

**Design and Access Statement [4]:**

This statement has been prepared on behalf of:  
Applicant: Mr. S. Bradbury / March 2012

Revised: October 2012 / January 2013

Agent Mr G. Colundalur / [Buildingdoctors.co.uk](http://Buildingdoctors.co.uk)



**Existing**



**Proposed**

## **Design and Access Statement**

### **Conservation Area & Building Conversion:**

The former church of Trinity Close is part of the Willoughby Street / Downshire Hill

Conservation Area [SUB AREA THREE].

The former church faces a shared, cobbled courtyard with a cobbled alley beside Willoughby House called Old Brewery Mews. Today the church and ancillary building are divided into three houses. The original conversion scheme rendered and painted all the buildings. It also squared off all courtyard facing windows, and added incongruously shaped dormers facing Old Brewery Mews. Few original church features survive. The Old Brewery buttresses and the Willoughby Street gable with retained Gothic pointed stone tracery windows. [All Painted White] No original church signage remains.

### **Design Principles and Concept:**

The buildings refurbishment and upgrade proposes to:

1. Replace the 1980's boxy, ill fitting front extension.

The front extension design uses smooth curves, 'former church' white paint, new stone tracery mullions on blue brick base. The front 'extension concept' recycles the Gothic Church elements to create a new front entrance that is in unison with the whole building.

2. Create additional living space in the basement.

The basement living needs daylight, which comes from a numbers of different locations. A/ By lowering the Courtyard Window sills and creating a Box Lights under the ground floor window seats to give high level basement light, without need courtyard pavement lights. New circular glass [Old Brewery Mews] Pavement lights are placed between buttresses. These new P/lights can easily be upgraded original cast iron crypt side lights. A street level / entrance threshold pavement light with a stone ventilation shaft are modestly scaled. The rest of the basement light comes down from the triple height existing church window and from the new double wide street level window. [Which has been slightly opaqued for privacy.]

3. Daylight to loft space with new conservation roof lights.

The existing 1980's dormer is retained. Conservation Lumen LR6/7 roof lights are proposed on the Old Brewery mews side and the Trinity Close Courtyard. All new conservation skylights are flush with the roof tiles and located in accordance with Camden's design guide and mostly concealed behind the ex. raised courtyard parapet. No development is planned above the ridge line.



## **Design and Access Statement**

### **Intended use**

The use of the development will remain residential.

### **Design Layout**

The new layout formally segregates the house into a central staircase core, light well and windows to the front and living spaces to the rear. A curved staircase is shaped for beauty, as a place to see the Gothic Arched windows and to emphasise the windows shape with triple height space.

### **Local Shapes & Materials**

The refurbishment uses ex. materials where possible. The ex. Slate and lead roof, Decorative Cast Iron Railings, Stone Mullions architectural features, the blue brick base exists from the current extension, and new curved shapes copy the Gothic original church.

### **Pavement lights to the basement**

Unobtrusive pavement lights, flush to the floor are proposed on either side of the building. These will either be clear glass or sand blasted and be located within the boundaries of the site. The proposed Pavement Light is Luxcrete PC170/100. Circular Lights encased in concrete and finished with a texture to match the existing paving.

### **Parking and Landscaping.**

The current parking arrangements will remain unchanged. The addition of pavement lights as discussed above will be inconspicuous as possible to the surrounding paving and landscaping.

An existing conifer tree at the far North West corner of the site will be retained. The development will not effect the tree in anyway, however if required this will be protected and Fenced to BS:5837 2005. The tree will be physically protected from damage by enclosing the area covered by the crown spread with hoarding or mesh panels (eg Herras or similar) supported by a robust post and rail framework, braced to resist impact.

### **Access:**

Current access to the property is changed to face the street. A canopy over doors forms part of the front extension. All designed to be as 'if it were original'

### **Materials:**

The palette of materials specified are in keeping with the existing property it adjoins and with materials predominantly used in surrounding context. A robust stone plinth, stone reveals, Cast Iron Railings and Galvanised Rain Water Pipes are all proposed to enhance on the building. These materials will add character and hint at original church features.

### **Energy Conservation:**

The proposal aims to achieve maximum energy conservation through the use of apposite design approaches and prudent use of materials. New construction is insulated to attain a U value of 0.25.



## Design and Access Statement

### Location Plan:

The site is situated in a residential area of Hampstead. The site one part of a former church converted into 3 houses in the 1982.



### Side views

### History

A Planning Application (2012/1446/P) made on 27/07/2012 was withdrawn due to concern listed below, by the planning officer Angela Ryan (East Area Team). Below are also **A SECOND SET** amendments and revisions proposed that address these concerns and form this application re-submission.

### Planning Officer Comments and subsequent amendments / improvements Officer Ryan:

1) As you may be aware the application site is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area (See page 55 of the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement 2001). As such the proposed roof terrace to be located on the side elevation (facing Willoughby Road) of the application site is considered to be unacceptable. A terrace located on the street elevation is not a characteristic of the area and is not a precedent that the Council would like to see set. It is also considered that this aspect of the proposal would not serve to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area or the building. It would also give rise to an element of sustained overlooking into the properties located opposite the site on Willoughby Road that is not currently afforded at the application site. It is acknowledged that there is an existing door and balcony on the side elevation of t no. 1a Trinity Close, however this property is well set back from the street and therefore does not have as much of an impact as the application proposals in terms of its visual and residential amenity.

### Building Doctors:

The existing roof terrace faces Willoughby Road exists. This submission makes the balcony smaller, and maintains the existing parapet. The original application design included a trellis to obscure views shown in a section through the balcony / street. The new application only makes the balcony smaller, with no trellis. A 3D model has been included for clarity. Officer Ryan raised concerns about how this scheme could 'start undesirable precedents' and alter the nature of the



### 3 Trinity, Willoughby Rd, Hampstead – Design & Access Statement [4]

conservation area. This statement can not be applied to this scheme as the alterations improve and existing balcony.

2) The pavement lights proposed on the front elevation (Trinity Close) are considered to be unacceptable as is considered that this aspect would not serve to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is considered that this attractive cobbled surface area should be retained as is.

#### **Building Doctors**

The majority of proposed Trinity Close pavement lights have been removed, one has been placed at the edge of the front door and within the curtilage of the property.

3) In terms of the pavement lights proposed on the rear elevation, the Council is not convinced that they would provide sufficient light down into the proposed kitchen area at basement level. As such a light assessment will be required to be submitted in order to verify that sufficient light will be provided. To this end I would refer you to the “site layout for planning for daylight and sunlight, second edition, 2011” that outlines the required standards of light for different rooms.

The pavement lights on the rear elevation, on their own may lack the capacity to provide adequate daylight, but these along with the pavement lights beside the front door and glazed fenestrations located at upper levels, including the lowering of existing ground floor windows will provide sufficient light into the proposed kitchen at basement level. In addition reflective surfaces where possible will also be used.

4) The large matching dormer window proposed at roof level is considered to be unacceptable as it does not comply with the Council’s design guidance for dormers in terms of its design. Given the bulky appearance and the fact that it is located on the corner of the building it is considered that it would be highly visible from Willoughby Road and is considered would harm the character and appearance of the building and conservation area. Particularly in light of the fact that the two existing bulky dormers located at roof level or nos. 1 & 2 Trinity Close are clearly visible from the street. I would refer you to Camden’s Planning Guidance CPG1-Design: Chapter 5. Moreover figure 4 provides a useful guide for an acceptable design.

Through various discussions with Officer Ryan we have now removed the previously proposed dormers and at the suggestion of OFFICER RYAN replaced them with Lumen LR6/7 Conservation skylights at both the Old Brewery side and the Trinity courtyard side, where they mostly sit behind the existing raised parapet.

5) The proposed blocking up of windows on the rear and side elevations together with the proposed alterations to the existing openings on the rear and side elevations are considered to be unacceptable in design terms. The buildings (nos.1 & 2 Trinity Close) are fairly uniform and broadly symmetrical in appearance and it is considered that this element of the proposal would serve to unbalance the façades which is considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and the conservation area. The rear window situated between the buttresses [Old Brewery Mews] breaks the eaves line, This is incongruous to the former church and we’ve removed. All other windows are retained as current, at the suggestion of Officer Ryan.

#### **Additional information**

For clarity 3d views of the proposed scheme incorporating all the aspects discussed above accompanies this application.



### 3 Trinity, Willoughby Rd, Hampstead – Design & Access Statement [4]

#### **Structural Engineer Comments / OCTOBER 2012**

The following documents and drawings as part of the Basement Impact Assessment. The report pertaining to structure and sequencing also form part of this re-submission

<b>Drawing no</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Revision</b>
S100	Structural Scheme Basement plan & Structure	P2
S101	Structural Scheme Ground Floor	P2
S200	Structural Scheme East-West	P2
SSK001	Structural sequencing & Construction Techniques Basement Impact Assessment Report	

#### **Construction techniques / sequencing:**

in order to retain the structural integrity of the highway/neighbouring lands/properties – this was mentioned in item 4.1.1. of our scoping report.

#### **The Construction Method Statement:**

This should be a made planning condition, as would be given by a contractor. The final details will be designed at tender stage, which Officer Angela Ryan mentions as this will form part of a 106 agreement and submitted to Highways dept prior to construction.

#### **Construction management plan**

Again this should be a made planning condition, as this would be better provided by a contractor, as it reflects issues such as hoarding, movement of vehicles, storage of site equipment for the very constricted site. We may seek to use two parking bays in front of the property with hoarding around all. Pedestrian pavements, and working hours.

#### **Structural Engineer Comments / January 2013 / By Email**

We undertook the Screening and Scoping element of the BIA, and further to that, at the end of October 2012, we revised the drawings and drew up a suggested method statement for construction, passed to the Building Doctors, please find these attached as you may have overlooked these.

However, from your comments on the screening and scoping report, we understand an SI with borehole information is required, and will advise the clients of this. I am surprised this was not advised by yourselves when the BIA and drawings were first submitted back in July/August last year, as we understand that the Council should advise on the scope of the BIA, i.e. if stage 3 & 4 are necessary. In addition, I have numbered your comments, below, for ease of reference, and replies in colour.

**Basement:** There are several concerns raised over the nature and level of information submitted in support of seeking to justify the basement proposals. More specifically:

**Council:**

1. In terms of the BIA screening results, in paragraph 3.1.5 the answer provided stipulates that “no change in the water quality is expected”. Limited evidence to back up such an assertion is provided. Commentary explaining why this would not be the case would be helpful in helping me to make a more detailed assessment of the possible impacts.



### 3 Trinity, Willoughby Rd, Hampstead – Design & Access Statement [4]

**Conisbee:**

Items 3.1.1-3.1.4 all highlight that the site is not near the ponds catchment area, and that the permeable /impermeable surface of landscaping is not to be altered, as such the surface water from the site (which is largely built upon, therefore that is minimal surface water run-off) is not changed in itself and therefore its quality also would not be changed.

**Council:**

2. Concerns are raised in respect of paragraph 3.2.1 and 3.3.10 (where the report confirms that the site is over a secondary A aquifer); it is considered that on-site investigations are likely to be required as a result of this (see further commentary below).

**Conisbee:**

The secondary aquifer is bedrock designation (i.e. is not a superficial deposit, which lies higher), from the Environment Agency website, and as such lies at a depth below the London clay, some 80m + below the site, therefore the proposals will not affect the aquifer. We have contacted the EA on similar projects and understand this is not a concern.

3. The B.I.A does not sufficiently demonstrate whether the structural stability of neighbouring properties will be maintained – 3.3.7 confirms that London Clay has high shrinkage potential and as such some seasonal movement is to be expected. It further goes on to state that there is no visible evidence of such movement on site. Paragraph 3.3.13 of the BIA provided refers to transition underpinning of no. 2 Trinity Close to ensure that there is no sudden change in the relative stiffness of the foundations and then further goes on to confirm that the building is relatively stiff. It is considered that evidence needs to be provided as to the exact measures (including full methodology) as to how the structural stability of neighbouring and nearby properties will be maintained. The cross section on S110 highlight the proposal lies away from a 45 deg line from the neighbours, and hence will not undermine them. Please find attached sequence proposal. At the present point in time it is considered that the information provided is insufficient to demonstrate compliance with this part of the policy.
4. Paragraph 2.2 in appendix C attached to the B.I.A confirms that a site investigation is proposed to determine the soils beneath the property, the soil properties and groundwater conditions. However based on the information provided it would appear that no on-site intrusive investigations have taken place; it is considered that these are necessary to provide more accurate and detailed justification for the proposals. See below.
5. Appendix C attached to the B.I.A refers to “Location Plan & TP LOGS (undertaken June 2012). It would appear that these items have not been appended to the report and as such I would request that copies are sent for the Council’s consideration. Please find the Site Investigation, with a series of trial pits, carried out by Site Analytical Services, attached (19433)





### 3 Trinity, Willoughby Rd, Hampstead – Design & Access Statement [4]

#### Council:

In light of the possible impact the proposed works may have on neighbouring properties and the water table. It is considered that a ground investigation needs to be undertaken and additional information submitted for the Council's consideration prior to permission being granted for the basement proposal. In particular you are advised of the potential need to undertake borehole investigations (see paragraph 290 of Arup study "a minimum of three boreholes or trial pits is usually required in order to determine the groundwater flow direction). The three locations should be arranged in a triangular pattern. This is particularly important given that I have received 6 objections to date where concerns have been raised in respect of the possible impacts of the proposed basement development. You are advised to consider further and revise the B.I.A in respect of stages 1 and 2 of the B.I.A process and undertake the subsequent necessary work (which are stages 3 and 4 of the B.I.A process). All of this must be done in advance of any application being in a position to possibly be supported by officers. The subsequent more complete B.I.A is advised to closely follow the staged approach outlined in CPG4 and also be mindful of the Arup document – this is available to download via the following links:

#### Conisbee:

This BIA was the screening and scoping part, - stages 1 & 2, and along the guidelines set out in the Arup's report, an SI with borehole and ground water information will be undertaken if still required from yourselves (do refer to the comments above – the screening and scoping elements highlighted no negative impacts on ground water, so we query if one is actually required).

#### Building Doctors / January 2013

The Council officers have admitted that the Conisbee Engineers BIA reports have not been read thoroughly by the appropriate council department [as application was withdrawn]. It is clear that Conisbee engineers have provided all information required and pointed out to the council where each answer is.

The Applicant is not prepared to spend a further £5000 for 3 bore holes that may or may not be required until the approval is granted, and the council has read the report fully.

Furthermore Conisbee says boreholes are not necessary because all Council questions and concerns have been answered without need for additional [& EXPENSIVE] investigation.





### 3 Trinity, Willoughby Rd, Hampstead – Design & Access Statement [4]



#### **Street View**

Light Basement Curved ground floor extension with soft lines to emulate Gothic Arches

### 3 Trinity, Willoughby Rd, Hampstead – Design & Access Statement [4]



#### **Courtyard View**

Ground floor extension with soft lines