

72 & 74 South Hill Park, NW3

Proposed Development:

Construction of a new mansard roof addition; remodelling of rear elevations including new fenestration, increase in height of existing rear side extensions and the reconstruction of the rear garden terrace to no 72; the enlargement of the existing front lower ground area way to no 72 and the formation of a new external staircase to the lower ground floor together with a new side door; replacement of windows to the front elevation of no 72; excavations to form new basements to both properties; the formation of a lean-to garden store to the side passage of no 72 and the remodelling of two windows at lower level.

Design and Access Statement

Contents

1.0	Design Statement
1.1	Boyarsky Murphy Architects - Company Ethos and Experience
1.2	Introduction
1.3	Existing Properties
1.4	Context
1.5	Design Context
1.6	Consultations
1.7	Environmental
1.8	Amenity
1.9	Scheme Assessment
2.0	Access Statement
3.0	Photographs of the existing properties

1.0 Design Statement

1.1 Boyarsky Murphy Architects - Company Ethos and Experience:

Boyarsky Murphy (BMA) has built up a reputation for sensitive modern design within the historic context of London. They have designed projects for the transformation of listed buildings and have built new infill housing units in conservation areas.

Boyarsky Murphy have completed a number of refurbishments in several London Conservation areas including a number of projects in Camden. Their refurbishment and extension to a property in Belsize Avenue was highlighted in the Belsize Conservation Area Advisory Committee's publication 'Belsize 2000. A Living Suburb'.

In 2006 they completed the refurbishment of Sir Christopher Wren's Christ Church Tower in the City of London. Christ Church Tower, a Grade One Listed Building and Scheduled Monument, had been bombed in the Second World War and was semi-derelict. They have recently completed designs for the conversion of and extension to a second Wren Tower, the Grade One Listed Tower of St Mary Somerset which is due to start on site later this year. Christ Church Tower was shortlisted for the RIBA Prize this year. The Tower has also been recommended for the City Heritage Award.

1.2 Introduction

Our clients have lived at no 74 South Hill Park for a number of years. They have recently purchased no 72 South Hill Park. No 72 is in dilapidated condition and their plan is to refurbish the house as their residence and to rent out no 74 as a single family residence.

1.3 Existing Properties

The group of houses numbered 72 to 78 South Hill Park form a single terrace of four buildings. The buildings were all seriously damaged in a bombing raid during the Second World War. Nos. 76 & 78 were rebuilt completely in contrasting styles. Nos. 72 and 74 were significantly rebuilt after the war.

1.3.1

We have not been able to find any records of the reconstruction in Camden's records but it is clear from visual inspection that the vast majority of the rear elevation and the western flank wall were rebuilt in flint brickwork with exposed reinforced concrete lintols to form windows and door openings. Some features such as the side chimney would appear to be original. The upper portion of the entire flank wall was rebuilt.

The entire front elevation was rebuilt in fletton brickwork on an exposed concrete ring beam above the second floor windows. **(ill nos 6 & 9)**

- 1.3.2** The rear windows to both properties are not original and are virtually flush with the facing brickwork. Existing windows to no 72 are a mixture of steel frame, plastic coated aluminium, UPVC and timber. **(ill nos 6 & 7)**
- 1.3.3** The roofs to nos. 72 and 74 are currently valley roofs. They provide some accommodation. It is not clear whether this was the original roof form or whether they were much taller pitched roofs similar to no 80 South Hill Park and the majority of the houses on the street. We believe that it is likely that the valley roof configuration was not the original roof form and that the roof profile was significantly higher. The current roofs are in poor condition.
- 1.3.4** Internally significant structural alterations were carried out to no 74 in the 1990s. No 72 has not been touched since the 1950s and is in an extremely poor state of repair with some structural problems and outdated services.
- 1.3.5** No 72 South Hill Park is suffering from subsidence. There is visible cracking to the party wall with no 74 and elsewhere. Floors to all levels have bowed significantly. The rear terrace is badly cracked. **(ill nos. 1 to 5)**
- 1.3.6** Trial pits have been made and the structural engineer (Greig Ling Consulting Engineers) is of the opinion that the subsidence has been caused by the 1950s construction pulling away from the Victorian fabric. Greig Ling have recommended that no. 72 and the party wall with no 74 be underpinned and that existing floor joists through out the building are removed, relaid and braced to the exterior walls.

1.4 Context

- 1.4.1** Nos. 72 & 74 South Hill Park form part of the South Hill Park Conservation Area. They are also part of a group of properties facing the ponds that had their permitted development rights taken away by an Article 4 direction.
- 1.4.2** The rear of 72 & 74 South Hill Park overlook the Hampstead ponds and are clearly visible from the Heath. Any proposed alterations or additions need to assess any impact on views across the ponds.
- 1.4.3** A panoramic view of the roof line of properties overlooking the ponds shows that a majority of buildings along this stretch of the ponds have glazed roof additions and terraces. The glazing is often full height. The view also reveals a diversity of architectural styles. No 76 South Hill Park is of a radically different design that does not blend with nos. 74 & 72. Nos 78 and the stretch of lower terraced houses to the north were built in the 1960s. **(ill no 8)**
- 1.4.4** The overall impression of the rear elevations of nos. 72 & 74 from the ponds is untidy with different window types and a profusion of pipework.

\

- 1.4.5** A recent application (ref 2006/4826/P), granted on 2nd November 2006, for elevational alterations to the third and fourth floor maisonette to Flat 4 South Hill Mansion, 68-70 South Hill Park has just been completed. The works included renewing the existing glazing, the incorporation of a new rooflight, and the lowering of part of the existing rear parapet.

1.5 Design Concept

1.5.1 Rear Elevation

Our design concept is to unify the two rear elevations to form a harmonious composition facing the ponds. The majority of the exposed pipework will be removed from the rear elevation and will be relocated on the flank wall of no. 72. The two side extensions are increased in height by half a floor to frame the central bay and balconies. They will not be higher than one full storey below the parapet level (SPG 2.7.17). New window openings to the extensions are proposed to unify the facades and to give them a more cohesive identity alongside no 76. All windows will be timber framed, double glazed and painted. New sliding and folding doors at garden level, at the third floor and at roof level will be timber framed to Conservation Area requirements.

1.5.2 Roof Level

The existing valley roofs will be removed and a new mansard roof extension will provide an additional floor to both properties. The mansard roof construction is within SPG guidelines with dormer roofs to the street side (SPG 2.8.7). The mansard roof and dormers will be lead clad, the front roof will be of natural slate with timber framed dormers and windows. To the rear a small terrace is proposed with a parapet height of 1230mm and the existing brick parapet is lowered by 1300mm. Timber framed glazed doors open onto the terrace. Unlike roof top additions to nos. 76, 70, 68, 66, 64 South Hill Park and further down the street where the full height of the glazed extension is visible only half of the height of the glazing will be visible above the parapet.

1.5.3 Side Elevation to no. 72 South Hill Park

- 1.5.3.1** An existing window is relocated at ground level. At lower ground level one existing window will be enlarged.
- 1.5.3.2** A lean to glazed garden storage structure is proposed midway along the side passage. The front building line will not be compromised, nor will it compromise or block the view from the street. The original architectural features of flank wall will not be obscured and the structure will not block access to the rear or adjoining properties (SPG 2.7.12)
- 1.5.4** With the exception of the roof addition external alterations to no 74 are minor and mainly involve internal reconfiguration

1.5.5 Basements

It is proposed to excavate basements to nos. 72 and 74. The basement to no 74 will be for storage, plant and utility. The basement to no 72 will be for storage, plant, utility, lift plant and a fitness area and hydrotherapy treatment pool. The excavations to nos. 72 and 74 will be within the footprint of the existing buildings. In the case of no. 72 the excavation will extend to the rear terrace which is currently suffering from subsidence and requires underpinning. (refer to structural engineer's dwgn no G451/).

The danger of additional flooding to the ponds which may occur due to excavation works will be offset by the implementation of a rainwater harvesting installation.

1.5.4.1 Heath and Hampstead Society's Statement on Basement Excavations

We have reviewed the Heath and Hampstead Society's statement of July 2007 and consider the main points below:

- the proposed excavation work is not a deep excavation. The new basement slab will be one metre below rear garden level;
- the extent of excavations will be within the outline of the existing houses;
- trial pits have established the feasibility of implementing the scheme;
- the effect of subsidence to no 72 means that the house will in any event have to be fully underpinned with resultant excavation works;
- a water harvesting scheme is proposed to prevent runoff contributing to flooding of the pond;
- we are not aware of any subterranean water courses under the properties;
- there are no significant trees in the immediate area of the proposed excavations and there is no risk of loss of trees of townscape or amenity value;
- there is no party wall to the south of no 72 South Hill Park and there is a two metre passageway between nos. 70 and 72. This distance will minimise any nuisance to the residents of no 70. Consultations have been made with the freeholder and resident of the lower ground floors of no 76 South Hill Park who has not objected to the proposed works.

1.5.5 Front Elevation

1.5.5.1 The proposed dormers and mansard roof construction are within SPG guidelines (SPG 2.8.7). The roof will be of natural slate, dormers will be of timber construction with Code 4 lead roofs and cheeks, windows will be of painted timber.

1.5.5.2 The existing lightwell to no 72 will be extended to match no 74 and a new stair will be constructed for deliveries that will be similar to the stair at no 74.

1.6 Consultations

- a pre-application set of drawings and texts were submitted to Camden on 7th June 2007 (ref CA/2007/ENQ/16137);
- Boyarsky Murphy have been in discussion with Planning Officer Paul Wood who has presented the scheme to Camden's design officers. The response has been to welcome the proposals to the rear elevation. There has been some concern about the height of the proposed roof addition, particularly at the rear;
- BMA submitted further drawings on 22nd June showing a reduction of height of 375mm from the original proposal. Camden's response has been that these reductions were not sufficient and that the proposed roof addition should be no higher than the roof additions to 68-70 South Hill Park (telephone conversations with Paul Wood, (August 2007) ;
- the proposed roof addition in this application is at the same height as the roof additions to nos 68 & 70 South Hill Park.

1.7 Environmental

- nos 72 and 74 South Hill Park will conform to the new Part L requirements;
- roofs will be super insulated;
- soundproofing will be installed between nos 72 & 74;
- sound proofing will be installed along the party wall with no 76 South Hill Park;
- a rain water harvesting system will be installed to both properties.
- we are currently looking into the installation of a Combined Heat & Power installation.

1.8 Amenity

There will be no loss of amenity to neighbouring properties from the proposed scheme:

1.9 Scheme Assessment

We consider that the proposed alterations to nos. 72 and 74 South Hill Park will not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

We consider that the proposed design will enhance nos. 72 and 74 South Hill Park and the South Hill Park Conservation Area for the following reasons:

- the design has been developed to be sympathetic to the surrounding context, the diverse roof scape and to views from across the ponds;
- the scheme has been designed and specified to provide alterations and additions of high quality that will improve the external appearance of the two buildings greatly;
- the two houses have been considered as a pair so that the proposed alterations and additions will unify the two rear elevations to form a harmonious composition facing the ponds;
- the impact of the proposed scheme on the Conservation Area and the Heath has been assessed carefully and the amount of exposed glazing at the rooftop level typically found in neighbouring buildings has been reduced. The proposed brick parapet height is also taller than in neighbouring buildings.
- pre-application advice has been sought from Camden's Planning Department and their comments have been incorporated into the final designs;
- the development also complies with all the relevant policies and guidance in terms of design, conservation and amenity.

2.0 Access Statement

2.1 No 72 has been designed to be wheelchair accessible on all levels in response to the client's requirements. This is to be achieved by the construction of a lift that will serve every level of the house.

2.1.2 No 74 will remain with a similar layout to its current form. No changes are proposed to the existing access arrangements.



1. cracking caused by subsidence to rear ground floor



2. cracking caused by subsidence to rear ground floor



3. heave caused by subsidence to front basement



4. cracking caused by subsidence to garden terrace



5. cracking caused by subsidence to garden terrace



6. detail of rear elevation windows, no 72



7. detail of rear rear elevation junction of nos 72 & 74



8. detail of rear rear elevation junction of nos 72 & 74



9. detail of rear elevation windows, no 72