


John Angel
Flat 2
55 Frognal
London NW3 6YA

Camden
Regeneration and Planning Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London, WC1H 8ND

10 April 2014

For the attention of Mr Niall Sheehan



Dear Mr Sheehan,

Reference: PLANNING APPLICATION NO 2014/1616/P

44 Frognal Lane: Proposed conversion of single dwelling into a larger dwelling with a self contained unit, extension and demolition of garage, by Mr. Jonathan Glassberg.

Thank you for offering us an opportunity to express our views on this application. My property is located directly behind the proposed development site and I have examined the plans in detail. I wish to object strongly to the development under the current proposal. I would like to request that Camden Council refuse the planning application by Mr Glassberg. My objections are explained below.

Policy DP2

First of all, in relation to Policy DP2, I would like to point out that the proposal is misleading as it implies a creation of an addition housing unit. In fact, the extension to 44 Frognal Lane already functions as a separate unit, has its own separate entrance, an entry path and a front door (right behind the wall of my rear garden). My impression is that it has been used as a rental property as I've seen (and heard) different people using it in the last 4 years.

Therefore the proposal does nothing to improve the supply of housing in Camden. It merely increases the size (and of course value) of an already substantial luxury property. The enlarged extension is in fact designated to be a nanny's flat, according to the drawings.

Policy DP24

Secondly, the proposal does not meet the requirement to give consideration to the proportions of the existing buildings, scale of neighbouring buildings, topography and trees. According to the proposal, the site is misleadingly defined as "essentially one of fairly remote large houses glimpsed behind wall, trees and hedges".

This is simply not true. The plan of the area clearly shows that the site is already densely built on. In particular, 3 flats in 55 Frogmal are situated less than 8 meters away from the proposed excavation / erection of a much taller dwelling replacing the existing 1 storey extension. The separate bungalow attached to 55 Frogmal is adjacent to the boundary wall where the excavation works would start. 53 Frogmal is also in direct proximity of the construction site. Importantly, for both 55 and 53 Frogmal, west-facing rooms are most quiet in the building, benefiting from the view onto the garden and enjoying afternoon sun.

In fact, the entire proposal is not balanced in the assessment of its impact on surrounding properties. It focuses entirely the view from Frogmal Lane and entirely ignores the severe negative impact to the neighbouring properties on its East and South, including:

a) Structural damage from the ground movement as a result of the extensive excavation

The excavation is proposed to start right at the boundary wall of 55 and 53 Frogmal. For Nr 55, this is 0.5m away from the garden tiled with travertine, with brick / travertine decking against the back wall. The garden was landscaped only 2 years ago. The movement at the base of the excavation is estimated at 10mm, according to the Basement Assessment, extending 3-4 times the excavation depth, i.e. all the way to the wall of 55 Frogmal main building. Ground movement of this scale will cause multiple tile / brickwork cracks, resulting in a direct damage to the property.

Redecoration, masonry work and repointing might be required for the main building as well. This will be disappointing as 55 Frogmal is just about to start expensive external refurbishment works.

b) Significant loss of light to the main bedrooms and the garden due to the construction of a much taller separate unit and a 'cupola' section replacing the existing 1-storey extension at the back of 55-53 Frogmal

Although the height of the proposed 'self-contained dwelling' and the cupola section is not explicitly specified anywhere in the proposal, it is visible from the drawings that it is envisaged to be as high as the top of the tiled roof of the existing extension. The cupola part itself will be even higher, through the drawings selectively omit this detail.

At present, the tiled roof of the extension behind 55-53 Frogmal extends to only ~50% of the rear garden of 55 Frogmal, leaving a considerable gap of ~2.5m that allows sun through (see picture below). Under the proposal, the gap will disappear entirely and the garden of 55 Frogmal will lose all sunlight currently coming from the west. The impact will be drastic for

the small (6m x 8m) garden that has 4 large trees on the south and west borders and already receives little sunlight being enclosed on 3 other sides by the surrounding properties / boundary wall.

c) Obstruction, loss of view and a complete enclosure of 55 Froggnal back side; potential fire safety issues.

The proposal involves extending the footprint of the existing extension all the way to the boundary wall of 55 – 53 Froggnal. This means the tall wall will move 2 meters closer to 55 Froggnal, resulting in 20%+ reduction in the open space between the windows in the main bedrooms and the neighbouring dwelling. In addition to the abovementioned loss of light, this will become overbearing and create a sense of complete enclosure for 55 Froggnal.

Importantly, the access to the back of 55 Froggnal from the street will be lost. This is concerning: in the event of a fire hazard 2 main bedrooms on the ground floor will be completely inaccessible. This is a serious worry for me, particularly as I am a single parent living with 2 children whose bedroom is located at the back of the house.

d) Health hazard from dust and dangerously high level of heavy metals found in the site's soil. Loss of quality of life from being unable to use the garden for a prolonged period time given close proximity of demolition / extensive excavation works.

I am particularly alarmed about the high reading on some toxic metals found on the site, e.g. 447 mg / kg for lead (and even higher maximum readings as per Risk Management Geological Report attached to the proposal). I am concerned that the extent of environmental pollution caused by the project will effectively prevent us from using our garden for the duration of the works and more generally cause a high level of pollution for the area as a whole.

e) Adverse impact on the environment due to loss of trees.

The proposal envisages cutting several deciduous trees at 44 Froggnal Lane, which is a shame. In addition, there will be loss of vegetation in the gardens of 55-53 Froggnal due to loss of light and digging close to the tree roots at the boundary wall.

f) Adverse impact of the proposed features on the character of the neighbourhood and its skyline.

The proposed tall cupola will alter the skyline of our area. Contrary to the report, this feature will be visible from Froggnal Lane and will be directly in front of all


neighbouring properties alongside Froggal. It will have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

To summarise, I request that Camden Council refuse the Planning Applications and encourages Mr Glassberg to make changes to his proposal, taking into consideration the impact on neighbouring properties and on the environment.

I would like to point out that 44 Froggal Lane is a massive plot of perhaps 10,000 square meters. It is difficult to justify the need to extend the already substantial property in every dimension (up, down and depth-wise) in the way outlined the Proposal, causing obstruction, loss of light, loss of vegetation and potential structural damage to so many smaller and more enclosed neighbouring properties.

Specifically, it is hard to explain the rationale for digging the basement directly at the boundaries of the neighbouring properties and pushing the walls all the way to block neighbours' gardens when there is so much space available for this purpose on the other side of the plot where such works would likely cause much fewer risks and concerns for the neighbours and the area as a whole.

If this application is to be decided by councillors, please take this as notice that I would like to speak (work permitting) at the meeting of the committee, at which this application is expected to be decided. Please advise me as soon as possible the date of the meeting.



Comments Form

Name..... MRS ANTONI VEKINIS

Address..... FLAT 1, 53 FROGNAL, NW3 6YA



Planning application number..... 2014/1616/P

Planning application address..... 4A FROGNAL LANE NW3 6PR


I support the application (please state reasons below)

I object to the application (please state reasons below)



Your comments

PLEASE READ ATTACHED LETTER.

A black rectangular redaction box covering a portion of the comments area.

Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8 ND

11th April 2014

Dear Mr Sheehan

**Re: Planning Application Consultation 2014/1616/P
44 Frognal Lane, NW3 6PP**

"Conversion of single dwelling into two self contained dwellings including partial demolition of the front extension and replacement with larger extension incorporating separate dwelling and single story side extension replacement with similar footprint involving demolition of existing single story garage"

Thank you for your letter dated 27th March 2014 regarding the above planning application. Our home is adjacent to the proposed development site, along the East side, and am writing to request that Camden Council refuse this planning application from Jonathan Glassberg of Michael Burroughs Associates.

Before I state my specific objections as to the application, I would like to comment on certain omissions and statements in the Planning Application Consultation Letter, Design and Access and Heritage Statement as well as the Proposed Site Plan.

1. PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION LETTER

The Planning Consultation Letter mentions a single storey side extension but no mention is made of the fact that the proposed side extension is to incorporate a basement which includes a swimming pool. The Application Letter is not a true reflection of the proposed works to 44 Frognal and is misleading.

2. DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT AND HERITAGE STATEMENT

- a) In the Design & Access Statement And Heritage Statement submitted for this application, **Paragraph 1** states that the proposal will involve the splitting of this home into a 'slightly larger extension' and that the single story extension

will be replaced with a 'similar footprint' as well as the 'construction of a basement'.

Looking at the proposed drawings it can be surmised that the proposed drawing shows a large extension and that the single story extension is of a much larger footprint and not of a 'similar footprint'. When mentioning the single storey extension no mention is made of the proposed swimming pool.

- b) Although **Paragraph 2** correctly states that the building is in a Conservation Area it does not identify that it is adjacent to a listed building, 51 Frogнал.
- c) **Paragraph 10** states that 'the photo below shows that the local townscape is essentially one of *fairly remote* large house glimpsed behind wall, trees and hedges'. This area is not at all a "fairly remote" area; it is adjacent to 5 properties.

Looking at the photo it is clear that the 44 Frogнал Lane is in very close proximity to 4 flats in 55 Frogнал, 3 flats in 53 Frogнал as well as 4 flats in 51 Frogнал. In fact, our bedroom wall is just one meter away from the boundary wall; a bungalow on 55 Frogнал is on the boundary wall, as is a listed summer house in 51 Frogнал.

I must also state that the aerial photo does not clearly show the flat roof single storey flat at no 55, which adjoins 44 Frogнал Lane.

- d) According to **Paragraph 12**, the proposal contributes to **Policy DP2** as it maximizes on the supply of housing on sites that are underused. At present, the existing extension is already a separate dwelling with its own private entrance. It therefore has already contributed to the supply of housing and extending it does not improve the housing situation.
- e) **Paragraphs 13** states that according to **DP23**, Conservation Areas should "only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area" and **Paragraph 14** states that according to **DP24** the Council requires that all developments consider "the scale of the neighbouring buildings" when alterations and extension are proposed.

These points have not been taken into consideration with this proposed application. The proposed extension and increase in height of the shared wall will completely obstruct light into the garden of 53 Frogнал. This extremely high separating boundary wall will also add to overbuilding and sense of enclosure.

- f) I must also point out a serious omission. On **page 9** the proposed replacements are shown in red. In the extension on the North/East side the

cupola on top of the new dwelling is completely omitted from the red replacement roof. If comparing this to the **East Elevation of the Proposed Drawing** the cupola is higher than the cables on the roof. This serious omission in the Planning, Design, Access and Significance Appraisal does not give the true visual impact of the building to the neighbouring buildings and is very misleading.

3. PROPOSED SITE PLAN

- a) The **Proposed Basement Plan** shows a large basement that is under a large portion of the front garden. The size of the basement appears to be disproportionate to the size of the host building. It is also against the boundary wall between both 55 and 53 Frogna1. This will require an extensive portion of the garden to be excavated causing loss to trees and flowers as well as extensive excavation to the shared wall between the properties on Frogna1 Lane. Also the excavation would be in extremely close to the main bedroom in Flat 1, 53 Frogna1.
- b) The **Proposed First Floor Plan** shows the cupola on the extension and the flat roof running through the entire North/East perimeter. To achieve this flat roof around the perimeter the boundary wall would have to be raised from the existing height. This added height to the wall will further add to overbuilding and sense of enclosure. This will also have a serious impact on the amount of daylight/sunlight the neighbouring properties will receive. The photo below is of the main bedroom at Flat 1, 53 Frogna1 and its present proximity to an already high wall. The distance between the bedroom and the existing wall is just over 1m.



The photo below is of the main bedroom back window that faces west. This clearly shows its proximity to the shared wall. A higher wall than the existing wall will have a negative impact on the window.



- c) The **Proposed Second Floor Plan** shows how the roof configuration will alter. Particular notice should be taken to the North/East roof. The proposed roof is much closer and nearer to the neighbouring properties. The photos overleaf show the present North/East roof scape from 53 Frognaal. Looking at the proposed roof on the **East Elevation** it is obvious that the proposed roof will be overbearing and have an oppressive effect to neighbouring properties and ours.



- d) The **Proposed Elevations/2 East Elevation** shows the proposed new roofs as well as the cupola and the cables and the extension to the boundary wall. Compared to the Existing East Elevation a much smaller area is left open to allow sun light through. The photograph below shows the existing extension

from the back garden of 53 Froggnal.



Below is the same aspect from the lounge of Flat 1, 53 Froggnal. The proposed higher wall will block out the sunlight in both the windows below and the north facing patio window of the main bedroom.



- e) The **Front Elevation** for both the existing and the proposed have omitted the windows in Flat 2 of 53 Froggnal. This is a serious omission as it does not give a true reflection of the impact this application will have on Flat 2, 53 Froggnal.

The photo below depicts the windows in Flat 2, 53 Froggnal as well as the main bedroom extension and lounge patio doors of Flat 1.



OBJECTIONS

I wish to object strongly to the proposed application and I herewith submit my objections which are:

1. By omitting mention of the proposed work to the basement, the **Application Work Notice letter** is in no way a true reflection of the proposed work.
2. Inaccuracies and Omissions of the cupola in the **Design & Access Statement And Heritage Statement** and the window aspect of Flat 2, 53 Froggnal in the **Front Elevation** for both the existing and the proposed plans
3. The proposed, extremely large basement takes up a disproportionate portion of the garden and evidence shows that it can disrupt the local water table and drainage, as well as cause serious damage to nearby properties, risk to environment and risk to trees.
4. Unacceptably high density and overdevelopment of the site, especially as it involves loss of garden land and the open aspect of the neighbourhood as well as the roof scape in a Conservation Area.
5. Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of overcrowding, overshadowing and loss of light.
6. Effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood.
7. The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners.

8. The adverse effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
9. The development on the setting of the Listed Building at 51 Frognaal.
10. Adverse impact on trees and greenery.

Therefore, we request that Camden Council refuse this Planning Application and encourage Mr Glassberg to resubmit a building design that is smaller, less intrusive on neighbouring properties, and more sensitive to the character of the area.

If this application is to be decided by councilors, please take this as notice that I would like to speak at the meeting of the committee at which this application is expected to be decided. Please let me know the date of the meeting.

Should you require any additional information, clarification of any comments made, or would like to arrange a visit to our home; do not hesitate to contact me on 020 7794 8590 or 07957 324 140.

Yours Sincerely,



A Black
Flat 3
55 Frognal
London NW3 6YA



Camden
Regeneration and Planning Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London, WC1H 8ND

14 April 2014

For the attention of Mr Niall Sheehan

Dear Mr Sheehan,

Reference: PLANNING APPLICATION NO 2014/1616/P

44 Frognal Lane: Proposed conversion of single dwelling into a larger dwelling with a self contained unit, extension and demolition of garage, by Mr. Jonathan Glassberg.

I would like to register my **objection** to this planning application and hope that the council will turn down this application due to the serious concerns raised in this letter. My property is located directly behind the proposed development site and I have examined the plans in detail. I outline my objections below.

Policy DP2

The proposal refers to maximising housing units in the area, in relation to Policy DP2. This is misleading, as this building already functions as a separate unit, with its own separate entrance, an entry path and a front door (right behind the wall of my building 55 Frognal).

It is misleading to purport that this proposal does anything to improve the supply of housing in Camden. It does however, increase the size (and of course value) of an already substantial luxury property creating a huge basement footprint.

Policy DP24

The proposal does not meet the requirement to give consideration to the proportions of the existing buildings, scale of neighbouring buildings, topography and trees. According

to the proposal, the site is defined as "essentially one of fairly remote large houses glimpsed behind wall, trees and hedges". This is simply not true.

The plan of the area clearly shows that the site is already densely built, the building at 55 Frogmal is situated less than 8 meters away from the proposed excavation / erection of a much taller dwelling replacing the existing 1 storey extension. The separate bungalow attached to 55 Frogmal is adjacent to the boundary wall where the excavation works would start. 53 Frogmal is also in direct proximity of the construction site. Importantly, for both 55 and 53 Frogmal, west-facing rooms are most quiet in the building, benefiting from enjoyment of a sunlit garden and all flats in these property having the benefit of vistas over west London and afternoon sun.

Adverse impact of the proposed features on the character of the neighbourhood and its skyline.

The proposal creates unacceptably high density and leads to the overdevelopment of the site, especially as it involves loss of garden land and the open aspect of the neighbourhood as well as the roof scape in a Conservation Area.

I find the proposal both misleading and inaccurate in its portrayal of the assessment of the impact of the proposed works on surrounding properties. It focuses entirely the view from Frogmal Lane and entirely ignores the severe negative impact to the neighbouring properties on its East and South. The proposed tall cupola will alter the skyline of our area. Contrary to the report, this feature will be visible from Frogmal Lane and will be directly in front of all neighbouring properties alongside Frogmal. It will have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Significant loss of light to adjacent buildings and adverse effect on neighbourhood amenities due to the construction of a much taller separate unit and a 'cupola' section replacing the existing 1-storey extension at the back of 55-53 Frogmal

At present, the tiled roof of the extension at 44 Frogmal Lane extends to only c.50% of the rear garden of 55 Frogmal, leaving a considerable gap of c.2.5m that give sun exposure to the garden. Under the proposal, the gap will disappear entirely and the garden of 55 Frogmal will lose all sunlight currently coming from the west. I consider this to be of major impact the building at 55 Frogmal, whose value and enjoyment will be adversely affected by this huge intrusion, by reason of overshadowing and loss of light. The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners.

Although the height of the proposed 'self-contained dwelling' and the cupola section is not explicitly specified anywhere in the proposal, it is visible from the drawings that it is envisaged to be as high as the top of the tiled roof of the existing extension. The cupola part itself will be even higher, through the drawings selectively omit this detail.

Obstruction, loss of view and a complete enclosure of 55 Frognal back side; potential fire safety issues.

The proposal involves extending the footprint of the existing extension all the way to the boundary wall of 55 – 53 Frognal. This means the tall wall will move 2 meters closer to 55 Frognal. In addition to the abovementioned loss of light, this will become overbearing and create a sense of complete enclosure for 55 Frognal.

Importantly, the access to the back of 55 Frognal from the street will be lost. This is concerning: in the event of a fire hazard 2 main bedrooms on the ground floor will be completely inaccessible.

Again, the impact for all flats is considerable in curtailing views and ultimately much reducing the benefit and value drawn from the views and perimeter of the property. By contrast, 44 Frognal Lane property which is already large will become even larger, encroaching on neighbouring properties.

Structural damage from the ground movement as a result of the extensive excavation

The excavation is proposed to start right at the boundary wall of 55 and 53 Frognal. For 55 Frognal, this is 0.5m away from the garden flat, which is tiled and with a brick wall. The movement at the base of the excavation is estimated at 10mm, according to the Basement Assessment, extending 3-4 times the excavation depth, i.e. all the way to the wall of 55 Frognal main building. Ground movement of this scale will cause multiple tile, brickwork building cracks, and beyond that create more subsidence affecting the entire building, resulting in a direct damage to these buildings. There is already evidence of ground movement, which has been the result of heavy excavation work in Frognal Way.

Health hazard from dust and dangerously high level of heavy metals found in the site's soil. Loss of quality of life from being unable to use the garden for a prolonged period time given close proximity of demolition / extensive excavation works.

I am alarmed about the high reading on some toxic metals found on the site, e.g. 447 mg / kg for lead (and even higher maximum readings as per Risk Management Geological Report attached to the proposal). I am concerned that the extent of environmental pollution caused by the project for the duration of the works and more generally cause a high level of pollution for the area as a whole. This area, and our building in particular, are home to families with young children, which would be adversely affected by the environmental changes noted above.


Adverse impact on the environment due to loss of trees.

The extremely large basement takes up a disproportionate portion of the garden and can disrupt the local water table and drainage and can cause serious damage to nearby properties, risk to environment and risk to trees. The proposal envisages cutting several deciduous trees at 44 Frogmal Lane, which is a shame. In addition, there will be loss of vegetation in the gardens of 55-53 Frogmal Lane due to loss of light and digging close to the tree roots at the boundary wall.

In conclusion, I hope that Camden Council will **refuse** the Planning Application and will encourage Mr Glassberg to make changes to his proposal, taking into consideration the impact on neighbouring properties and on the environment by reducing the scale of his proposal. It strikes me that 44 Frogmal Lane is a large plot of land and that this application seeks to extend the footprint of an already substantial property by developing it height, and depth wise, causing obstruction, loss of light, loss of vegetation and potential structural damage to many neighbouring properties. This feels absolutely out of proportion.

The Council must preserve the amenities and features of the area, this is an important role for the Council, who currently seek reappointment – residents will want to see real notice of their concerns at this time.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A Black', with a long horizontal flourish underneath.

A Black

M: 0797 0912 797

E: aliceblack.mail@gmail.com