

November 2017

Planning + Design and Access statement

73 Maygrove Road, London, NW6 2EG

Prepared for:

Granada Development Limited

Prepared by | **paul+o**architects

Unit 8, 73 Maygrove Road, London, NW6 2EG

1.0 Introduction / Background

Planning permission was submitted (2017/1882/P) for a lift tower which was refused by Camden on 1 August, on the grounds that the lift tower would significant affect the outlook of the Ground floor flat (also owned by the applicant).

We have subsequently taken this planning application to appeal (Planning Inspectorate ref: APP/X5210/W/17/3181406)

We contend, see appeal statement , that the current scheme does not significantly affect daylight levels (and have supplied a BRE daylight/ Sunlight report to justify this) and improves the outlook and therefore should on balance be allowed.

However while the appeal is running we are submitting a second planning application with the lift tower moved a further 630mm away from the window of the Ground Floor flat so that the lift tower will be **2360mm** away from the window.

This increases the views past the lift tower into the courtyard and increases the size of the new private 'courtyard garden' between the lift tower and the window .

We trust that by moving the tower further away from the building that Camden now find this proposal acceptable.

Other relevant planning applications

Planning permission has been Granted for three extensions to 73 and 73a Maygrove road.

Planning permission has been granted for a mansard to the rear extension (2015/2396) ,

The western extension (2016/2021/P) and eastern Extension (2016/5498/P – subject to a Section 106 agreement being signed.

When built (the mansard and the Western extension are currently under construction) and the two new extensions will create a pleasant courtyard space.

This Statement should be read in conjunction with the following documents and drawings prepared by Paul+O Architects Ltd:

- PL – 100 A Site Plan Existing
- PL – 110 A Site Plan Proposed
- PL – 200 A Existing and Proposed section thru. courtyard
- PL – 201 A Existing and Proposed section thru. courtyard

- PL – 202 A Existing and Proposed section thru. courtyard
- PL – 220 A Proposed Elevations
- PL – 300 A Proposed Sections
- PL – 301 A Proposed Sections
- PL – 400 A Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- PL – 401 A Proposed First Floor Plan
- PL – 402 A Proposed Roof Plan

The supporting site photos, photos for inspiration, BRE skylight/ daylight report, and appeal statement all submitted as part of the first planning application (2017/1882/P) and appeal

(APP/X5210/W/17/3181406) are still relevant.

3.00 Design Guidelines

The UDP and the London Plan all emphasize that any new building should fit in with the existing streetscape. English Heritage also emphasizes this stating that:

7.8 When considering proposals for new development the local planning authority's principal concerns should be the appropriateness of the overall mass or volume of the building, its scale (the expression of size indicated by the windows, doors, floor/ceiling heights and other identifiable units) and its relationship to its context – whether it sits comfortably on its site. A new building should be in harmony with or complementary to its neighbour.

The aim of site-specific design guidance therefore should be to encourage new development that compliments the established urban grain or settlement pattern, whilst representing the time in which it is built and the culture it accommodates”

The London Plan noted that Good Design is central to the London Plan and advises that;

Policy 4.101 “Good design is rooted firmly in an understanding and appreciation of the local social, historical and physical context, including urban form and movement patterns and historic character. London is highly diverse and constantly changing, but developments should show an understanding of, and respect for, existing character. The Mayor has already produced some guidance on best practice for well-designed higher density housing. Boroughs and Applicants may also refer to a range of guidance from the Commission on Architecture and the Built environment (CABE) on achieving the highest quality design in the built environment”.

In English Heritage and Cabé's guidelines 'Building in Context. New Development in historic area'. Sir Neil Cossons and Sir Stuart Lipton write:

*Thoughtless haste on the one hand and ill-considered imitation on the other have both over the years damaged the fabric of our historic towns and cities. But there is another way, in the form of **buildings that are recognizably of our age while understanding and respecting history and context.**” they go on to say that “the right approach is to be found in examining the context for any proposed development in great detail and relating the new building to its the right approach is to be found in*

examining the context for any proposed development in great detail and relating the new building to its surroundings through an informed character appraisal. This does not imply that any one architectural approach is by its nature more likely to succeed than any other. On the contrary it means that as soon as the application of simple formula is attempted a project is likely to fail whether that formula consists of 'fitting in' or 'contrasting the new with the old'.

Camden's own Development Policies 2010-2025 notes that:

5.38 DP24 Securing High Quality Design, sets out that the Council will require all development including alterations and extension to existing buildings to be of the highest standards of design and will expect development to consider:

- *Character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;*
- *The character and proportions of the existing building where alterations and extensions are proposed;*
- *The quality of materials to be used;*

4.00 Existing Building at 73 Maygrove road.

The existing building at 73 Maygrove road is an old button factory, which was converted into apartments and live work unit 15 year ago. Originally the building had strip metal 'industrial windows' with spandrel panels in glazed green tiles. When it was converted into offices, apartments and live work unit. The building was re-clad in an imitation yellow stock brick and the windows openings were reduced in size with the aluminum windows being replaced with white aluminum ones.

5.00 Existing Building at 73a Maygrove road.

73a Maygrove Road, the rear building behind 73 Maygrove Road, built 15 years ago, replaced old storage sheds. It is clad in a brick to match the 73 Maygrove Road. The southern façade overlooks an internal carpark, the northern and western elevations overlook the Maygrove peace park.

Planning permission has recently been granted (2015/2396/P) and a section 106 Agreement signed for a mansard floor to be added to 73a Maygrove Road.

6.00 Liddell Road

Planning permission 2014/7651/P has been granted for the redevelopment to the former Liddell road estate. Permission has been granted for a school and Apartment buildings along Maygrove. As well as the new school (currently under construction) planning permission has been granted for a large mixed use commercial building and 14 Storey tower / apartment building directly behind and over looking 73A Maygrove road. This planning application creates a principle for development in the area.

7.00 Eastern and Western Extensions (2015/2301/P and 2016/5498/P)

Planning permission has been granted for two new extensions to the existing buildings at 73 and 73A Maygrove Road – both have been designed by Paul+O Architects - together these buildings will create a pleasant courtyard space access through the “porter lodge” underneath the new Eastern Extension.

The Western Extension is currently under construction and the brickwork almost complete. The soft handmade yellow brick compliments the existing building and blends in perfectly with the London stock brick of the adjacent Victorian Terraces. This contemporary building is simple and well considered with windows set back from the façade, a corner window will address both the park and the street and a staircase extension which references the Chimney stacks on the nearby end of terrace houses.

The form of the building is both Sculptural and Poetic and is sympathetic to and enhances both the Maygrove Peace Park and the surrounding buildings.

8.00 Proposed Scheme

8.01 Proposal

The Brief was to provide a lift access to the live work units at First Floor. Many options were considered.

Paul+O architects have paid the same attention to good design and detailing to the proposed new lift as can be seen in the Western extension which is currently under construction.

The proposal for the lift is practical and functional and poetic. The lift enclosure is designed as a sculptural form in the new courtyard space. The Courtyard will, once the landscaping has been completed and importantly trees planted, become a pleasant space amenity space a refuge from the street, surrounded and overlooked by the offices and apartments while at the same time functioning as a carpark.

The proposal is to build a free standing lift shaft clad in Timber (Accoya) and stained dark grey, with a semi glazed elevated walk way at first floor.

The Vertical timber accentuates the height of the enclosure and will also become a trellis for climbing / flowering Creepers (Clematis Amandii) . The roof of the lift shaft will be very visible from the surrounding apartments and therefore importantly the timber cladding will continue over the roof .

Camden Council has advised in their report on the first application that the proposal is of good design and the materials proposed are appropriate and sympathetic to the existing building.

8.02 Privacy / Over looking

The proposal does not significantly increase over looking - Importantly the walkway at First level has panes of glass of only 160mm wide intersected with deep timber mullions - so overlooking into the live work units is negligible and not significant. In any event the people using the lift will be the occupants of the live work units.

8.02 Loss and Day light and sunlight

We have carried out and Submitted BRE daylight / sunlight report which demonstrates that after the lift and walkway is constructed the the bedrooms achieves *a score of 1.1% that indicates that the bedroom will not fall below the minimum recommended level of daylight 1%*

The amount of daylight the bedroom will get if the lift is constructed is above the recommended minimum for bedrooms.

Camden's planning guidelines advise that *"as a minimum for dwellings the (ADF) figures should be 2% for kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms and 1% for bedrooms"*.

The question is therefore whether the change in amount of daylight received by the room is acceptable.

Camden notes *"The guidance also states that 'if the VSC, with the new development in place, is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value, occupants of the existing building will notice the reduction in the amount of skylight.' Therefore as the study found that the VSC is less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value there will be a noticeable loss of daylight"*

Firstly it is important to note that 'The Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight Guidance' is guidance only and clause 6.5 of the council's planning guidance notes that;

"While we strongly support the aims of the BRE methodology for assessing sunlight and daylight we will view the results flexibly and where appropriate we may accept alternative targets to address any special circumstances of a site"

Clause 6.13 notes that *" daylight is only one of the many factors in site layout design. Therefore, when applying these standards in Camden, we will take into consideration other site factors and constraints"*

Further The VSC calculation is a quick simple test which looks to give an early indication of the potential for light. However, it does not, in any fashion, indicate the quality of actual light within a space. It does not take into account the window size, the room size or room use. It helps by indicating that if there is an appreciable

amount of sky visible from a given point there will be a reasonable potential for daylighting

Based solely on the VSC one may think that there will be a noticeable difference in daylight but VSC does not take into account the '*special circumstances*' of the site and other '*site factors and constraints*' namely;

- that the room/window faces due north
- the size of the window (in this case very tall and wide) so the sky will be clearly Visible when using the room.
- the use of a room (in this case a bedroom)
- the ceiling height of the room
- the position of the furniture in the room/ layout of the room
- light reflected off surrounding buildings (see previously submitted photos showing light on wall between courtyard and maygrove peace park)
- the fact that because of the position of the surrounding buildings and because the carpark is adjacent to Maygrove Peace Park the window gets, and will continue to get, early morning and late afternoon sun for six months of the year or more.
- the flat has a large south facing window to the living room.
- the fact that currently the venetian blinds, because of overlooking, are kept permanently closed.

We therefore contend that the loss of daylight is acceptable.

Also we assume the reason why more emphasis is placed by the council on the VSC when assessing the impact on existing windows is that often these windows will be into rooms of a neighbouring houses belonging to another person.

In this in this case the flat belongs to the applicant and is rented out (the current tenants have only been there for ten months) so in this instance it would seem more appropriate to apply the ADF test, which the council applies to new buildings.

We also note that the ground floor flat was only converted into a residential unit less than 20 years ago, which means that the flat would have no any established 'rights to light'.

We also note that LBC design guidelines on sunlight (submitted by LBC in response to our appeal) notes that "*New developments should be designed to provide at least one window to a habitable space facing within 90 degrees of south, where practical. This window should receive at least 25% of Annual Probable Sunlight Hours, including at least 5% of Annual Probable Sunlight Hours between 21 September and 21 March, where possible*"

The ground floor apartment has three large windows. One large window from the living room faces due south with no overlooking (so blinds are kept open) and therefore get sunlight all day long and two windows looking due north over the carpark (blinds as kept closed) so in balance the apartment has good light levels and outlook all in line with the LBC guidelines.

Loss of Outlook

We have given careful consideration to the outlook. This

Not only do we contend that the loss of outlook is acceptable we also argue that the proposal will improve the outlook and that the proposal is in line with Camden's planning policies.

We have submitted photos drawings and sketches which demonstrate that the inhabitants of the flat / bedroom will have pleasant and wide views to either side of the lift shaft while at the same time not been overlooked.

Camdens design guidelines 7 'Overlooking, privacy and outlook' stipulates 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*"

The proposed lift extension increases the privacy of the occupants of the ground floor flat and creates a pleasant outlook from the bedroom, more pleasant than the current outlook.

LBC policy 7.5 notes that "*Screening by walls or fencing; and Screening by other structures or landscaping*" are methods that can be used to ensure an acceptable level of privacy. This is exactly what we are proposing in order to ensure that the bedroom to the ground floor apartment is not overlooked by the people using the carpark

LBC policy Outlook 7.8 notes "*How pleasant an outlook is depends on what is being viewed. For example, an outlook onto amenity space is more pleasant than an outlook across a servicing yard. You should design developments so that the occupiers have a pleasant outlook. You should screen any unpleasant features with permanent landscaping*"

Currently the bedroom of the apartment overlooks a carpark (which is the same a "servicing yard") and the proposal screens the carpark with a timber 'pergola' and permanent landscaping. The proposal is therefore in line with policy 7.8.

We do not disagree that the lift shaft will give a " sense of enclosure ". As with any courtyard space this is the design intent. The materials chosen and the detailing of the lift tower and walkway ensure that the lift reads as a timber wall and pergola. The lift tower has been carefully detailed so that it functions as a climbing trellis for plants. The courtyard 'enclosure' therefore benefits the apartment.

Most gardens on the rear of London Victorian terrace houses are surrounded by high fences (often covered with plants) in order to enclose the garden and give privacy and a 'sense of enclosure' . Having an enclosed / private garden is for most people a positive not a negative.

Outlook from Apartments above the lift.

Importantly, as noted in our statement of case, we have also given careful consideration not only to the outlook from the ground floor flat but also to the outlook from the first and second floor flats which look down onto the top of the structure.

To ensure that the outlook from these flats is pleasant we have deigned the timber cladding so that it continues over the roof of the lift and walkway.

The flats above will therefore look out onto a timber box / pergola covered with climbing flowering plants.

It is therefore important that if this appeal is granted the lift is constructed in accordance with the planning drawings with the timber continuing over the roof of the lift shaft and covering the roof and soffit of the 'bridge'.

8.03 Detailing

For recognize that detail is central to the success of the lift enclosure and that in order for

The structure to be a delicate sculptural pergola in the in courtyard the detailing is paramount.

Paul+O Architects have therefore worked up the construction details which are submitted as part of this planning application. The construction dwgs importantly show the details of the cladding the glazed walkway which is paramount in order to achieve the design intend, and to

Ensure that overlooking is mitigated and that the outlook from the bedrooms in the ground floor flat is improved.

If the Council are minded to grant planning permission there would seem no need to add a condition requesting additional details.

9.00 Carparking

The Courtyard has been re configured to ensure that there is no loss of car parking.

The current pathway along the rear of 73 maygrove road will be replaced with a planter to give more privacy to the units in the building and improve the outlook from all the units at ground floor level.

The previous approved scheme submitted as part of planning permission 2016/5498/P had 16 carparks and 7 number "Sheffield" bicycle stands. The

revised plans retains the same number of car parks and also has space for a disabled drop area in front of the lift.

12.00 Landscaping

The courtyard has been carefully considered to ensure a balance between car parking and planting. Creepers (Boston Ivy) have already been planted in the courtyard and are starting to cover the walls of the existing building. Additional creepers will cover the proposed lift enclosure.

Pin Oaks, a deciduous trees with a fine structure, will be planted in the courtyard. Providing shade in the Summer

In conclusion:

The new lift enclosure has been carefully designed so that it becomes a sculptural element in the courtyard – a pergola covered with flowering Creepers.

The materials - timber stained dark gray – have been carefully chosen and detailed and will compliment the existing yellow brick buildings, the dark timber picking up on the black brick banding.

The Lift enclosure will not be seen from the public domain because of the surrounding buildings and because of the high brick wall and trees between the courtyard and Maygrove peace park (the top , smothered in time in flowering creepers might be glimpsed from the park) .

The new lift enclosure has been carefully designed and will enhance the courtyard , a sculptural form which will be a joy to look onto.

The proposed building is in line with the policies set out in the London plan, and the local UDP as well the advice given by English Heritage and Caba.

LBC policy '*Policy A1 Managing the impact of development*' as part of their questionnaire documents. The clause reads "*The Council will seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. We will grant permission for development unless this causes unacceptable harm to amenity*"

We contend that the reduction in daylight and outlook is not significant and does not Case unacceptable harm to the amenity of the Ground floor flat.

The lift tower is a well considered design in line with LBC Design guidelines.

In accordance with LDC 2.8 we have taken "*context, height, accessibility, orientation, siting, detailing and materials*" into account ensuring a building of design excellence.

The lift tower improves access (see below) and we therefore request that this appeal be allowed.

Access for all

LBC submitted 'policy 4.96 Good access' as part questionnaire documents, highlighting, in purple, the clause that reads *"We will expect all buildings and places to meet the highest practicable standards of accessible and inclusive design so they can be used safely, easily and with dignity by all"*

It would therefore seem that that LBC consider that having "Good Access" and "Access for all " is relevant to this planning application.

LBC policy 9.4 ' Access for all' advises that. *" Changes of use, alterations and extensions to existing buildings and spaces should, where practicable and reasonable, be designed to improve access for all"*

The lift will ensure that the occupants of the live work units at first floor can access the units via a lift , ensuring access by all. The proposed lift is therefore in line with LBC policy 9 and on balance, we contend, planning permission for this new lift proposal should be granted.