

London, 7 May 2014

HERITAGE STATEMENT

105 FROGNAL

Re. Householder Application ref. 2014/2436

105 Frognal is part of a Grade II Listed complex which has been built in 1745-50 and altered throughout the centuries to conform to various needs and requirements of the previous owners and tenants. The past alterations are now an integral part of the history of the house.

Sources which fully explain the architectural and historic interest of 105 Frognal have been highlighted in a comprehensive report 'The history of Frognal Grove and 105 Frognal' by Penelope Olsen, commissioned in 1996 by the actual owner Anthony Moores and an old heritage statement from Camden Council dated 11/08/50.

As a brief description¹:

Large house with stable block, now 4 semi-detached houses. c1745-50. By Henry Flitcroft for himself; much altered with later additions.

¹ Article Reference - Author: Nares, G - Title: 24th June Frognal Grove Hampstead - Date: 1949 - Journal Title: Country Life - Page References:1502-1506

Henry Flitcroft bought the copyhold of Frognal Grove in 1741 from Thomas Watson-Wentworth, Earl of Malton.

This house replaced a structure of c1700. Henry Flitcroft junior inherited the house but leased it out, the most famous tenant being Edward Montagu, Master in Chancery who lived there between 1772 and c1794. The house subsequently passed into the hands of the Street family, into which Flitcroft's great-granddaughter had married.

The architect GE Street inherited the property in 1871-2 and was responsible for works here.

Also known as Montagu Lodge, Frognal Grove was subdivided in the 1950s.

No.105 was the south-east range; No.107 the principal block; No.109 largely later C19 work with 1926 extension; No.111 converted stables. Painted brick with slated and tiled roofs.

EXTERIOR:

[...]

No.107: the principal block:

Slated hipped mansard roof with dormers and wooden rectangular cupola having segmental openings, hipped roof and weathervane. 3 storeys and attic. Brick and timber round-arched pergola, erected pre-1894, leads to architraved doorway with panelled doors and cast-iron entrance gables.

Stone at 1st floor level. Gauged brick flat arches to recessed sashes; upper floors with louvred shutters.

Stone cornice and stone coped brick parapet.

[...]

The application was issued to gain the permission to replace no. 13 existing Single Glazed Sash Windows with Double Glazed Sash Windows.

The existing windows are not sound proof neither thermally efficient and are leading to a considerable heat loss through the single glazing panel and the gaps between the sashes and the window's boxes.

Different solutions have been considered: installation of secondary glazing, use of shutters and replacement of existing sashes with double glazed units.

1. Secondary glazing can sometimes be effective in reducing both draughts and heat loss through glazing and have been considered.

However, in this occasion they are not an option: as also confirmed by the manufacturer, they require second windows which cannot be fitted within the existing bow-windows on the East elevation.

Those windows are enhancing the rooms where they are placed but, due to their considerable sizes, they are also the main cause for the heat dispersion.

2. Shutters have been shown to be effective in terms of reducing heat loss, but are only a night-time measure.
3. The existing windows don't present special decorative features such as stained or decorative leaded glass and etched glass which would need to be retained. They don't present crown glass or drawn sheet glass but modern polished plate glass.

It is therefore possible the replacement of the windows with new units that will exactly match the original in terms of material, size, proportions and glazing pattern, mouldings.

Single windows with double glazed units would be a less intrusive solution able to preserve the architectural features of the interiors.

To minimise any adverse impacts on the significance of the asset, all the existing window's boxes will be retained, so to not to endanger for any reason the brick and masonry works externally and of the plaster inside. As a result, the architectural integrity of the building will remain untouched.

Although we are prioritizing very much the conservation of the architectural features, we know that all buildings, historic or otherwise, were built for people to live in them. This makes their usability of fundamental importance.

The owner of 105 Frognal finds it hard to make his home warm enough to be comfortable, and he confirmed that the single-glazed windows are the main reason to the coldness of his home.

Standard double glazing has visual differences to single glazing (particularly older glazing), in terms both of the flatter glass and thicker astragals and transoms.

This has historically been deemed unsuitable for listed buildings. However, due to increasing pressure to meet carbon emission reduction targets and mitigate the effects of climate change, as well as help combat rising energy costs, we are now able to find on the market double glazed panels which are considerably reduced in thickness and with high performing thermal insulation properties.

As manufacturer, we have consulted CCL Woodworkers Ltd, a privately owned business located in the Hertfordshire village of Bennington, employing 8 highly skilled craftsman each with over 20 years' experience.

They have been chosen for their portfolio and reputation for providing like-for-like bespoke solution in listed building context. The quality of their products is exemplified in their highly skilled people, state of the art machinery and the materials they use to make them.

Some of the jobs with comparable scope they have under taken for clients in Grade II listed buildings are:

- Fulham Palace replacement windows
- 53 Springfield Road Maida Vale Windows
- Ashworth Road Maida Vale Windows/Doors
- Chance Hall Walkern Windows.

Clients' references can be provided on request.

As also unquestionably shown by commissioning such detailed historical report to Penelope Olsen, Mr Moores is very much motivated by a real desire to hand over the building to the future with its entire heritage asset.

He can although confirm that the proposed works, as shown in the architect's drawings, won't cause any harm or loss of significance to the architectural features.

We find, therefore, that our proposal sits within the criteria stated in the National Planning Policy Framework Section 12.

Kind regards

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mauro Dell'Orco', with a stylized, cursive script.

arch. Mauro Dell'Orco