

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT
71 Avenue Road, London NW8 6HP



PATRICK URBANSKI
ARCHITECT

—

17a Capel Road
London
WD1 4FE
United Kingdom

—

Tel: 078 5880 9627



pu@puarchitect.com



Pu architect

—
www.puarchitect.com
info@puarchitect.com

—
pu@puarchitect.com
T__+44(0)7858809627

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

71 Avenue Road, London NW8 6HP

Project Name: 71 Avenue Road
Address: 71 Avenue Road
London
NW8 6HP
Project No: P_19_245
Date: 18 April 2022
Revision: Rev_A

(A) INTRODUCTION:

This statement forms part of the Planning Application for Planning Permission for Erection of a two storey, single family dwellinghouse (Class C3) with basement and accommodation in the roof space, following the demolition of the existing main dwellinghouse.

Design Team:

Architects:	PU ARCHITECT LTD
Structural Engineers:	ADKINS CONSULTANTS LTD
Environmental Consultants:	GEOSMART INFORMATION LTD
Arboriculturalist:	ARBORTRACK SYSTEMS LTD

Accordingly, in support of this application we enclose the following:

- this covering letter dated 18 April 2022;
- application form;
- red line site plan P001 Rev_ Site and location plan;
- P010 Rev_H Ground floor plan existing;
- P011 Rev_H First floor plan existing;
- P012 Rev_H Roof plan existinf;
- P020 Rev_H Front elevation existing;
- P021 Rev_H Rear elevation existing;
- P022 Rev_H Side elevation existing;
- P023 Rev_H Side elevation existing;
- P100 Rev_J Basement plan proposed;
- P101 Rev_J Ground floor plan proposed;
- P102 Rev_J First floor plan proposed;
- P103 Rev_J Roof plan proposed;
- P104 Rev_J Second floor plan proposed;

- P200 Rev_I Front elevation proposed;
- P201 Rev_I Rear elevation proposed;
- P202 Rev_I Side elevation proposed;
- P203 Rev_I Side elevation proposed;
- P400 Rev_A Boundary street elevation proposed;
- P401 Rev_A Boundary street elevation proposed;
- P410 Rev_A Boundary street elevation proposed;
- statutory fee in the sum of £462.00;
- Tfl Access Level (PTAL) report;
- Tfl Time mapping (TIM) report;
- Site inspection report brick condition by Adkins Consultants Ltd;
- Appendix 1 – brick condition photo album by Adkins Consultants Ltd;
- Flood Risk Assessment by GeoSmart Information Ltd;
- Sustainable Drainage Assessment by GeoSmart Information Ltd;
- Basement Impact Assessment Report by Adkins Consultants Ltd;
- Demolition Plan by Adkins Consultants Ltd;
- AR-MP-A1-C-01 Demolition Plan by Adkins Consultants Ltd;
- Arboricultural Impac Assessment Arbortrack Systems Ltd;
- Photos of the dwellinghouse.

Planning History:

Application number: 9005089
 Application registered: 13-02-1990
 Decision: Grant Full or Outline Perm. with Condit. 08-01-1991

Proposal:

The erection of extensions at ground first and second floor levels of the south west wing of the existing residential house to provide additional habitable floorspace as shown on drawing no(s) 566-01 566-02 566-03.

Application number: 8401986
 Application registered: 22-11-1984
 Decision: Grant Full or Outline Planning Permissn. 06-02-1985

Proposal:

The erection of extensions at ground first and second floor levels on the south-west wing of the house (amendment to planning permission (Regd.No.31020(R1) dated 13th January 1981) as shown on drawings Nos. 566-01 02 & 03.

Architects: PU ARCHITECT LTD
 Structural Engineers: ADKINS CONSULTANTS LTD
 Environmental Consultants: GEOSMART INFORMATION LTD
 Arboriculturalist: ARBORTRACK SYSTEMS LTD

(B) ASSESMENT:

Following the meeting with senior planning officer Mr David Peres da Costa on 30th August 2019 and review of the proposed planning drawings Mr Peres da Costa confirmed that it was made clear that the purpose of the redevelopment was to provide enlarged living accommodation for the existing occupier's family.

Demolition of the existing house

Policy CC1 Climate change mitigation require all proposals that involve substantial demolition to demonstrate that it is not possible to retain and improve the existing building. The condition and durability of the brickwork is substantially reduced, many of the bricks were heavily frost damaged where freeze-thaw action had been sufficient to damage the face of many bricks. Many of the faces were substantially spoiled and are not viable, this leads to further water penetration and also affects

their structural strength. The bricks have been also completely damaged by the removal of the old paint work, which has now made them extremely porous, therefore unsuitable to reuse. Cost of rectification is now very unlikely to be proportionate to the value of the property and may not extend the lifespan of the property to a worthwhile extent. It would be very difficult and expensive to rectify the building in a manner which enabled it to fit in with the neighbouring properties in their style and appearance. On this basis, it appears that the client's plan to demolish the property is a reasonable one, as it will enable the construction of a property which will have long-term viable uses and will be constructed at a proportionate cost considering its potential lifespan. It will also enable the construction of a property which will look in keeping with the neighbouring properties.

The demolition process and reconstruction will be fully justified in terms of the optimisation of resources and energy use, in comparison with the existing building.

We have provided Site inspection report brick condition and Appendix 1 – brick condition photo album by Adkins Consultants Ltd as a justification for the demolition.

The overall impact of a new development will be carefully assessed and kept to minimum by optimising:

- production of materials and components (raw material extraction, material production, wastage and waste processing, transportation)
- construction stages (transport, storage of products, wastage and waste processing, energy and water use in construction, ancillary materials)
- use stages (energy and water used in operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and refurbishment)
- end of life stages (de-construction or demolition, transport, waste processing, disposal of waste).

It can be also confirmed that we are proposing to divert 85% of waste from landfill and comply with the Institute for Civil Engineer's Demolition Protocol and either reuse materials on-site or salvage appropriate materials to enable their reuse off-site. We will also consider the specification of materials and construction processes with low embodied carbon content.

(C) THE PROPOSAL:

Design

The design of the replacement house is very similar to the existing dwelling. The proposed front elevation is similar to the existing but without the bay windows and the single storey north east element would be replaced by a two storey structure. Front lightwells are proposed in the location of the existing bay windows. The front lightwells would be 1.6m in depth (measured from the front elevation to the front of the lightwell). The principal rear elevation at ground and first floor would be rebuilt 6.00m further into the rear garden, in line with the recently approved rear two storey extension at 69 Avenue Road and the existing 2 storey south east wing. The existing garage will be replaced by a two storey structure. Overall, the proposed extensions in the form and appearance of the proposed dwelling when compared to the existing house are relatively minor and would not harm the appearance of the host property or the surrounding area.

Alterations to roof

We are proposing to increase pitch of the roof and add dormers on each elevation to match the nearly completed development at 73-75 Avenue Road and create well proportioned entry to Queens Grove framed with the new developments. The proposed rear dormers line up with the windows below and this would appear harmonious. Dormers will be aligned with windows on the lower floors and be of a size that is clearly subordinate to the windows below.

Basement

The proposed dwelling includes a basement. The Council will only permit basement development where it is demonstrated to its satisfaction that the proposal would not cause harm to:

1. neighbouring properties;
2. the structural, ground, or water conditions of the area;
3. the character and amenity of the area;
4. the architectural character of the building; and
5. the significance of heritage assets

The proposed basement will comply with the following requirements when measured against the proposed building:

4. not comprise of more than one storey;
5. not be built under an existing basement;
6. not exceed 50% of each garden within the property;
7. be less than 1.5 times the footprint of the host building in area;
8. extend into the garden no further than 50% of the depth of the host building measured from the principal rear elevation;
9. not extend into or underneath the garden further than 50% of the depth of the garden;
10. be set back from neighbouring property boundaries where it extends beyond the footprint of the host building; and
11. avoid the loss of garden space or trees of townscape or amenity value.

It is appropriate to allow for a proportion of the basement to be deeper to allow development of swimming pool. The additional depth does not harm the neighbouring properties or the structural, ground, or water conditions of the area.

The basement would not exceed 50% of the rear garden (A5h). The rear garden measures 209.50sqm. The proposed basement would result in a basement beneath as 59.5sqm of the garden and 150.0sqm would remain.

The basement would be less than 1.5 times the footprint of the host building in area. The footprint of the proposed building is 364.18.sqm and the footprint of the basement is 424.95sqm (1.16 times the footprint of the host building).

The depth of the proposed building is 18.38m and the basement would extend into the garden approximately 7.26m and complies with Camden Planning Guidance 'Basements' criteria.

The basement would extend underneath the garden further than 50% of the depth of the garden.

The existing garden has a depth of 19.61m and the basement would extend under 13.26m of the garden (67%). This is contrary to 'criterion k'.

The basement will be slightly set back from neighbouring property boundaries where it extends beyond the footprint of the host building. The front lightwell adjoins the south east boundary with the neighbouring property but similar basement extension has been recently approved at 69 Avenue Road.

In addition we have provided a tree constraints plan to demonstrate that the proposed basement would take account of the root protection areas of the trees located within the garden and neighbouring gardens.

Suitable access will be provided to basement accommodation to allow for evacuation. We have consider the Surface flow and flooding screening flowchart in CPG Basements and provided a Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Assessment.

Basement Impact Assessment

The Council requires evidence of the impact of basement schemes in the form of a Basement Impact Assessment to be carried out by appropriately qualified professionals. The Basement Impact Assessment Report by Adkins Consultants Ltd.

Trees

Tree constraints plan has been provided and tree survey and an arboricultural impact assessment (in line with BS5837:2012) has been provided by Arbortrack Systems Ltd.

Transport

We are proposing to reprovide existing parking provision as we have demonstrated that the existing occupiers are to return to the address when the development is completed. As the proposal involves the demolition of the existing house and the redevelopment to provide a 2 storey dwelling house for the existing occupier, the Council could consider temporarily relaxing the car-free requirement in respect of that dwelling for the period over which that occupant resides at the property. A mechanism set out in the Section 106 agreement will require returning owner occupiers to provide evidence that they intend to continue to occupy their home as their principal residence before any temporary relaxation of car-free status can take place. We would propose to retain four parking spaces. The evidence from returning owner will be provided stating that the current occupiers are intending to continue to occupy their home as their principal residence.

Boundary treatment

The existing property has a garage accessed from Queen's Grove. It is proposed to replace the garage access with gated access to the garbage bins and bicycle storage.

Construction Management Plans will be proposed to demonstrate how a development will minimize impacts from the movement of goods and materials during the construction process.

Energy

The proposed development will demonstrate a 19% CO2 reduction below Part L 2013 Building Regulations (Policy CC1).

Other matters

We think that there are no concerns with the impact of the development on neighbouring amenity (in terms of overlooking, daylight and sunlight) as the proposed building is relatively minor in scale where compared with recently granted dwellings along Avenue Road. The alteration to the pitch of the roof and the addition of front and rear dormers would not harm neighbouring amenity in terms of harmful overlooking or loss of daylight and sunlight.

Conclusion

The proposed redevelopment in the form and appearance of the proposed dwelling when compared to the existing house are considered to be relatively minor and would not harm the appearance of the proposed property or the surrounding area.

(D) SITE PHOTOS:



View of Avenue Road.



View of Queens Grove.



View of Queens Grove.



View towards 75 Avenue Road taken from the roof of 71 Avenue Road.

We trust the above is clear; however, if you have any queries regarding the above, please feel free to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Patrick Urbanski', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Patrick Urbanski
on behalf of Pu architect



pu@puarchitect.com
