

Ref: 21 Frognal Lane, London NW3 7DB
Case no. Ref: 2012/0847/P and 2012/0995/L

Dear Sir or Madam,

Further to our recently refused planning and listed building consent application for the '*Erection of a single storey rear ground floor level extension with rooflight, new steel staircase and replacement of window with door in existing rear basement light well, all in connection with existing dwelling house (Class C3)*', we would like to resubmit the application in accordance with the recommendations made by the conservation officer.

Depth of Extension:

Subsequent to the recent refusal, we have re-measured the footprint and site of no. 19 Frognal Lane. We have found some discrepancies between our measurements and those shown on the Ordnance survey map, which was part of the original submission. We have discovered that the footprint of the building and the site boundary were incorrectly plotted. This inaccuracy in measurement is allowed for in the National Ordnance Survey accuracy tables, which outline the tolerances at the given scales. Please see table below:

Survey scale	Absolute accuracy compared with the National Grid. Absolute error – root mean square error (RMSE)	Absolute accuracy 99% confidence level	Relative accuracy Distance between points taken from the map. Relative error	Relative accuracy 99% confidence level
1:1250 (urban)	0.5 metres	<0.9 metres	+/- 0.5 metres (60 metres)	<+/- 1.1 metres (60 metres)
1:2500 resurvey or reformed (urban and rural)	1.1 metres	<2.4 metres	+/- 1.0 metres (100 metres)	<+/- 2.5 metres (100 m)
1:2500 overhaul (urban and rural)	2.7 metres	<5.8 metres	+/- 1.9 metres (200 metres)	<+/- 4.7 metres (200 metres)
1:10 000 (mountain and moorland)	4.1 metres	<8.8 metres	+/- 4.0 metres (500 metres)	<+/- 10.1 metres (500 metres)

For the amended application we have reduced the proposed depth of our rear extension to line up with the existing depth of the rear projection to no. 19 Frognal Lane, as requested. The design of the proposed extension has been kept, which was noted to be acceptable in our previous correspondences.

Basement Door:

We have revised the design of the basement door so that the head height of the door lines with the existing adjacent windows at this level, therefore not affecting the fenestration pattern of the rear elevation. The design of the door is based on the existing rear door to the main house.

The existing light well railings are not original. They were fitted 20 years ago by the present owner, having no particular architectural heritage to the area.

Conclusion:

We have addressed the outstanding comments as indicated in the recent Letter of Refusal and believe that the revised application would now be considered acceptable.

Regards,

Patrick Walsh BSc Arch TECH ACIAT