

Planning Services  
Camden Town Hall  
Argyle Street  
London WC1H 8EQ

6<sup>th</sup> June 2014

**REF: 104, 44a Fortress Road London NW5 2HG**

### **Design & Access Statement**

#### **Design Process, Appearance & Access**

The existing property comprises a lower ground floor and ground floor within a terrace house. The property is Grade II listed and is within the Kentish Town designated Conservation Area. The access is through the lower ground floor on the front garden.

There are two flats above.

The proposal is to re-model the internal layout. The current arrangement comprises two staircases with the ground floor being divided being front and back. This makes for a very tortuous arrangement. A single stair arrangement is proposed.

The location would correspond to the original stair location below the stair to the communal part of the building above.

We are also proposing to replace the current rear extension conservatory with a more contemporary arrangement. The current roof is made of a polycarbonate sheet that has very little insulation and is not very appealing.

A pre application submission was made on the 11<sup>th</sup> April 2014. The response e-mailed on the 13<sup>th</sup> May, ref. 2014/2847/pre is included part of the planning application.

In brief the pre-application response was not in favour of the proposed scheme.

The commentary was as follows:

#### **1 The site**

*The site is a basement and ground floor flat with a back garden in a grade-II-listed terrace of 26 houses of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. The houses are mostly four storeys with basement although this one, as an end terrace, it three storeys with basement and mansard. Access is from the unusually wide front area. The rear garden is secluded, being surrounded by mature vegetation and having a tall brick wall at its foot, part of a large car repair garage. The house benefits from a rear extension apparently dating from 198 (8701121), when the premises was known as 44A.*

#### **2 The proposal**

*The operative drawings are 104\_03, 06, 10 and 16 (Feb 2014).*

*The proposal involves the replacement of an existing rear timber lean-to conservatory with a larger one, which will be more visually exposed owing to the digging out of brick-lined raised beds which partly recall the original rear basement area, present in 1959. The acceptability of the new conservatory would be subject to submission of acceptable detailed designs. Care should be taken not to submit a design that contains alien forms or unsuitable materials.*

*Otherwise the exterior remains unchanged.*

## **2.1 Basement**

- 2.1.1 Internally, the knocking through of the wall from the front room to the rear is proposed.*
- 2.1.2 The removal of a partition in the rear room is proposed.*
- 2.1.3 The removal of a stair in what appears to be a late-20th-century rear extension.*
- 2.1.4 The demolition of a partition in this rear extension.*
- 2.1.5 Not mentioned during the site visit, but shown on the drawings is a widening of the doors between the house and the conservatory.*

## **2.2 Ground floor**

- 2.2.1 The introduction of an en suite bathroom in the front room.*
- 2.2.2 The alteration of an existing staircase to allow half landing access to the rear extension at ground floor level. This will entail the alteration of an apparently non-original aperture cut through what appears to be a loadbearing wall, presumably made when the lower two floors were separated from those above. Planning history suggests that this work was done in 1959 (F12\_I\_A\_23332). At this point, the rear bedroom was also divided to accommodate the new stair.*
- 2.2.3 The creation of a doorway at ground floor level from the house to the rear extension.*

## **Notes**

- 2.1.1 A modest double doorway would be acceptable in this position.*
- 2.1.2 It seems likely that this would restore the house's original form, so is acceptable.*
- 2.1.3 The removal of the rear stair is acceptable.*
- 2.1.4 This demolition is acceptable.*
- 2.1.5 I cannot comment on this aspect of the proposal, not having scrutinised the doors and doorway.*
- 2.2.1 The introduction of an en suite bathroom is unacceptable in this location. It would break up the room, making it difficult to appreciate its original volume and would harm the historic plan. Furthermore, the necessary pipes, etc, would result in damage to the floors and joists, resulting in damage to historic fabric.*
- 2.2.2 The staircase appears modern, both in its fabric seen from underneath and in its location, apparently having been relocated to pass unexpectedly through the wall.*
- 2.2.3 This doorway would pass through an unadorned wall in an area already much altered. In removing the ceiling to allow headroom, it may be that original features will be uncovered which can be reinstated.*

Our response to the pre-application is as follows:

- 2.1.1 to 2.1.4 remain as accepted.*
- 2.1.5 The opening between the kitchen and the conservatory will be kept as is, no widening of the opening is sought.*
- 2.2.1 Comments taken on board. We have immoted the bathroom proposal to the front room and installed the bathroom in the rear part of the lower ground floor as shown on the drawings.*
- 2.2.2 Noted and remains as proposed.*
- 2.2.3 Noted, any original features that will be un-covered will be reinstated as requested.*

**Use**

The existing residential use remains unchanged.

**Layout**

The layout remains virtually the same except for the change in circulation arrangements with a single stair rather than two.

Yours sincerely,

Sebastian Camisuli

On behalf of:  
Martins Camisuli Architects