



DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT



34-38 EVERS HOLT STREET
LONDON
NW1 1DA

AUGUST 2017

1. THE APPLICATION

- 1.1. Proposed erection of new floor above existing 3 storey part commercial part residential building to create 2 self-contained residential units.

2. SITE LOCATION

- 2.1. The application is for a site on Eversholt Street, London. The plot is approximately 371m². Currently, the site is used for commercial purposes on the ground floor, with residential units above.
- 2.2. The properties on Eversholt Street and the adjacent streets have a wide variety of form and materiality with both modern and traditional detailing and construction methods apparent in the vicinity.
- 2.3. The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no Listed buildings within the immediate vicinity. The site is positioned such that it forms the end of a parade of shops, which are traditional in their form and scale. Adjacent to the site on the opposite side is the Euston mainline station. Across the road to the east are offices or a larger mass and scale.
- 2.4. The existing building has recently undergone remodeling works for the creation of additional residential units, together with refurbishing the building as a whole. These works were in line with previously approved applications 2010/2940/P & 2011/1283/P.

3. BACKGROUND – PRE-APPLICATION

- 3.1. Following a meeting with the Camden Council planning officer Jonathon McClue during a formal pre-application advice request, positive feedback was given with reference to the principle of overall proposal, and its feasibility on the site, however there were certain external and internal alterations required to reach a satisfactory proposal.
- 3.2. It was established that there was no objection to adding an additional floor; however, the scale and mass would have to be such that it sat comfortably within the site and context.
- 3.3. The scheme submitted at pre-application stage was for four self-contained units within a more contemporary mansard extension. As such, it was considered that the overall design of the extension was not in keeping with the context and presented an alien addition to the building. It was suggested that a more traditional mansard form be proposed to the front of the extension with detailing that matched the existing building.
- 3.4. This pre-application advice process helped refine the final scheme into a proposal was sympathetic to the immediate neighbours as well as the surrounding area. Various aspects of the design such as the facade treatment, bulk and scale of the proposal were revised as part of the submission to address the comments raised during the pre-application process.

4. BACKGROUND – PREVIOUS APPLICATION

- 4.1. Following the pre-application advice, a planning application was submitted in June 2015 (Reference: 2015/4296/P). The planning application submitted was for a *'Proposed third floor extension to the existing building to accommodate further 3 self-contained residential units.'*
- 4.2. During the submission of this application, we were in constant dialogue with the case officer Mr Jonathon McClue. We took on board the comments raised and made amendments to the proposal to address these.
 - Extensions along Doric Way were reduced in height and stepped back to ensure that they were subordinate to the main roof.
 - The proposed Mansard Roof was changed to meet the planning guidelines and as such the pitch was amended to 60 degrees and the internal height was brought down to be no more than 2.3m. This allowed for the mansard roof to be behind the parapet.
 - Mansard windows were reduced in size to ensure that they were subordinate to the windows below.
 - Internal layout was altered to ensure that 2 residential units were proposed instead of 3.
 - Cycle parking arrangement was altered and detailed to ensure it meant the planning guidance set out.
- 4.3. All the amendments above were accepted by the case officer and deemed acceptable apart from the first point. Therefore, it was agreed, that as part of the application, we would remove any extensions proposed along Doric Way. Following this, the application was approved in February 2016.
- 4.4. As part of this resubmission, we are looking to reintroduce the proposed extension along Doric Way in addition to what has already been approved as per the previously submitted application. Details of this have been outlined below.

5. DESIGN

- 5.1. The proposal seeks to add an additional floor to the building, which will provide 2 new residential units and increase the overall floor area by 150m². The extension will follow the same footprint as the floor below, and will make use of the existing staircore, which currently leads to the flat roofs.
- 5.2. The overarching design approach to the proposal has been to work within the constraints of the site and propose an extension that sits comfortably within its context. The footprint and layout of the floors below have been used as a starting point to determine the rough extents of the proposed extension and also the internal arrangement of the flats. This footprint has however been scaled back slightly to the front façade to form the mansard roof.

Massing

- 5.3. The proposed building will be 4 storeys high, and so proposes an additional floor to the mass of the existing building throughout the length of the building. This additional floor was considered acceptable during the pre-app stage and so has been retained within this design.
- 5.4. Compared to the existing building line, the proposal is set back from the front in order to reduce the bulk of the new addition. However, towards the rear the footprint of the floor below has been continued up to form the extents of the new flats.
- 5.5. The building currently has a full height staircore that projects above the main parapet line and allows access to the plant room and flat roofs, this parapet height has been retained and carried through for the proposed extension.
- 5.6. Towards the rear of the site, the existing parapet level drops from the staircore level down by approximately 2.6M, and then a further 165mm. This staggering has been retained within the new proposal, and sees the rear portion of the extension drop down by approximately 1.5M from the height of the current staircore. As such, whilst additional mass has been created towards the rear elevation fronting Doric Avenue, it has been kept to a minimum and only looks to continue the existing parapet height of the staircore and provide the minimum internal head height required.
- 5.7. The front mansard form is such that it is set back considerably from the front building line and is set at an angle of 70 degrees, which helps to reduce the bulk of the extension when viewed from the street. It is also partly masked by the existing angled parapet that stretches from the front parapet wall to the staircore.

Scale

- 5.8. The height and scale of the proposal has been governed by the storey heights of the existing building and more so the existing staircore. As such, the new fourth floor matches the parapet height on the existing building.
- 5.9. With the front portion of the extension being set from the front wall within the mansard, the extents of this top floor will not be seen from the street immediately in front of the building. As such, the scale of the building will appear reduced and less dominant within its setting.

Materiality

- 5.10. The materiality of the existing building is partly traditional and characteristic of the area with masonry used for the main structure; however, it has a painted render finish, which is in contrast to the facing brick elevations seen within the vicinity. As such, the proposed scheme will use this as a precedent and propose an extension that will be predominantly a painted render finish.

5.11. The mansard roof however will be traditional in style and detailing with natural slate tiles used together with lead flashings where required.

Fenestration

5.12. The form and proportion of the proposed fenestration is such that it follows the existing arrangement and order within the elevations. The windows to the front elevation are traditional timber sash opening within a hierarchical order, whilst the side elevation fronting Doric Way features windows that are more contemporary. These other windows are grey powder coated aluminium framed and also include double doors with Juliet balconies.

6. DAYLIGHTING, SUNLIGHT & OVERSHADOWING

- 6.1. The flats themselves are designed such that light is maximised with the living spaces. There is one unit to the front of the building, which is south-west facing. Whilst the unit to the rear is north-east and south-east facing, and is dual aspect with the primary living space being east facing. As such, there will be a good quality of daylight within both the units.
- 6.2. The impact of the proposal upon the units adjacent to the site and the floors below have been considered and as such the internal arrangement and thus layout of the windows are as per the floors below.
- 6.3. Whilst there is a degree of overlooking into the amenity spaces below, the overlooking into the units themselves have eliminated by the orientation of the windows, which direct views away from the adjacent units. It is also thought that as the existing units have minor areas of the overlooking, the proposed extension will not create any additional overlooking issues.
- 6.4. An additional externally commissioned Daylight and Sunlight Report has been prepared by Syntegra Consulting to supplement the application and demonstrates that the scheme complies with all statutory requirements.

7. TRANSPORT & PARKING

- 7.1. The property is currently a car free development and it is envisaged that this will continue as the site is rated 6b under the PTAL rating, and so will provide the residents with an excellent level of accessibility
- 7.2. We have shown cycle storage as part of the proposal, with provision for 4 additional spaces for the 2 x 2 bedroom units proposed as per the councils guidelines. The cycle storage will be 'Sheffield' Type Stands in a secured area along Doric Way.
- 7.3. There is also a cycle hire stand on Doric Way immediately adjacent to the site, which again offer residents a high level of accessibility.

8. ACCESS

- 8.1. The access to the site and building remains unchanged as part of the proposal. The existing staircore will be utilised as it currently serves the roof level and the new proposed extension.

9. REFUSE STORAGE PROVISION

- 9.1. The refuse store is located externally adjacent to the main entrance and cycle storage area. Again, this storage area is currently above capacity and as such can accommodate the additional refuse demands by the 2 new flats.

10. LIFETIMES HOMES

- 10.1. The internal layout of the new extension has been designed to provide ample circulation space and room sizes to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard. The following checklist presents the compliance or justification against the 16 criteria requirements:

- 10.1.1. Parking – No parking space are provided on site.
- 10.1.2. Approach to dwelling from parking – No parking space are provided on site.
- 10.1.3. Approach to all entrances – The exiting main entrance to building is via a short flight of external stairs due to the level constraints of the building.
- 10.1.4. Entrances - The main entrance is illuminated with undercroft lighting. There is a level landing and threshold with a single entrance door, achieving a minimum clear opening of 800mm. There is weather protection with the entrance being under a small canopy.
- 10.1.5. Communal stairs and lifts - Common stairs have a max rise of 170mm and min going of 250mm. Handrails are 900mm above the pitch line and extend 300mm beyond the top and bottom step. The step nosings are from a contrasting material and risers are not open. A lift is not provided within the building.
- 10.1.6. Internal doorways and hallways - All new internal doorways and hallways comply with the minimum width requirements. Internal doors have a minimum clear width of 750mm increasing to 900mm where the approach is not head on. Communal doors have a clear width of 800mm increasing to 825mm where an approach is not straight-on. Communal doorways also have minimum nibs of 300mm.
- 10.1.7. Circulation space – The units are not wheelchair accessible.

- 10.1.8. Entrance level living space - All the units are designed as single level accommodation, although are only accessible by stairs.
- 10.1.9. Potential for entrance level bed-space - All the units are designed as single level accommodation, although are only accessible by stairs.
- 10.1.10. Entrance level WC and shower drainage - All the units are designed as single level accommodation, although are only accessible by stairs, with the WC meeting the required specifications. The centreline of the WC is at least 400mm away from the adjacent wall with a clear space of 1100mm in front of the WC.
- 10.1.11. WC and bathroom walls - All the walls within the units will be capable of installing and supporting grab rails
- 10.1.12. Stairs and potential through-floor lift in dwellings - There is no common lift within the building and so through lifts will not be possible.
- 10.1.13. Potential for fitting hoists and bedroom/bathroom relationship - The structure above the main bedroom and other areas within the flat are capable of supporting hoists, however the units themselves are only accessible by stairs.
- 10.1.14. Bathrooms - All bathrooms meet the required specifications of clear zones. The centreline of the WC is at least 400mm away from the adjacent wall with a clear space of 1100mm in front of the WC. The basin has a clear approach 700mm wide extending 1100mm from the bowl. The bath has a clear zone 1100mm long and 700mm wide alongside the bath.
- 10.1.15. Glazing and window handle heights - All living spaces have adequate fenestration to allow residents to have a line of sight out when in a seated position. Opening lights are all approachable and usable by a wide range of people.
- 10.1.16. Location of service controls - All service controls including power points and other sockets will be located between 450mm and 1200mm from the finished floor level.

11. AFFORDABLE HOUSING & SECTION 106

- 11.1. It can be confirmed that the developers are willing to enter into a Section 106 Agreement for the proposal for whichever designations the proposal falls under. Please refer to the additional Section 106 Document attached.

12. DORIC WAY EXTENSIONS

- 12.1. As mentioned above, as part of the previously approved application, we were asked to remove the extensions proposed along the Doric Way elevation. However, as part of this resubmission, we would like to propose the extensions along Doric Way, in addition to what has been approved as per the previous planning application (reference: Reference: 2015/4296/P).
- 12.2. We have ensured that the extension along Doric Way is stepped back significantly from the main façade – it is stepped back a minimum of 2metres. In addition, the proposed extension is significantly lower in height than the main roof, with the ridge height being 700mm lower than the main roof, and further stepping down to follow the step of the main building.
- 12.3. The step down allows for the extensions along this elevation to be subordinate to the main elevation, whilst providing a much more gradual stepped effect to the neighbouring property.
- 12.4. The significant set back from the main elevation would ensure that the extension cannot be viewed from the street, causing minimal impact to the street scene. Both the step down and step back would continue to allow the main building to be read independently. Furthermore, the gradual step down to the neighbouring would be more suitable than the significant step down currently approved.
- 12.5. The neighbouring properties both along Doric Way as well as along Eversholt Street are all of varying heights with varying ridgelines. In particular, the building at 26-32 Eversholt Street (Euston House), which is the neighbouring building on the opposite side of Doric Way is 10 stories high – which is significantly higher than the application site, the proposal, or any of the neighbouring buildings. In addition, the application site itself steps down along Doric Way, and therefore no ridgeline is maintained – as mentioned above, the proposed extension would provide a more gradual step down from the front elevation. In addition, the Saint Marys Flats immediately along Doric Way are significantly higher than the application site, and would be taller than the proposed extensions.
- 12.6. It is important to note that the proposed extension along Doric Way would allow for the addition of one additional 2 bedroom self-contained residential unit, in addition to the one already approved as per the previous application. This would provide a total of 2 x 2 bedroom units which have been outlines as very high priority units in accordance with Policy DP5.

13. CONCLUSIONS

- 13.1. The proposal is seen to be a reasonable development on a plot of this scale and within the area. The proposal looks to make use of potential extension areas within the site and boost the housing unit supply within the borough.
- 13.2. The scheme is of a contemporary design yet contains traditional qualities, and reflects the materiality of the existing properties within the immediate context. The proposal has also been designed to be sympathetic to the immediate neighbouring properties with the building lines and key dimensions respectful of its context.
- 13.3. This application is the result of a positive dialogue with the planning officers, and addresses the issues raised on the previous scheme during the pre-application advice stage. As such, a scheme has been proposed that does not exceed the suggested scale or massing but looks to maximise the internal configuration and provide a suitable modern level of accommodation within a reasonable building.
- 13.4. The application site is within an established residential area, well provided with public transport, shopping and other facilities required by residents. The provision of an additional two self contained residential units on this site would therefore comply with the thrust of local, regional and national planning policy. Accordingly, there would seem to be no “in principle” policy objection to the proposed development.
- 13.5. The determining issues then, are whether the proposed development would be likely to have any materially harmful effect on local amenity issues and whether it would provide suitable accommodation. As noted above, it is considered that the proposed development would provide good quality accommodation, meeting the Council’s adopted standards, and that it would not cause harm to its neighbours or to the street scene.
- 13.6. The development therefore represents an opportunity to provide additional and much needed residential properties to add to the stock of housing in the borough, helping to meet Camden London Borough Council’s housing targets. It would provide an additional 2 self contained residential units which as outlined in the council’s guideline Policy DP5 – this type of unit is a ‘very high priority unit.’ Moreover, it would achieve this without causing harm to interests of acknowledged importance. Especially due to the design proposed as part of this application, including the setback, stepdown and materials and characteristics used to ensure that the existing is matched.
- 13.7. Thus, it is felt that the proposal at 34-38 Eversholt Street is of an acceptable standard and we look forward to working with the planners on this scheme to facilitate a favourable decision.