

## **DESIGN/ACCESS STATEMENT**

**PROPOSED Single storey rear extension with associated alterations and refurbishment works**

at

**Flat 1, 140 Fortess Road, London NW5 2HP**

for

**Bromley Park Garden Estates Ltd**

Prepared by

**Avalon Built Environment Ltd  
Chartered Building Surveyors  
Parndon Mill  
Parndon Mill Lane  
Harlow  
Essex CM20 2HP**

## Background

This application follows the ***Pre-Application Proposal Ref. 2015/2754/PRE***, titled '*Erection of single-storey ground floor extension at rear installation of iron balustrade and formation of new roof terrace at 1st floor level rear including new door as replacement of existing window to create a 2 x bedroom self-contained flat*'. The LPA responded to initial scheme with "The proposed extension would be full-width and project beyond the single – storey extension at no.138. It would more than doubled in size in terms of general footprint, scale and proportion and is not considered subordinate to the main building; or the general principles paragraph 4.10 of Camden Planning Guidance. Similarly, the proposed extension would not be in compliance with policy DP24, paragraph 24.13, which advises against overly large extensions and their impact on the host building; and to avoid past extensions as a precedent for succeeding proposals. Whilst there is no objection in principle to an extension here, the full-width extension is too solid in appearance and is considered excessive in scale and proportion and is unacceptable. At the site visit I discussed the proposal with the agent and references were made to neighbouring existing extensions. It was agreed that revised drawings would be submitted to better reflect similar rear extensions within the terrace."

### **The revised proposal was responded to with the following negative comments:**

"There two noticeable differences to the revised scheme are the omission of the 'L' shaped footplate and the depth reduction, by 0.9m (from 4.6m to 3.8m). The overall floor size remains largely as originally proposed; and it would also align with the single-storey extension at no.138. It is recognised that the extension would be limited to private views only being fully enclosed by neighbouring buildings. Notwithstanding, the full-width extension still retains its solid appearance and is not in compliance with CPG guidelines; and is considered excessive in scale and proportion and not subordinate to the appearance of the host building and is unacceptable. The Council's minimum residential space standards CPG2 are 32sqm 1 person; 48sqm 2 persons; 61sqm 3 persons; (excluding communal lobbies and staircases); (paragraphs, 4.12 - 4.16). The net floor area (NFA) of the proposed flat is 55sqm and would comprise 2x double bedrooms (12sqm each) and is less than CPG minimum. The double bedrooms would equate 3 or 4 persons in occupation; and therefore the unit size as proposed is not in compliance with the CPG standards and is unacceptable. In addition, bedroom 1 has one opening on the west side, which would be set back approximately 1.1m from a new boundary wall and 2.1m from the rear elevation of the host building. As proposed therefore, the flat size is considered too small for the number of occupiers and is unacceptable and not in compliance with CPG2. With only a single opening to bedroom 1 and being so close to the rear of the host building I have concerns about the limited amount of day/sunlight into this room and the impact on the occupier. As proposed this bedroom is considered substandard and is unacceptable. The proposed roof terrace at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level would introduce opportunities for overlooking to 1<sup>st</sup> floor windows to the flank elevation of no. 142 Fortess Road and the rear elevation of 138 Fortess Road. If these are windows to habitable rooms such overlooking would need to be mitigated."

### **The feedback was concluded as follows:**

#### "Key areas of concerns:

Design: The revised proposal would match the depth of no.138 which is considered a small improvement on the original. It is considered however, that an overall depth of 3.0m [from the closet wing) would be more acceptable here due to its full-width and full-depth footplate on the north side. Consideration should be given to a mixed of materials to the rear elevation to provide a light-weight appearance as this would minimise the visual bulk and be more satisfactory.

New residential accommodation: The proposed 3 - 4 person's self-contained flat is considered unacceptable owing to its small size and it would not be in compliance with the Council's residential standards CPG2.

Amenity: The proposed extension is not considered to cause harm to the neighbours' amenity in terms of loss of sun/daylight or loss of privacy. You may need to consider adjusting the footplate to bedroom1 in addition to the inclusion of rooflights to bedroom 1. However, you should be mindful of light pollution to the occupiers on the upper floors of the host and neighbouring buildings.

Roof terrace: At the 1<sup>st</sup> floor level, the roof terrace is likely to impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. You will need to demonstrate how this can be avoided from the roof terrace, such as probable reduced terrace size, installation of privacy screens subject to design compliance, or omission of the roof terrace."

## **Actions taken in this proposal:**

### **1. Design**

The depth of extension is now limited to 3.0M from the closet wing as requested.  
Openings to rear elevation have been maximised to reduce visual impact of facing brickwork.  
Slim profile framing to fenestration to further improve appearance.

### **2. Residential accommodation**

Internal layout of unit varied to accommodate 2 persons with the London plan size requirements.

### **3. Amenity**

Roof-light provided to bedroom 1, details of light pollution measures to be clarified as required.

### **4. Roof terrace**

Privacy screen added to roof terrace.  
Reduction in accessible terrace size.

## **DAS headings**

### **Use**

The proposed development includes no change of use of the existing ground floor residential unit, the current use is a studio unit with insufficient facilities which is to be improved by extension and refurbishment to provide a 2no. single bedroom garden flat with increased amenity space for first floor unit.

### **Amount**

The proposed development comprises the extension of the ground floor residential unit, a proportion to the boundary and 3.0M outwards to the rear.

### **Layout**

The proposed development will not negatively affect any public or private footpaths or amenity spaces due to being identical in layout in terms of pedestrian access. The access to the building is unaltered with the provision of an entrance way from the existing common parts access.

### **Scale**

The scale of the property is increased to a suitable size by the proposals, but is in line with adjoining developments in terms of height and footprint.

### **Landscaping**

No public landscaping is to take place as part of the development.

### **Appearance**

The front elevation design is to remain unchanged, and the rear in line with historic extensions and conversions across the terrace.

The brickwork will match the adjoining properties and the main building so as not to create any discord between the original and extended as with the existing historic works, with brickwork arches or soldier courses above openings to match the original openings to the main and adjoining buildings improving the appearance from the existing exposed concrete lintels.

## **Access**

The proposed measures do not cause an increased impact on the existing public and private transport arrangements within the area, being rear extensions and internal only in nature, and using existing access routes.

The access to the unit is currently by rising one step at the doorway and consideration of making this level entry has been offered, consequently it has possible to design for disabled access within this proposal, considered when responding to lifetime homes standard sections below.

## **Lifetime Homes Standard responses**

The following is a breakdown of response to the relevant parts of the revised Lifetime Homes Standard (LTH) - Revised July 2010 version;

1. Parking provision – No allocated car parking
2. No defined parking provision for residential unit or access to dwelling from same
3. Approach to entrance is existing, entrance is on public highway.
4. Communal Entrance is existing, dwelling entrance will be 800mm wide.
5. Existing access to unit is not wheelchair accessible, ramps could be implemented where required.
6. Internal doorway and hallways comply with the minimum sizes.
7. Circulation space in the new unit complies with requirement 7.
8. Criterion 8 – Living space is fulfilled in the proposal.
9. Criterion 9 does not apply, as unit is not multi-storey.
10. Criterion 10 – Entrance level WC and shower is provided within the unit.
11. Walls in bathroom of new unit comply with the requirements of criterion 11.
12. Criterion 12 is satisfied as dwelling is not multi-storey.
13. Structure of ceiling/separating floor is designed for full use, and as such will comply with the requirements of criterion 13.
14. Layout of bathroom in unit will comply with the requirements of criterion 14.
15. The requirements of criterion 15 are satisfied in the design of the unit.
16. Layout of all service points will comply with the requirements of criterion 16.

## **Conclusion**

The existing unit in this location is an undersized studio unit with a poor layout which has a large element of outside amenity space which can be extended into. The proposals allow to for an increase in the size of this unit by single storey extension to a usable standard accommodating 2no. single bedrooms and associated living and amenity space to the subject and adjoining unit.

**Ben Muir**

**Avalon Built Environment Ltd**