

19.1 of 3
Doc 138 /007

4 SITE DESIGN LTD
Chartered Architects

Architectural Services . Property Development . Property management .

Registered in UK. Number 4229660
30 Westbere Road . London NW2 3SR.
Tel: 020 7431 6929. Fax:020 7435 3748
e-mail : snour @blueyonder.co.uk

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT
For
PROPOSED 4th FLOOR MANSARD ROOF
7 ELY PLACE ,LONDON ,EC1N 6RY

May 2007

DESCRIPTION :

The property is one of a short terrace of three dating from the late 1700s . The building is Grade II listed and lies within the heart of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area .The building is used by a solicitors firm .The area has a long standing tradition for office use by solicitors/ legal services .It is also subject to the construction of a considerable number of new purpose built office buildings .

This application seeks consent for the creation of a mansard roof to provide further office space at 4th floor level . We consider that this extension will help to keep the building viable to continue it's existing usage within an environment of ever changing demands while maintaining it's character and appearance .

DESIGN REFERENCES :

RUDP Policies :

Prior to designing the proposal, it's context within it's surroundings was carefully considered in accordance with Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan policy B1 . General design Principles .Studies were made of recently consented proposals of a similar nature within the vicinity;. No. 33 opposite (refer to photos) was recently granted planning and listed building consent for a similar type of construction as was no. 6 Hatton Garden , the rear of which can be viewed from the rear of 7 Ely Place .Enclosed photos show the recently completed mansard level from both the front and rear facades .

Immediately adjoining no. 7 to it's right is no. 1- 6 .This building is several stories higher than the short 3 terrace but has a cornice detailing which relates to the strong parapet line of the terrace .To the right of the terrace , no. 10 comprises a new terrace of Georgian houses that has a higher parapet line as well as a full mansard level while being of similar age .

Given the above variety and diversity of context we consider that our proposal complies with Policy B1 : a) respecting it's site and setting ,d) is sustainable by prompting energy efficiency and efficient use of resources , e) provides an adaptability to change in economic and social requirements by keeping the building a viable flexible workspace within the confines of it's age and appearance , able to compete with the huge amount of modern office space being developed around it . g) without harming said appearance or amenity . h) it takes into consideration the significantly varying building lines and plot ratios in it's

surrounding area , j) as well as the height bulk and scale of neighbouring buildings while maintaining an overall coherence and with out loss of historic fabric . m) the quality and detailing and materials of the proposal are appropriate to it's setting .

We also consider that the above shows compliance with **Camden RUDP Policy B3** , Alterations and extensions in that a) the proposal respects the form ,proportions and character of the building and it's setting , b) the extension is subordinate to it's original building and of a form that has many precedents within it's immediate vicinity . c) loss of historic fabric is avoided by retaining and restoring the original "M " shaped "London valley" roofing as the second slope of the proposed "True Mansard " .d) high quality materials that match existing materials are proposed and f) the architectural integrity of the existing building is preserved by the use of natural slate and timber sash double glazed dormer windows and wrought iron work .

We also consider that the design proposal complies with **Policy B6 - Listed Buildings** ,b) in that the extension would not cause harm to the special interest of the building nor it's setting given the large number of similar mansard extensions of various ages

We consider that the proposal also complies with the tenets of the **RUDP B7- Conservation areas A)** for the reasons outlined above .

CONSERVATION STATEMENT GUIDELINES :

In addition to the RUDP policies listed above , the proposed design was also based on a study of the **HATTON GARDEN DRAFT CONSERVATION AREA STATEMENT** .

This statement indicates that the first properties to be developed circa 1659 were built along what is currently known today as Hatton Garden Subsequently , we made particular study of the recently completed Mansard extension to number 6 Hatton Garden as the rear of this property is directly opposite the rear of no. 7 Ely Place and this building predates no. 7 Ely Place . The proposed rear façade at no. 7 shows two sash window dormers within the traditional "true mansard" construction at dormer level which we consider more in keeping with the windows below than those constructed at no. 6 Hatton Garden (refer to photo) In addition , the proposed extension to the existing sash to the rear of the second floor half landing would be created within the same opening width ,simply extending it to floor level Again , the appearance of the door opening is designed to match the existing windows in appearance. The proposed railings to the existing flat roof would be in wrought iron and of a pattern matching that of the original railing to the front façade .

Section 5.10 of the Conservation Area statement outlines that the character and special interest of the conservation area is defined through the quality and variety of buildings and uses. It is not dominated by one particular period or style. It is the combination of styles that make the area of special interest. As long as the alterations that take place respect the established character of the street , they are deemed in keeping . We consider that by maintaining the original parapet line and by using the materials outlined above (section 5.21) the proposal complies with the guidelines of the Conservation Statement .

We also consider that the proposal extends the viability of the current use of the building by it's current occupiers who are facing increasing pressures in terms of usable floor space to enable them to continue practising at this address .The proposed mansard would provide for the extra needs and avoid the risk of the property falling into disuse as no longer appropriate for office use thus affecting the "special character of the area" . (Section 6 ,Current Issues) The proposal would also address Section .7.20 of the Conservation statement's concern for

the need to ensure the retention of a stock of small industrial premises associated with specialist trades and the need to retain an overall balance between residential and commercial development . We consider that the design proposal achieves this while respecting “ the built form and historic context of it’s area ” (Design 7.17)

CAMDEN PLANNING GUIDANCE 2006

The proposed extension comprised of a mansard roof , has been designed in accordance with 41.13 Roof alterations and extensions a,b and c. and 41.16 mansard roofs .The mansard roof is designed as a “true mansard with the existing valley roof being transferred to the upper slope . It is to be constructed within a 45 degree sightline to the front façade .

The existing parapet wall is maintained and will not be adapted in any way in accordance with 41.17 figure 1 .

The lower slope of the mansard to the front and rear will be at an angle of 65 degrees within the suggested maximum proposed in 41.19 It rises from behind the existing parapet as suggested and is separated from the parapet wall by a substantial gutter

The party walls to no.s 1-6 and no.8 will be built up in accordance with 41.19 . The chimney stack will also be retained and increased in height and the chimney pots retained and reinstalled .The dormers will be confined to the lower slopes .

The materials used for the roofing will be of natural slate to match the existing in accordance with 41.20 The upper slope will be comprised of the existing M valley and it’s materials will be retained with any making good to be carried out in the same natural slate .The angle of the upper slope will follow that of the original .

Drainage from the mansard will not be altered from the existing arrangement

The dormer windows to both front and rear have been designed to complement the existing sash windows in the façade of no. 7 in accordance with 41.23 and 41.24 relating to the windows below in terms of alignment, material and size .The dormer cheeks are to be dressed in lead with lead flashing and are designed in compliance with 41.25

The proposed railings to the rear façade’s existing flat roof are designed in compliance with the guidelines of 41.31 and 41.32 rear extensions and terraces

ACCESS

In terms of improved access , given the nature of the proposal and the history of the building , The proposal seeks the continued use of access from the exterior via the existing entrance at raised ground floor level as well as the external stairs down to basement level via the street facing light well .

To the rear façade the existing access for fire escape would be improved by the introduction of an exit onto the flat roofs at lower level .