

 dtc

design team consultants

chartered surveyors ▪ architectural designers

# Design & Access Statement

## 48 Albert Road, West Drayton, UB7 BES

29<sup>th</sup> September 2022

## Table of Contents

Site and Surrounding Area	3
Proposal Summary	3
Assessment	4
Principle of Development	4
Design	4
Impact on Residential Amenity	7
Internal Layout	7
External Amenity	7
Transport and Cycle Storage	7
Basement	8
Trees	8
Conclusion	8

## SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

The application site comprises a two-storey detached property, Fern Cottage, located on the eastern side of Albert Road, Yiewsley. The site is bordered to the north by 56 and 58 Albert Road, to the east by the rear gardens of 49, 51 and 53 Colham Avenue, and to the south by 46 Albert Road. 31 Albert Road is located opposite the site. The site is located within an area with a PTAL rating of 3 and within a Parking Management Scheme. The surrounding area is residential in character, with some retail space at the far end of Albert Road comprising two and three-storey apartments and terraced and semi-detached properties.



## PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a three storey detached block with a semi basement area which utilizes the site topography. The accommodation in the roof provides 1 no 2 bed unit, the basement a 1 bed unit, the ground floor 2 x studio flats and the first floor comprising 2 x 1 bed units, totalling 6 units with associated parking a amenity space, cycle storage and landscaping.

There were few previous planning applications submission for this site which were not successful, however a recent pre-planning application with reference number 40335/APP/2020/4175 dated 4<sup>th</sup> May 2021 was approved.

Previous comments on earlier scheme related to the following design issues and we have addressed as part of this application. These are as follows:-

- Insufficient car parking

**We have provided 6 onsite parking spaces located at the rear of the site**

- Insufficient soft landscape al the forecourt

**Substantial landscaping proposed at the front and rear of the site**

- Unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers due to balconies

**There are no balconies have been removed from this scheme**

- Concerns regarding noise issue from proposed balconies

**Balconies have been removed from this scheme**

- Internal floor space would be below standard

**Internal floor space revised to meet London plan**

- Suitable quality of internal living in the roof space due to lack of outlook **Proposed new dormer window to the rear, the loft accommodation is proposed**

## ASSESSMENT

### Principle of Development

The principle of development was found to be acceptable as mentioned in the officer report in the previous schemes.

### Design

The street is characterised by a mix of house styles including terraces, semi-detached houses and flats as can be seen on photos above. The block of flats would replace the existing single dwelling, setting back the existing front building line to better match neighbouring properties whilst extending up to the rear of the neighbouring 56 and 58 Albert Road. The proposed building is sited to ensure that the immediate neighbouring building lines are respected, creating a staggered form.

The proposal also follows the topography of the site where it slopes down towards the rear of the property.

The officer report mentions that the design in the pre-planning application is much improved from the previous submission. We have therefore tried to retain the overall external design of the building with minimal changes to follow the topography of the site.

The proposed development would also retain a minimum of 1m from the adjacent properties which is characteristic of the area.

dtc

design team consultants

chartered surveyors ▪ architectural designers



36 Albert Rd



6 Albert Rd

dtc

design team consultants

chartered surveyors ■ architectural designers



5 Oner Way



64A Albert Rd

## Impact on Residential Amenity

The pre-planning application noted that the proposed rear balconies on the previous scheme would overlook into the neighbouring buildings and would also generate unacceptable level of noise which could have an impact on the amenity of adjoining properties.

The balconies have been removed from this scheme as there is a large garden space available at the rear of the site providing a communal garden space.

## Internal Layout

The scheme have been revised taking the pre-planning application advise into consideration by providing good level of outlook and high quality design together with maximizing the site potential and neighboring properties. The internal floor area would exceed the required London plan standards as per the table below:

	No. Bedrooms	Proposed Floor Area	London Plan Standards
Unit 1	1B2P	57 sqm	50 sqm
Unit 2	Studio	39 sqm	39 sqm
Unit 3	Studio	40 sqm	39 sqm
Unit 4	1B2P	51 sqm	50 sqm
Unit 5	1B2P	59 sqm	51 sqm
Unit 6	2B3P	72 sqm	61 sqm

## External Amenity

The site benefits from a large garden at the rear. It is therefore proposed to have one communal garden space to be used by all occupiers of the flats. The proposed external amenity space is in excess of the required amenity space specified in the SPD.

## Transport and Cycle Storage

Cycle storage has been proposed at the rear of the site, accessed from the access road to the side of the ground floor which ramped access.

The proposed parking layout utilizes land to the rear of the site and is accessed via a ramped access road to the side of the ground floor. The building has been proposed to comply with the highway standards in terms of the amount of landscaping together with the width of the cross overs.

Considering that the proposed number of bedrooms have been reduced in comparison to the pre-planning application scheme, the proposed 3 number of parking spaces should suffice the number of proposed units.

London Plan standards requires less than 1 parking space for 1-2 bedroom properties, considering that all proposed 6 units have less than 1-2 bedrooms, the proposed 6 parking space would adequately comply with this standard.

### **Basement**

The topography of the site is in a way that it slopes down towards the rear, therefore creation of a basement and a lightwell at the rear of the site sit well with the natural slope of the ground and it would provide a great outlook to the kitchen and living room in the basement. The site is not located within a flood risk zone, however we would be looking to provide an acco drain at all ground floor and basement door thresholds.

The basement proposal is small in scale in comparison to the overall proposed footprint of the development together with the natural fall of the ground; this would not have an adverse structural stability to the neighbouring properties. If the council requires further structural method statement for the construction of the basement this could be requested in a form of a planning condition.

### **Trees**

There are no TPO trees on site and it is therefore proposed to remove some trees at the rear of the site and clean the site from overgrown vegetation.

The proposed development are further away from the existing trees at the rear of the site, it is therefore considered that there will be no impact on the remaining trees at the rear of the site.

### **CONCLUSION**

The existing building is poorly maintained and a straightforward conversion to flats would not produce the same standard of accommodation as the proposed scheme for future occupants.

The proposal has been revisited with the new block set deeper into the site, creating a landscaped frontage and addresses the Council's concerns from the previous schemes and draws its inspiration from the pre-app scheme that was found to be more favoured by planners. It is hoped that the conclusions drawn by the Council are that the proposal represents an effective and efficient use of land in the creation of appropriate mix of housing stock.