Delegated Rep	oort A	Analysis shee		t E		Date:	20/04/2012		
	Ν	I/A / attacl			Expiry	onsultation xpiry Date: 05/04/2012		012	
Officer			Арр	Application Number(s)					
Richard Black			2) 20)12/0847/P)12/0995/L					
Application Address				Drawing Numbers					
21 FROGNAL LANE LONDON NW3 7DB				Location Map - Proposed; Location Map - Existing; 668E01-0; 668E02-0; 668E03-0; 668P04-0; 668P05-0; 668P06-0; 668P07; 668P08-0.					
PO 3/4 Area Team Signature C&UD				Authorised Officer Signature					
Proposal(s)									
Erection of single storey rear ground floor level extension with rooflight, new steel staircase and replacement of window with door in existing rear basement lightwell all in connection with existing dwellinghouse (Class C3).									
Recommendation(s):1) Refuse planning permission 2) Refuse listed building consent									
Application Type:	 Householder Application Listed Building Consent 								
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft [Decision No	otice	e					
Informatives:									
Consultations									
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	12	No. of re	•	00 00	No. of c	bjections	00	
Summary of consultation responses:	Neighbours were consulted by letter, a site notice was placed outside the property on the 7 th March 2012 for three weeks and a press notice was published on the 15 th March 2012. No objections were received.								
CAAC/Local groups comments:	The Reddington Frognal CAAC were consulted, however no response has been received.								

Site Description

The application site is a grade II listed house situated in the Hampstead Conservation Area. It is listed together with its immediate neighbour at No 19 and is also known as Maryon House.

Frognal Lane rises from Finchley Road to Frognal, narrowing as it reaches Frognal. The western boundary of the Conservation Area lies at the top of Frognal Lane. The high brick boundary walls and narrow width of the road create a pinch point entry into the Conservation Area. On the north side Nos.19, 21& 23 are within the old demesne farm site, with buildings dating from 1793 (listed).

The list description for No.21 reads:-

"Detached house, now two residences. c1793. Possibly built by T Pool, converted in 1896 by Francis Tasker. No.19 with 1964 additions by John Brandon-Jones. Multi-coloured stock brick. High slate mansard roof with pedimented dormers. 2 storeys, attics and basement. No.19, 2 windows; No.21, 2 windows plus slightly recessed 1-window entrance bay. No.21 entrance with later C19 doorway having segmental open pedimented canopy, sidelights, fanlight and panelled door. Main entrance to No.19 on Chesterford Gardens with prostyle Doric portico and later C19 altered doorway. Gauged brick flat arches to recessed sashes and 1st floor shutters; No.19, canted bay rising through ground and 1st floor; No.21 with ground floor canted bay. Parapet. INTERIOR: not inspected."

Relevant History

Subject Site

9370040 - Erection of a single storey rear conservatory and associated works to the existing building. Granted - 26/08/1993.

PWX0002115 - Installation of a new dormer window to rear mansard roof. Granted - 03/04/2000.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development CS14 Promoting high Quality Places and Conserving Our Heritage

DP24 Securing High Quality Design DP25 Conserving Camden's Heritage DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2011 CPG1 – Design Reddington Frognal Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

Proposal:

The proposal involves the demolition of the existing rear extension, erection of single storey rear ground floor level extension with rooflight, new steel staircase and replacement of a window with door in existing rear basement lightwell, all in connection with existing dwellinghouse.

The proposed single storey extension measures 6.7m in width, 6.5m in depth and has an overall height of 2.6m. The structure is to be enclosed by flat roof.

Design and Conservation:

The main element of the proposal involves the demolition of the existing 1992 conservatory rear extension and its replacement with a new conservatory with a larger footprint in terms of both depth and width. Given that the existing conservatory is modern, and of a somewhat dated 'post-modern' design, there are no objections to its demolition which will not affect the historic fabric of the listed building.

CPG1 (Design) notes that extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation unless the specific circumstances of the site, such as the context of the property or its particular design, would enable an exception to this approach. The Reddington Frognal Conservation Area Statement also refers to this issue. In this instance there are concerns regarding the increased footprint and consequent size and scale of the proposed replacement, which despite a minimalist architectural vocabulary (which would complement the historic rear elevation of the listed building), would fail to be subservient to the main house and would dominate its setting at the rear.

The proposal intends to match the depth of the wing on the adjacent property at No 23 Frognal Lane, but this depth is too great for the property in question, which has a shallower footprint than its neighbour at No 23 (which is further set back from the road). It should be noted that this issue relates to the size of the listed building rather than to the size of its (recently enlarged) back garden. Also, No 21 has to be read in the context of its adjacent neighbour at No 19 which already has a rear wing of a certain depth and the proposed extension is of a greater depth in comparison. This is consistent with CPG1 (Design) which notes that rear extensions should respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space.

The Council's Conservation Officer, notes that the applicants were advised at pre-application stage that the principle of a replacement conservatory would be unacceptable unless it was reduced in depth to match the depth of the rear projection at No 19.

The second element of the application proposes access steps to the rear lightwell at the western end of the house and a new door at lower ground floor level. There are concerns that a door with a notably higher head height than the existing row of windows would have a negative impact on the fenestration pattern at this level of the rear elevation, harming the special interest of the listed building.

The applicant has stated that the lightwell railings are approximately 20 years old, and therefore the partial loss of this railing will not result in the loss of historic fabric.

Impacts on Neighbours:

The enlargement to the existing rear extension, given that it will be approximately the same depth as the extension at No.23 and will be set at a lower level in comparison to this structure, as such it is considered that no adverse affects in terms of privacy, access to sunlight/daylight or overlooking, are considered to arise in respects to this neighbour.

Conclusion:

Although the principle of a replacement conservatory is considered acceptable in this location, the current proposal is unacceptable on the grounds that it is too large in terms of excessive footprint and the resultant bulk and scale, which would fail to be subservient to the listed building, harming its setting and special interest. It would also have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area. In addition, the proposed new door at lower ground floor is considered to have a negative impact on the special interest of the listed building. The proposals are therefore contrary to LDF policies CS14, DP24 and DP25.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission and listed building consent

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444