such to be opposite side of West End Road.

Having duly considered the requirement to provide new foundations to the front bay at 2.3m it was also considered prudent to minimise the effect of foundations at different depths to underpin the adjacent sections of the front wall having due regard to the potential for further movement to occur to the non-underpinned sections of the property, as a result of the probable continued recovery of the soil as a result of its prior desiccation by the Sycamore and/or Cockspur-thorn, now removed.

The original scheme for the reconstruction of the bay was on a like for like basis on new foundations, for the reasons noted above. Heights of the bay windows and details were to match existing.

Cont'd.../

During construction it was necessary to incorporate a new lintel under the main external front wall at the opening into the bay, to support the original deflecting timber bressumer and as agreed on site with the London borough of Camden building control inspector. The size and method of placing the new lintel required the ceiling level of the new bay to be lowered, to cover the new lintel under the main wall and reduce the encroachment of the lintel into the bay below the ceiling line. The lowering of the external ceiling line therefore determined that the external position of the window cill and head of the window, including the stone lintel over the bay window, be set 2 courses lower than the existing window height. The top of the parapet wall of the bay is retained at the original height, with 2 additional courses added to the parapet to cater for the lowering of the window head and stone lintel below. All features of the bay window, such as the stonework etc, have been reinstated to match the original appearance of the bay.

The plan area of the bay has been reconstructed to match existing.

The landscaping to the site will be retained as existing.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. Hughes'.

Ben Hughes
on behalf of Richard Jackson Limited