

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

February 2013

15 Gayton Crescent Hampstead London NW3 1TT
Proposal for Side and Rear Extensions

PROPOSAL

The works proposed are as follows:

1. South side extension consisting of a structure akin to a single-storey orangery at street level and a lower ground space facing rearwards opening onto a yard garden and not visible from the street.

*nb: the lower ground extension is not a **basement extension**. LBC previously sought a BIA for front light well excavation which does NOT form part of this current application*

2. North side extension formed as a bay with a balcony above accessible via a new opening, clearly visible from the street
3. Rear wc single-storey lean-to extension providing ground floor WC access

PLANNING OPINION ENQ/03575

Items 1 and 2 above were reviewed favourably in a planning opinion issued to us by Camden in August last year by officer Hugh Miller.

Item 3 above was not part of the proposals reviewed by officer Miller.

MATTERS REVIEWED IN ENQ/03575 NOT INCLUDED IN CURRENT APPLICATION

Officer Miller also reviewed proposals which are **NOT** included in this current application i.e

- front area light wells involving excavation at basement level
- external insulation and render to whole building
- front porch extension at first floor to form enlarged bathroom

PLANNING CASE FOR NORTH AND SOUTH EXTENSIONS

The planning case for the south and north side extension is given in officer Miller's opinion which is included in this document.

LIFETIME HOMES

The Lifetime Homes assessment is supplied as the last page of this statement.

DESCRIPTION OF REAR WC EXTENSION

1. The proposed structure will not extend the footprint of existing building. It will be built off the small rear extension at lower ground floor level. The gross area = 5.25sqm.
2. The walls will be made from brick painted white matching the main house.
3. A small dh sash window will be included in the north-facing wall.
4. The roof will be slated with a Rooflight Company Conservation skylight. The pitch will match the main roof.

PLANNING CASE FOR REAR WC EXTENSION

1. relationship to main building
 1. The form and scale of the WC extension is subservient to the parent building.
2. overlooking
 1. There is no risk of overlooking or loss of neighbours' amenity resulting from the proposal
3. design quality
 1. The rear of the parent building has no design "features" that will be adversely affected by the WC extension as proposed.
 2. The extension does not adversely affect the streetscape.
 3. The materials chosen match those of the main house.
4. decent or lifetime homes standards
 1. An accessible WC is provided.

Policy	Comment	Drawings
1b – Parking	Disabled parking next to the new house is achievable in the open space on the north side of the house.	A-1-12
2 – Approach from parking	A ramp is possible on the south side of the house between the street and the proposed conservatory. This would offer a level going from street pavement kerb edge to the bottom landing of the ramp. The ramp would lead to an entrance at the junction of the conservatory and main house.	A-1-12
3 – Approach to all entrances	See above	
4 – Entrances	The front door is about 900mm wide.	A-1-12
6 – Internal doorways and halls	Internal doors are 760 mm clear minimum or double leaf and 1,520 mm wide.	A-1-12
7 – Circulation space	Turning space is sufficient in all rooms including the entry hall. Bedrooms allow for adequate bedside space.	A-1-12, A-1-13
8 – Entrance level living space	The main living space is at lower ground floor level. The stairs to it can be made ambulant disabled conformant. A stair lift can be installed as well. A lift can be fitted into the conservatory to provide access between the two main living spaces in the house. By the same token, a new conformant stair could be provided between the conservatory and the lower ground side extension enhancing access.	A-1-11, A-1-12
10 – Entrance level WC/shower	There is no entrance level bathroom provision; one could be added at a later date although this would necessitate a new application.	A-1-12
11 – WC and bathroom walls	The walls can support rails.	
12 – Stairs & potential lifts	Stairs to lower ground can be revised to accommodate stair lifts. Stairs to the first, second floors would be much harder to adapt. A lift between floors may be feasible given the comparative spaciousness of the main hall.	
13 – Potential for hoists	Wall and floor structure is capable of supporting hoists.	
14 – Bathrooms	A conformant bathroom next to a double bedroom is provided.	
15 – Glazing	Windows in the Living space are conformant eg low enough.	A-3-11
16 – Service Controls	At tender stage all service controls will be designed conformantly.	

Fig 1: Lifetime Homes Standards conformance

note from applicant:
original planning opinion text below with strikethrough is not relevant to this application

START OF OPINION

Pre-Application Proposal Ref. ENQ/03575

August, 2012

15 Gayton Crescent,
London NW3

Site & Surroundings

The application relates to a detached basement 3-storey building located on the south side of Gayton Crescent at the junction with Willow Road. The host building is surrounded by garden amenity space, the largest located on the south side adjacent to no.14 and it has light wells at the front in common with dwelling houses on the south side of Gayton Crescent. The building's brick surface has white painted finish similar to others in the locality. To its east lies a terrace of 2-storey houses with painted and rendered finish as nos.33-41 Willow Cottages. The building is not listed but is in the Hampstead Conservation Area and buildings numbers 1-15 are identified in the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area.

History

April 2012 – Withdrawn application - Erection of a two storey side extension, a single storey front extension at lower ground level, and a new bay window with a balcony above to an existing dwelling house (Class C3); ref. 2012/0529/P.

The applications withdrawal was due to matters of detail design and insufficient time to make the necessary amendments to enable a formal determination by the local planning authority.

13 Willow Road

9500166 - Erection of mansard roof extension and the provision of a glazed roof to the existing front basement area. Granted 15/09/1995.

9560019 - Demolition of two storey rear extension and works of partial demolition in association with the erection of a roof extension and the enclosure of the front basement area. Granted 15/09/1995.

The Relevant Policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage / conservation areas.

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage / conservation areas

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2011:

(CPG1: Section – 1 Introduction; 2 Design excellence; 3 Heritage; 4 Extensions, alterations and conservatories.

Hampstead Conservation Area Statement 2001

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Proposal

Erection of side extension at south side (part-single, part 2-storey), new bay-window on north side, extension of the front porch at ground and first floor levels plus installation of external wall cladding.

The host building is atypical of the neighbouring houses in that it has a very shallow depth closet wing unlike its neighbours. Neither does it have a large enough rear garden space to provide extensions when compared with the adjacent dwelling houses. On the south side lies a large gap adjacent to no.14 and it is proposed to erect a side extension at ground and basement floor levels. This is achieved because of the lie of the land which slopes north-south. The host building is largely devoid of many architectural details though it has strong vertical emphases, displayed by the window frames, and complemented with arch lintels to some windows and doors lintels. The shallow depth bay-windows on its front elevation also give it visual interest at the ground floor level.

Design and appearance

Extension – south side

The proposed part single-storey, part 2-storey extension as shown on the submitted drawings would appear to be acceptable in this location, in terms of design, height, width, depth and use of materials. It would have brick flank walls with raised parapet and painted render finish. The decorative brick dentils and raised parapet together would anchor the extension in this location whilst being subordinate to the host building. It would have pairs of windows at the front also rear elevations and a single window at the side at the ground level with full-height glazed doors at the rear basement floor level. So as to retain a wide gap, the extension would not be full-width at ground level and a staircase access between the ground floor and basement level is proposed and this is acceptable. However, at the site visit, the applicant queried the possibility of the extension being full-width at the basement floor level; given the topography of the site, it is considered that a full-width basement extension would not add any significant additional bulk to cause harm to the host building or harm the Conservation Area, as the essential wide gap at the ground floor level would be maintained.

The extension would have a glazed hipped roof set behind the rendered raised parapet. The rear basement elevation would have a light-weight appearance of full-height glazed windows and glazed door. The glazed elements would give a light-weight appearance to the rear elevation, which would harmonise with the host building and reduce visual bulk. Notwithstanding what is shown, the proposed windows should have timber framed sash windows with glazing bars in the middle and painted to match existing.

The proposed extension has some similarities to the recent withdrawn scheme for this site and building in terms of footprint, depth and width. This revised scheme is of a design and appearance that is considered to be more compliant with LDF policies DP24 and DP25 and Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1 Design) guidelines, plus much more sympathetic for the original house.

At ground floor level and due to the lie of the land, the extension would only appear as a single-storey extension from the public realm and a 2-storey one from the private views of occupiers at no.41 Willow Road. Generally, therefore, its visibility would not be overpowering and would not be visually bulky due to its use of materials and finish; and is considered acceptable in principle. In this regard, it is considered that the proposal in principle would not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the host building or harm the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation.

New bay-window / north side

To the north, the openings on the front elevations of nos.42-48 distinguish their elevations both in their opening pattern and their rhythm. Elsewhere at no.1 Christchurch Hill there is such an example showing a window on its southern most elevation that ties the windows on the east and west elevations. On the host building, the north elevation frontage along Willow Road is devoid of any architectural details. The new bay-window would provide visual interest in this blank elevation and it would not harm the appearance of the host building and is considered satisfactory in this instance.

Front porch extensions

At the site visit, the applicant enquired about extending the front porch towards the front boundary. Some local examples were identified at nos. 45 & 47 Willow Road (north of site) and at its southern end. The examples referred to appear very visually dominant and unsympathetic in their setting and harm the appearance to the buildings. It is likely that they were built under permitted development by their age. The host building however occupies a prominent corner site and it is considered that a porch extension would be overly visually dominant and prominent in this location. This is therefore considered unacceptable in principle due to its impact on the building as a positive contributor to the area, neither would it preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area.

It is also proposed to extend the porch at first floor level to accommodate a new bathroom. An extension at this level would not be considered subordinate and would clearly erase the relationship between the porch and bay windows. It would diminish the hierarchical role currently existing and is considered unacceptable. This too is considered unacceptable in principle due to its impact on the building neither would it preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area and is not in keeping with policies DP24 & DP25 of LDF. Neither would it reflect the guidelines of the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement or Camden Planning Guidance guidelines.

Basement front lightwells

Open light wells are characteristic of dwelling house on the south side of Gayton Crescent which vary in sizes, depth and width. Some have access from the ground floor level. At no.15 the light wells have narrow openings and it is proposed to enclose them with glass roofs. The applicant did identify an example at no. 13 Willow Road that has a larger width front garden and a full width glazed strip (lean to glazed roof originally granted planning permission on the 15/09/1995; flat glazed roof approved January 2008), but this has a different context. In any event glazing over the light wells are unacceptable on design grounds particularly for its impact on the building itself, its relationship with neighbouring properties and the streetscape and the appearance of the conservation area.

Amenity

The garden space for the extension is visible from windows (staircase) on the north side at no.41 Willow Road which has an obscure window at first floor level. The rear windows and doors would provide views of no.41, however it is considered that no overlooking or privacy issues would occur. Similarly, it would be sufficiently far not to cause loss of sun/daylight or impact on the occupiers' views or outlook.

A side window is proposed that provide views due west to no.14. However, the boundary wall and gap adjacent to no.14 would prevent harm to the occupiers. Generally therefore, the proposed extension and the new bay window would be in compliance with DP26 & CPG guidelines.

External wall insulation cladding

By email dated 6/6/2012, the applicant sought advice on “the installation of external wall insulation dressed with render painted a cream colour finish to improve the problem of heating a thermally inefficient detached house with a large wall surface area which is constructed of solid masonry”. Generally the Council supports measures to improve energy efficiency plus thermal performance of dwellings. However this has to be balanced with Conservation plus townscape considerations. In this case the cladding would result in for example: a] increase depth to window reveals; b] loss of texture of the buildings façade, altering the buildings appearance from Victorian to a more contemporary form, c] re-installation of and raising profile of waste and rain water goods; d] alterations to the depth plus prominence of the roof eaves.

It is acknowledged that the building is painted and the actual bricks are covered but this is similar to others in Gayton Crescent. It is considered too that repainted surface would improve on the existing. It is accepted that the goal is to improve and enhance the heating capabilities of the building which in principle is acceptable but officers are concerned about the impact of this cladding would have on the building and the conservation area and therefore more information would be required to aid officers’ response.

As per our telephone discussion, the submission of drawings (sections), showing typical changes as mention above as appropriate would help enormously. You mentioned alternative thickness of cladding materials and their respective performances and it is considered that you need to narrow these alternatives to the most acceptable in terms of heating performance whilst having the least impact on the buildings appearance, because these will be discernible once added. It is accepted that you consider cladding as the solution to the heating problem; however it would be of help to know if all possible alternative source of heating improvements were explored. The provision of photo-montages, samples of cladding types etc would help to give more information to aid officers’ response. The building is in a prominent location, within the conservation area and is identified as a positive contributor to the wider area therefore any cladding which will erode its characteristic features plus form would need to be considered very carefully.

Conclusion

The erection of north and south side extensions would be acceptable in principle, but subject to the design comments above. The cladding of the building is in principle considered unacceptable; nevertheless more information is required to enable officers to provide you with clear guidance on this issue.

END OF OPINION ENQ/03575
