



**Addendum to Design & Access Statement**  
248 Kilburn High Road, NW6 2BS

Planning application ref: 2014/2662/P

April 2014

The below notes attempt to address the design feedback previously raised by Camden Council, and respond to each item raised in turn as follows:

## **The building to the front; Front elevation of the building:**

**To the left of the ground floor, this requires some interest, currently it is a blank wall.**

01 - There are 3 major service zones in the project at ground level – the bins store, the bicycle store and the plant room. It does not make sense to “feature” the cycle store on the street for security reasons. We don’t want to advertise bikes to potential thieves. It does not make sense to move plant to the front, and therefore the bins away from the street. It does not make sense to put the cycle store at the furthest point from the entrance. Hence the current layout.

02 - We have been in contact with Camden Street Environment Services to discuss a waste collection strategy, who suggested placing the bin store close to the street for a kerbside collection, given the busy nature of the street. This is reinforced by CPG1 10.10 and CPG7 which suggests a streetside collection is preferable.

03 - CPG1 (2.10) requests that waste storage facilities are incorporated into the design. Our bin store is discretely incorporated.

04 - CPG1 6.33 acknowledges “Entrances and adjoining areas of buildings are often spaces which require the integration of a number of competing needs such as the provision of bins, cycle storage, meters and inspection boxes and external lighting. These elements should be constructed with materials sympathetic to the site and surroundings.” While integrating our bin store into the scheme, we have made distinct efforts to make it read as a “background” space, as we do not want a bin store to be the focus of attention, in line with CPG1 6.33’s suggestion to “minimise the visual impact of storage areas”.

05 - CPG1 Figure 16 point 7 says that waste storage “should be located as close to the front boundary as possible, preferably behind the front boundary wall, without detracting from the street scene”

05 - There is potential to use the undercroft’s landscape wall, which is visible from the street, to provide some visual interest to the street. *Please refer to pages 72 and 73 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

06 - The NPPF (point 60) says that “planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness”. We would argue against the imposition of a feature, unrelated to the wider architectural expression, where not relevant or necessary.

07 - On a purely architectural level, the integrity and visual strength of the ground floor wall helps to provide a balanced overall composition to the street. By introducing an undefined feature onto this wall would detract from the wider visual reading of the building’s form. The bin store is a subservient space, and the elevation reflects its conceptual role in the overall project.

**“The right hand side of the building needs to be partially set back to respect the front building line (which is further setback to the right)”**

08 - Our site is situated between two different street lines. Because of this existing misalignment between 244 and 250, there will be a setback. The question is where this setback will be and what do we want to see. Our scheme attempts to provide an intentional and designed edge to the setback rather than an incidental and unsightly one.

09 - Our current building line is the one that aligns with 250, not 244. *Please refer to pages 36-39 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

10 - The vast majority of the façade to 244 (over 60%) above ground level actually projects forward of its ground floor building line, and is actually closer to our current and proposed building line for upper floors.

11 - Our overhang to the street provides a covered area for the entrance to both 246 and 248.

12 - The current ground floor setback occurs at the junction of 244 and 246, and is unlit. Our proposal moves this step back from the party line junction to the underside of our proposed undercroft, lighting it to make it safer. No new street level set back has been created, but the situation improved.

13 - By setting back the ground floor line of the building for the undercroft, to align with the shop fronts to 244, we are actually donating part of our site to the pavement and the public realm of Kilburn High Road. *Please refer to pages 36-37 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

14 - Regarding the height of the parapet to the street, CPG1 asks us to “consider how the building relates to its surroundings”. There are a number of misalignments at the eaves down Kilburn High Road, so by not lining through with adjacent windows and eaves lines we are being contextual. To line everything through would feel forced in this context. *Please refer to pages 58-61 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

## **“windows on the side elevation need to be removed”**

15 - The NPPF (point 63) states that “In determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area.”

16 – There are a substantial number of examples of windows looking down Kilburn High Road and other town centres in Camden. *Please refer to pages 12-13 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

17 – CPG6 Section 7 “Key Messages” suggest “Public spaces benefit from overlooking as natural surveillance”, as reinforced by CPG6 7.7 “Public spaces and communal areas will benefit from a degree of overlooking due to the increased level of surveillance it can provide.” Our side windows provide such overlooking on the street.

18 - Passivhaus 500mm wall thicknesses mean that window reveals are thicker and therefore lateral views down the front windows are more restricted than on traditional schemes.

19 – Further to the above issue being raised, we have reduced the width of these windows so that they provide a “snap shot” down the street, which should be enough to provide a sense of connection to the context.

20 – As precedent, Chester Balmore has a number of windows that look down both streets, presumably as a result of the need for passive overlooking. *Please refer to pages 24-25 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

21 - By having no windows on this side elevation we would be presenting the view down the street with a blank façade, further emphasising the step back situation. By introducing the windows we are softening the edge of the set back, attempting to blend it in with the various facades running down the high street. It becomes part of the composition, not a left over edge. *Please refer to pages 38-39 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

## **“The rear building is a floor too heavy and this needs to be removed.”**

22 - CPG1 2.10 states that good design should “ensure buildings do not significantly overshadow existing/proposed outdoor spaces” or “amenity spaces”, which we have sought to do with our design.

23 - CPG1 2.13 says that tall buildings should consider the “degree to which the building overshadows public spaces”. We do not feel that our building could be classed as a tall building, but we have avoided doing this in any event.

24 - In the immediate context, the building at 1-2 Grangeway rises to six storeys, with a much larger top storey.

25 - Precedents – there are a number of developments just off the high road that rise to more than 5 storeys. We are not setting any new precedents for the context. *Please refer to pages 24-25 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

26 - C5 is the most architecturally enjoyable flat in the entire scheme, with the best quality interior development. It is also considered to be one of the more family-friendly apartments, due to its outlook, security and accessible terrace, developed in response to a pre-planning request for family friendly units.

27 - The massing is driven by a desire to respect the daylighting requirements of the existing context, which created a need for an additional floor to optimise the site’s potential. This was acknowledged at pre-application stage:

*“In terms of footprint and orientation the scheme is considered to be a welcomed response from the previous scheme. There is greater space within the ‘courtyard’ and consideration has been given to adjoining occupiers rather than maximising the footprint.*

*This has resulted in an additional storey to the central block. However this will respect the scale along Kilburn High Road and would not unduly impinge on views from the park which already has individually taller building rising above the predominant three or four storey development which surround it.”*

28 – Notwithstanding the above, our proposed scheme is still within the previously approved massing (and that of the pre-application scheme). *Please refer to pages 26-27 of submitted Design & Access Statement for comparative diagrams.*

*Please also refer to pages 38-39 of submitted Design & Access Statement for illustration of how our proposal has a negligible impact in comparison to 1-2 Grangeway.*

29 - The uptake in the number of units is not due to an increase in massing from pre-application stage. It is the result of us creating a greater mix of units, including compact 1-beds that add to the unit number. In fact, in total, our GIA has been reduced since pre-application to create a more modestly scaled scheme, despite positive feedback at pre-application.

## **“The bedrooms to the upper floors facing onto the adjoining site need to be re-directed as the current relationship is not ideal. There are a number of bedrooms, and openings which seem to provide access onto the side of the building. If a suitable solution can not be found then it may be appropriate to reduce the overall width of the building.”**

30 - The nature of the site and prior development on adjacent sites (particularly recent development to 244) has determined that some amount of fenestration will be required to the north edge of the site, reflected in all previously granted applications on the site and our-pre-application submission.

31 - Previous schemes on the site, namely 2009/5625/P and 2007/3467/P, had been granted permission with the whole of the ground floor extending right up to the boundary. These schemes also had Northwest facing windows above ground floor at a similar distance from the boundary as our proposal, with balconies projecting even closer to the boundary.

32 - The aforementioned previously approved scheme put the majority of windows, and almost all sizeable windows, facing the boundary of 254. *Please refer to pages 20-21 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

33 - Our proposal has improved on these previously granted schemes by placing all of the living spaces to the south side of the scheme overlooking a new communal courtyard. The only windows to the north façade of our proposal are for bedrooms and bathrooms, which is in line with CPG2 4.22. *Please refer to pages 42-43 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

34 - Acknowledging No 254 as a development site, in a scenario where a new building is erected on No 254 Kilburn High Road, we would expect that this development maintain a certain distance from the boundary at a distance appropriate and proportionate to its site dimensions.

35 - Our site, from the Northwest to the Southeast boundaries, is approximately 17m across at its widest point. Our setback from the boundary of 1960-2295mm represents a setback of more than 12% of the overall width of the site. When added to the larger set back on the south east side, maintained for the benefit of living spaces, we have contributed over 40% of the width of our site to boundary setbacks. *Please refer to pages 34-35 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

36 - If a development at No. 254 happens, and maintains a similarly proportionate set back from the boundary, the windows at the North West corner of our site will be able to take advantage of angled views back toward the rear of the buildings along Kilburn High Road.

37 - The horizontal proportion of the windows on our North West façade have been designed with the intent to maximise angled views and outlook from the bedrooms. *Please refer to page 75 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

38 - CPG1 2.10 asks us to “provide visual interest for onlookers”. Our design and façade treatment makes a deliberate effort to avoid presenting the neighbour with a blank elevational treatment.

39 - Our design responded to the council’s pre-application meeting report, which was based on plans showing windows at a similar distance from the Northwest boundary. This pre-application report concluded that, in terms of footprint and orientation, the scheme is considered to be a welcomed response from the previous scheme (which had been granted permission), with greater space within the ‘courtyard’ and consideration given to adjoining occupiers rather than maximising the footprint. Since this pre-application stage, we have made further efforts to improve the orientation of apartments within the scheme, removing all living spaces from the North corner of the site and moving them to the south facing courtyard side.

40 - Our scheme has attempted to incorporate balconies and terraces within the footprint of the building to minimise any potential overbearing or overshadowing they might impose.

41 - In terms of materiality, we have chosen a light coloured brick and white window trims and reveals with the distinct intention of maximising reflected light for the wider surrounding context.

42 - CPG6 Section 6 “Key Messages” states “We expect all buildings to receive adequate daylight and sunlight”. Furthermore, CPG6 6.6 states “We will aim to minimize the impact of the loss of daylight caused by the development on the amenity of existing occupiers and ensure sufficient daylight to occupiers of new dwellings.” As evidenced by Brooks Devlin’s daylight report, we have made best efforts to ensure a design that mutually respects the concerns of existing buildings and our new development. The form of our building, stepping down toward the existing buildings fronting Kilburn High Road, is driven by respect for the existing context. In positioning the scheme’s windows, our best course of action was to respond to what already existed on and around the site and our window placement reflects this, minimizing the existence of directly opposing windows.

43 - Regarding outlook, CPG6 7.9 states that “when designing your development you should also ensure the proximity, size and cumulative effect of any structures do not have an overbearing and/or dominating effect that is detrimental to the enjoyment of their properties by adjoining residential occupiers.” We have made every effort in the layout of our project to avoid such detriment, avoiding the placement of windows looking straight at the rear of the residential flats to 250 and 252. At the same time, by introducing the planters and the green wall to the courtyard we are seeking to improve their outlook which currently consists of a blank rear wall at No.246.

44 - The number and location of windows on the north facade are driven by an effort to provide natural light to as many spaces as possible, including family bathrooms.

45 - Permission has previously been granted for windows at 244, permitting their placement on the boundary line directly overlooking our site. Our scheme has responded to this context by creating sufficient setbacks to the 244 boundary while still maintaining a 12% set back to the North West site boundary, something not achieved by other similar developments in the immediate context.

46 - It is our understanding that the windows were granted to 244 because at the time they were not impinging on any viable existing amenity. Our project has adopted an approach of safeguarding existing amenity to the greatest degree possible. *Please refer to page 66-67 of submitted Design & Access Statement for details of existing amenity.*

47 - The existing development granted permission at 244 built right up to the boundary, 2-3 storeys high. We have responded positively to this restricting context by creating a set back to the 244 boundary to ensure that all flats within our proposed development receive sufficient daylighting, in line with the 25 degree angle method set out in BRE's “Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight”, as also prescribed by CPG6 2.7. For this reason we cannot move the building any further towards the 244 boundary. Respecting the existing context placed considerable restraints on where we could position the massing of the development on the site. *Please refer to pages 20-21 of D&A for details of previously approved scheme built right up to the boundary of 246 as a comparison.*

48 – We can only take into account the existing site context, and have sought to be generally considerate of neighbouring sites. *Please refer to page 35 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

49 - By creating these setbacks, we have made all reasonable efforts to be as neighbourly as we can be. We believe that the setbacks we have created, and the plot ratios we have managed to achieve while doing so through good, efficient design, would represent a **sustainable approach** to development in town centre sites such as this if replicated.

50 - We cannot move the building any further into the courtyard because it would make vehicular turning circles impossible and the disabled car parking space would be lost. *Please refer to pages 32-33 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

51 - While we have established that moving the building into the courtyard is unfeasible, it remains true that to move the building 1m away from the boundary to 254 would have little benefit while moving 1m into our courtyard would be to the serious detriment of that space and our development.

52 - The previously approved scheme, with similar massing, achieved a bare pass in its BREEAM analysis. We are looking to create a quality, Passivhaus scheme by comparison.

53 - The previously approved scheme also had windows to the northern corner of the site. We have placed a private bedroom courtyard to this side to relieve the sense of proximity between our bedrooms and the neighbouring building. These balconies will also provide a greater outlook as the balcony wall thickness, as a non-insulated wall, will be thinner and have thinner reveals.

54 - CPG6 Section 7 “Key Messages” state that “Development are to be designed to protect the privacy of existing dwellings” and that “Outlook from new developments should be designed to be pleasant.” Given the

nature of our site, placing a number of windows to the North West elevation seems to be the best way to protect the privacy of existing dwellings while providing acceptable outlook to our apartments.

55 - None of the windows provide access to the north side of Block B.

56 - There is no practical reason to include angled windows, as such windows do not actually provide a wider aspect or outlook. The angle of outlook is determined by the structural opening in the wall. The position of the glass relative to this opening is unimportant in this regard. *Please refer to pages 74 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

57 - Another reason for the avoidance of projecting angled windows is the need for energy efficiency, in line with CPG3 3.10. Passivhaus windows have specific detailing requirements for energy performance, which requires that they are typically in the plane of the insulation, and to project them beyond this line is quite expensive. To extend beyond the insulation line to the extent necessary would not be feasible in a Passivhaus scheme. *Please refer to pages 74-75 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

58 - The pre-application response guided us to look at CS5 and DP26 documents regarding daylight and sunlight neighbouring occupiers and our proposed residential units. We noted that in addition to occupiers, these documents guide designers to consider the impact on amenity.

59 - CPG1 2.10 states that good design should “ensure buildings do not significantly overshadow existing/proposed outdoor spaces” or “amenity spaces”, which we have sought to do with our design.

60 - CPG1 2.10 asks us to “consider the extent to which developments may overlook the window or private garden area of another dwelling.” Currently there are no such amenities overlooked by our North West façade.

61 - CPG2 4.29 states that “Balconies and terraces should be located or designed so that they do not result in the loss of privacy to existing residential properties or any other sensitive units.” The balconies at the Northern corner of Block B do not interfere with any such residential or sensitive uses.

62 - In determining how to apply all of the above, we have sought to see how these policies have been proactively implemented to Camden’s express approval. We saw the Chester Balmore development, led by the Council, as an exceptional example of how to implement sustainable urban policies. We noted that this project did have windows and terraces overlooking the adjoining residential sites, at a distance of a few metres, up to and including the fourth floor. While we understand that this condition is never ideal, we recognize it is necessitated by a majority of high-density urban projects such as ours to comply with the broader majority of planning aspirations. *Please refer to pages 24-25 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

**“The terrace to Unit B5 and the communal terrace need to be removed to avoid impact on privacy and noise.”**

63 - CPG2 4.30 acknowledges that “In some instances, it is accepted that existing buildings may not be able to provide balconies or roof terraces, however, external amenity space i.e. access to communal gardens should still be provided where possible.” This a clear statement in favour of the inclusion of roof terraces wherever necessary and appropriate, and that their exclusion must be adequately justified and unavoidable.

64 - We hope these points help explain our approach and why we feel that the layout of the proposal strikes the best balance between site layout and maintaining the integrity and quality of the apartments within our scheme.

65 - A number of other terraces have been built in the immediate area (eg 1-2 Grangeway, 246 Kilburn High Road). *Please refer to pages 10-11 of submitted Design & Access Statement for local examples.*

inside out architecture 6-8 Cole Street London SE1 4YH  
t 020 73676831 f 020 73787784 e in@io-a.com w www.io-a.com

registered in England no. 4458218

66 - There is currently no absolute silence to protect. The noise levels on Kilburn High Road are already very high, and a roof terrace is likely to have minimal or no impact.

67 - The terrace to B5 is a private terrace, and is therefore no different in nature than all of the other terraces and balconies. It is merely different in size as it takes advantage of the building's roofscape, which has been generated by higher priority design criteria.

68 - In terms of its position relative to nearby residential windows, the terrace to B5 is no different to the rear garden of a traditional terrace house. In terms of noise, these gardens would, in fact, be much closer to a neighbouring bedroom window than our terrace at B5, but this is deemed acceptable as the garden is for private use only.

69 - At pre-application stage there was a request for a greater number of family-friendly units. These terraces contribute to the family-friendly nature of the site, and hence to a diverse occupancy. CPG2 4.29 states that "private gardens should be allocated to family dwellings". This has been difficult on our site but our terraces have made a considerable contribution.

70 - In terms of our own scheme, there is little to worry about in terms of noise due to the Passivhaus 500mm thickness of wall construction. The walls are super insulated and the envelope airtight. The MVHR provides fresh air when the windows and doors are shut, without transferring the noise inside or out.

71 - CPG1 2.10 asks us to "consider the degree of openness of an area of open spaces, including gardens, including views in and out of these spaces". Our courtyard provides a highly enclosed communal entrance space, while the proposed roof terrace proposes a much more open, daylight, sunlit space with improved outlook, a counterpoint to the space below.

72 - CPG1 5.23 acknowledges that privacy and noise can be issues associated with roof terraces. It does not suggest simply not having them, but suggests appropriate ways of mitigating these issues. CPG1 5.24 suggests possibly using set backs, which we have done by including planters to keep residents away from the edge of the terraces. It suggests the possible use of screens or planting to prevent overlooking of habitable rooms or nearby gardens, which we have done where appropriate. It suggests careful choice of materials and colour to match the existing elevation. Our terraces appear to be integral, including balustrades.

73 - By using our planters and vegetation for screening, we have ensured that our landscape strategy is integral and useful within the project, not an afterthought.

74 - CPG1 6.35 encourages the "combination of low brick boundary walls with hedges as a boundary treatment", guidance which we have followed with our planters.

75 - The choice of planting for the terrace planters is currently undefined, and will be specified in consultation with a suitable expert to install a screen suitable for the task of maintaining privacy.

76 - In relation to noise, we have followed the guidance of CPG2 4.28 and CPG6 4.4 to stack similar spaces above one another. We have also created a bathroom buffer zone either side of the lift the whole way up the building, and placed the bedrooms of Block A on the courtyard side to shelter it from the street. These bedrooms also provide passive overlooking to the Block B courtyard which would otherwise be lacking from surrounding residences due the planting and screening we have incorporated to protect their privacy.

77 - CPG2 4.29 states that "Outdoor residential amenity space can be provided in the form of private garden space, balconies, terraces, roof terraces or communal gardens". If there is ever to be a need for the use of roof terraces to create on site amenity, it is likely to be on high-density town centre sites such as this.

78 - CPG2 4.29 also states "All new dwellings should provide access to some form of private outdoor amenity space, eg balconies, roof terraces or communal gardens". This goes to the core importance of the



roof terrace. Furthermore, units B3 and B4 will have access to the communal roof terrace for the purposes of providing their amenity space.

79 - CPG2 4.30 suggests "Community amenity...space should be located sensitively so that it is overlooked surrounding development and secure for residents." So while there is a duty to avoid impinging on the privacy of existing residents, which we have respected, having a passive relationship between windows and public space is a good thing.

80 - We have introduced planters to the edges of both roof gardens, to create a vegetation screen for the purposes of privacy.

81 - The four criteria prescribed in CPG6 4.10 do not apply to our scheme, hence a noise report was deemed not necessary.

82 - The recent development at 1-2 Grangeway includes a number of roof terraces, in close proximity to residential occupants nearby. This was deemed appropriate for the location, and so we are not looking to set any new precedents. These terraces were granted with only the suggestion of a landscape screen to the edge of the plan (third floor), which have subsequently not been added. Our design includes integral planters to support their inclusion and maintenance.

83 - CPG6 7.4 states "Development should be designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree". Our scheme has made reasonable practical efforts to mitigate overlooking. *Please refer to pages 66-69 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*

84 - CPG6 7.5 recognises that when the 18m ideal distance between opposing windows cannot be obtained, mitigation measures should be undertaken. Careful consideration of our development and the position of rooms is defined elsewhere in this document. Screening by other structure or landscaping has also been described elsewhere. *Please refer to pages 76-77 of submitted Design & Access Statement.*