

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

**April 2011
Job no: 20044**

**Lower Ground Floor Flat,
96 South Hill Park,
London, NW3 2SN**

smith lam architects ltd
4 – 8 Canfield Gardens London NW6 3BS
Tel: 020 7372 2888 Fax: 020 7372 6333
www.smithlam.com

Introduction

This application is for alterations to the existing lower ground floor flat, by an infill side extension, increasing the floor area of the flat.

A similar application was granted in August 2008 (application 2008/2955/P)

The main difference between the applications is that no rear extension is proposed in this scheme.

The house of which the flat forms part, is a five storey semi-detached building, divided into three flats. The house itself has a prominent position overlooking Hampstead Heath Pond No.2 while the lower ground floor flat is largely hidden from view.

The property is located in the South Hill Conservation Area and this scheme has been carefully designed to be sympathetic and sensitive to the building itself as well as its context.

Since submitting a new planning application ref: 2011/1279/ in March 2011 the owners have become concerned about the scope and costs of the proposed works. At this point in time they remain undecided as to which application to implement.



Front view of 96 South Hill Park

Use

The current use is as a large one-bedroom flat of a total of 72m². The private garden to the rear of the property is largely protected from public view by a high brick wall and planting. To the front of the property there is a small sunken light well with access stair from ground floor level.

Since the approval of application 2008/2955/P, some implementation work has been undertaken in accordance with the consent. The light well has been partially excavated and stepped planting has been created between the light well and pavement at ground floor level. Part of the area under the entrance to the flats above has been excavated but not to the extent shown in the approved drawings.

Layout

The existing layout of the flat offers 72 m², the consented 2008 scheme 98m² and this proposed scheme consists of approximately 87m².

Care has been taken to ensure that the flat meets Camden's room size requirements. While the overall footprint of the building has increased in relation to the existing, it will be less than that of the 2008/2955/P consent. It is also worth pointing out that the side extension sits within an area currently encircled with a high wall and is at present serving no purpose.



Rear view of 96 South Hill Park



Currently redundant yard to the side of the property

Appearance

The side extension have been carefully designed to make as little impact as possible on the passageway and follows the line of the existing boundary wall. Roof lights will be installed on the roof of the extension to provide natural light to the flat; however they have been set back and will have little impact on the passageway.

The extension has been designed in a sympathetic relationship to the building and its setting and is largely hidden from views across the pond by a mature Lime tree in the rear garden. The existing boundary wall will be kept as it is in good shape and rebuilding it might have a negative impact on the lime tree.



View of the property from the walkway along Hampstead Heath Pond No 2

Conclusion

We believe that this application is largely the same as the consented scheme (2008/2955/P) and that it is sensitive and sympathetic to both the building and the Conservation Area.

We trust that planning consent will be forthcoming.



View from the other side of Hampstead Heath Pond No 2. The application site is the right hand lower ground floor, almost completely hidden by the large willow tree.

**Appendix A: Design and Access Statement for Consented Planning Application
(2008/2955/P)**



Smith lance larcade & bechtol

Architects Ltd London
4 – 8 Canfield Gardens NW6 3BS
Tel: 020 7372 2888 Fax: 020 7372 6333

Introduction:

This planning application involves an infill side extension, a new rear extension and alteration of the existing entrance to the flat. A Similar application (2008/0302/P) was as granted on 18 March 2008. The only difference in this application is the inclusion of a modern rear extension with green roof in place of the consented rear conservatory.

The flat itself is the bottom flat of three contained in this five storey semi-detached building. This itself has a prominent position overlooking Hampstead Heath Pond No. 2 while the application site itself at the lower ground floor level and is largely hidden from view.

Please see appendix A for detailed design statement relating to consented scheme, which is largely the same.

Use:

The proposed application has no different use then the consented one.

Amount:

This application has only increased the floor area by negligible amount over the consented scheme.

Layout/ Access:

The layout of existing building with its redundant yard to one side naturally lends itself to side extension in the manner as we are proposing.

Given this is an existing property and is a tight site no ramped access is possible to the main entrance. However our client is specifically refurbishing this flat with a disabled user in mind. Therefore the entrance is ambulant disabled friendly with a chair lift incorporated in the layout. Likewise a disabled bathroom plus enlarged door sizes are proposed. This is seen as benefit to Camden's house stock and goes beyond the requirements of building regulations and planning requirements.

Appearance:

By including a rear extension with a green roof instead of the glass conservatory as per consented scheme (2008/0302/P) we aim to achieve better connection between rear garden and flat with true modern architecture and materials assuring an environment friendly and energy sufficient building. The extension wall facing neighbour 94 South Hill Park is made off brick to match existing. Rest of two facades are made of frameless glass and folding doors allowing open view of pond from inside flat.

A Roof light in rear extension provides natural light in to kitchen area.

Landscaping:

Landscape proposal had not changed since consented scheme.

In appendix B and C are attached Arboricultural method statement and Engineers drawings of extension foundations provided with previous planning application 2008/0302/P. Similar construction will be used for the new extension and this will have no effect on the TPO tree.

Conclusion:

We believe this application is largely the same as that consented and is sympathetic to both the building and its local setting; we therefore hope that this application meets with your approval and that planning consent will be forthcoming.



View from other side of Pond No 2 from Hampstead Heath, site for application is right hand lower ground floor almost completely concealed by large willow tree:

June 2008