

Delegated Report (Member's Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		08/11/2006	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		11/10/2006	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Bethany Arbery				2006/3498/P & 2006/3499/L			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
42 Frognal Lane London NW3 6PP				Refer to draft decision notice.			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		Date:		
Proposal(s)							
Excavation of (part) basement and erection of ground floor level rear extension with rooflight over following demolition of existing single-storey rear ground floor level extension with rooflight.							
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional permission and listed building consent					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission Listed Building Consent					

Conditions:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice				
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	14	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 20/09/06 to 11/10/06.</p> <p>Adjoining owners/occupiers The occupier of Flat 2, 18 Lindfield Gardens has sent in a copy of their letter dated 17th July 2006 submitted in respect of an earlier planning application at 42A Frogna Lane. The current application does not relate to the property or the proposed development referred to in their letter. <i>Response: The objection does not relate to the current planning application. This relates to applications 2006/1937/P & 2006/1938/C, which were withdrawn.</i></p> <p>English Heritage The site is located within an archaeological priority area as designated by the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan. The site lies within an area of potential for medieval and post-medieval archaeological remains and the building is of historic and architectural interest. Taking into account the proposals and information submitted it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant impact upon the archaeological heritage. An archaeological condition is not required.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>Hampstead CAAC Given the extreme difficulty of access to this property and the likelihood that traffic will increase with the increased accommodation we suggest that consideration should be given to improving the access in any way that seems feasible. <i>Response: The proposal results in an increase in residential floorspace on the site, but there is to be no increase in the number of units. It is considered that the proposal is therefore unlikely in itself to result in any significant increase in traffic.</i></p> <p>Heath and Hampstead Society This home is one of Hampstead's most important listed buildings, certainly of this period. The demolition of the 20th century addition is welcomed. Whilst we cannot fault the architects intentions in designing these extensions we have to conclude that the result is disappointing, especially the fussy form of the roof; hipped roof forms especially to this small scale, do not sit well with the Basil Champneys' finely proportioned architecture. Suggest that further guidance is given leading to modifications that could do justice to this great house. <i>Response: The roof form of the proposed extension has been amended. The hipped roof has been omitted and the applicant intends to replicate the rooflight that exists above the existing extension. The proposal will have a negligible impact on the appearance, setting and special interest of this historic building.</i></p>					
Site Description						
<p>The application site is 42 Frogna Lane; also known as Manor Farm. The building is a substantial sized dwellinghouse comprising ground, first and second floor level, with a single-storey rear projecting wing and garage all set within a generous garden. The building is red brick and dates from the late C19th. The property is Grade II listed and is situated within the Hampstead Conservation Area. It is in a designated area of archaeological priority. There are 3 trees within the grounds which have TPO's: an Ash, Lime and Horse Chestnut.</p>						
Relevant History						
<p>42A Frogna Lane - 2006/1937/P & 2006/1938/C Applications were submitted on 21/06/06 for construction of a new 3-storey dwelling plus basement following the demolition of the existing tennis pavilion and tennis court. The applications were withdrawn on 15/8/06.</p>						

Relevant policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. However it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan (2006)

S1/S2 - Sustainable development

SD6 - Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 - General design principles

B3 - Alterations and extensions

B6 - Listed buildings

B7 - Conservation areas

N8 - Ancient woodlands and trees

Supplementary Planning Guidance (2002) and (2006)

Alterations and Extensions

Hampstead Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

Amendments

The proposal originally included the erection of a solid extension with dormer windows at rear first floor level. This element of the proposal has been omitted. Instead the applicant proposes to install a rooflight over the new ground floor level extension to replicate the existing.

Proposal

Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the following works:

- Demolition of the existing single-storey rear extension with rooflight which accommodates the swimming pool;
- Erection a new basement and ground floor level rear extension with rooflight over;
- Replacement of first floor level window with a bay window; and
- Internal alterations at ground, first and second floor level.

The proposal will result in an increase of residential floorspace to provide a new pool, gym, sauna etc at basement level and a living room and entertainment room at ground floor level.

Design

The main house was built in 1881 by Basil Champneys for his own occupation on the site of farm buildings on the former Priory Estate. He occupied it until his death in 1935. The building is 2-storey, and is constructed of red brick with a hipped tiled roof, covered wooden eaves cornice and Flemish gables.

The rear extension was originally approved in the 1950s when the building was in use as flats, but was converted to a swimming pool in the mid 1980s. It is proposed to demolish this later addition and rebuild the structure to the same footprint with a newly excavated basement below. Its elevational treatment will be almost identical, albeit with more refined detailing and fenestration. Also, to excavate down to create a new basement level. This will have a negligible impact on the appearance, setting and special interest of the listed building and is considered to be acceptable.

It is also proposed to modify an existing window at first floor level on the north elevation to a shallow bay. This is contained within a modern section of the building and is considered to be acceptable. This will broadly match the existing shallow bay window on the south elevation.

The interior of the building has been significantly modified in the 1960s and 1980s, during two documented phases of works. There are no surviving features from the original phase of construction and all finishes, walls, floors, decorative features have been replaced. Several internal alterations to plan form, and a full decorative refurbishment are proposed. Given the alterations that have occurred to the interior of the building and the absence of special architectural or historic interest, the proposed internal works are considered to be acceptable.

Amenity

The proposed extension is located to the south of the site. It replaces an existing ground floor level extension with rooflight over. The proposed basement that is to be excavated does not manifest itself externally, and therefore does not raise any amenity issues. The proposed ground floor extension is the same footprint as the existing extension. The proposed ground floor extension is marginally higher than the existing extension (0.4m), although the southern most section closest to the boundary with no.5 Frognal is actually reduced in height. The proposed rooflight over is essentially a replication of the existing rooflight and is the same height, bulk, mass and design. The proposed extension sits adjacent to the boundary wall with a car-parking area to the rear of no.45 Frognal. The proposed extension will project marginally higher above the boundary wall with the car park than existing. However, this is some distance from the rear windows of no.45 Frognal to the east and therefore they are unlikely to be affected in terms of loss of daylight or outlook as a result of the proposal. To the south are windows in the rear elevation of no.5 Frognal; these currently look onto the existing extension. The proposed extension is 0.4m higher than existing, although the southern most section of the extension which is closest to the boundary with no.5 is actually reduced in height. It is considered that the potential impact on this property is likely to be negligible in terms of loss of daylight, and outlook.

The proposal does not include the creation of additional window openings beyond the existing situation; it is therefore considered that the proposal will not result in any significant increase in overlooking.

Archaeology

The site is located within an archaeological priority area as designated by the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan (2006). The site lies in an area of potential for medieval and post-medieval archaeological remains and the building is of historic and architectural interest. English Heritage has advised that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant impact upon the archaeological heritage. They have advised that an archaeological condition is not required in this instance.

Trees

The arboricultural report states that there are no TPOs on the site, but our records show that there are in fact three. An Ash (T4), a Horse Chestnut (T8) and a Lime (T18) are all covered by TPOs. The report identifies T1 a mature copper beech for removal; due to the degree of decay in the lower main stem. The degree of decay does justify removal of the tree; however, this removal is proposed as part of a scheme for redevelopment of 42A rather the current proposal. If the Council were to formally agree to removal of this tree as part of any scheme for 42A, it would be necessary to seek a replacement. The schedule also identifies the TPO'd Ash (T4) for removal due to decay in the upper part of the crown. Further evidence in terms of decay tests would be required to support this removal. There is no necessity to remove either tree as part of the current proposal. It is recommended that a condition be attached to the permission advising that notwithstanding the details of the arboricultural report this permission does not grant consent for the felling or lopping of any tree on this site.

The current proposals are within the footprint of the existing development and there are no direct impacts from the design proposals on trees on the site. However, there may be indirect impacts as a result of construction activity of the site (site storage, access and accommodation etc). Therefore any planning permission should be conditional on the provision of a method statement for the protection of trees on the site for the duration of the construction works.

Recommendation

Grant conditional planning permission and listed building consent.

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613