

**Design Statement (September 2018)**  
**Proposed Alterations to The Ridgemount Hotel, 65/67 Gower Street**

**1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 This design statement accompanies a Listed Building Consent application for minor internal alterations to the above property, which is Grade II listed, in order to provide ensuite accommodation at No 65, similar to No. 67 carried out in 2009.
- 1.2 As this is a proposal for internal alterations only, aspects such as the social, economic and landscaping contexts are not relevant.
- 1.3 The application also follows previous refusal Ref. 2017/3119/L in November 2017 and also pre-planning consultation from Catherine Bond (email) on 6<sup>th</sup> June 2018.

**2.0 Design Principles**

- 2.1 The alterations as outlined in the enclosed drawings do not include the removal of any original walls of the building. It involves removal of existing (1970s) partition walls on the First, Second and Third Floors, then creation of 'pop' type en-suites which are formed independently from any original fabric of the building.
- 2.2 As this building is not only Listed, but also within the Bedford Estate, we have acknowledged the sensitivity of this building and its historic importance and therefore propose to duplicate as best as possible the coving, skirtings and door frames in order to achieve design continuity throughout.
- 2.3 All advice given in both the refusal report from 2017 and also the pre-planning advice has been considered and included in our updated proposal.
- 2.4 We have maintained the form of the original rooms as much as possible and updated the layouts of the newly formed rooms so they are less 'cluttered' and more in keeping with the original layout of the building.
- 2.5 We have shown the principles of the drain runs, which in most cases will be connected to existing foul pipes already located within the building. This will require some careful opening up works to exactly decide on final drain runs, which we trust can be conditioned as part of the hopefully successful application.
- 2.6 We have included the previous Heritage Statement which was previously submitted as most of this is relevant in terms of the historic importance of this property.

**3.0 Consultations**

- 3.1 We do not feel any consultation is required for this development.

**4.0 Conclusion**

- 4.1 In conclusion, we feel we have understood the concerns from both the previous refusal and the more recent pre-planning consultation, plus further comments from Catherine Bond, therefore we trust this application can be supported by Camden.