

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2026/P	Jan Hildebrand	51 Frognal London NW3 6YA	29/04/2015 18:05:35	OBJ	I object to this planning application due to it's inappropriate scale and mass to increase its floor space by 450% with huge basement close to underground river sources; heritage loss of a well-loved listed building and 2 years of local disruption.
2015/2026/P	Jan Hildebrand	51 Frognal London NW3 6YA	29/04/2015 18:06:05	OBJ	
2015/2026/P	M Orwell	31 Frognal	30/04/2015 13:13:13	COMMNT	Further to my objection I understand this application may be dealt with under delegated powers. I do not think this is acceptable for an application of this scale and nature and therefore request the chance to speak at committee
2015/2026/P	Neal Menashe	26 Ellerdale Road NW3 6BB	01/05/2015 17:20:21	COMMNT	<p>Dear Zenab,</p> <p>After reviewing the planning application for 41 Frognal, we would like to express our support for the proposal.</p> <p>As local residents, we take an interest in the immediate area. We feel that the proposal offers a sympathetic approach to the local setting, and the scale and design of the extension is appropriate to the location.</p> <p>It is positive to see that the existing building and landscape will be preserved, along with the attractive front garden.</p> <p>Further to this, after reviewing the construction management plan, it is encouraging to see that any potential disruption of construction and traffic on the neighbourhood, in particular the school opposite has been carefully considered.</p> <p>To summarise, we believe the proposal would be an improvement to the existing site, and examples such as this should be supported by Camden.</p>
2015/2026/P	Brian Susskind	30 Ellerdale Road London NW3 6BB NW3 6BB	01/05/2015 17:19:04	COMMNT	<p>I wish to confirm my support for the proposal and have seen the planning application for 41 Frognal.</p> <p>I overlook the site and my wife and I take are involved with the local area. The proposal offers a sensitive design and fits in well with the surrounding buildings. It is good that the existing building and landscape will be revitalised.</p> <p>It appears that the CMP properly addresses the traffic issues and we welcome the renewal of this site which sorely needs it.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2026/P	Nigel Carrington	21 Frogna Lane Hampstead London NW3 7DB	30/04/2015 14:21:41	OBJ	The existing property is a special 'locally listed' residential property on a very special and beautiful site. I understand that the proposed redevelopment will create a property with a floor space of more than 4 times the existing property and includes a large basement close to underground river sources. I oppose this application on the grounds that it will involve years of disruption for local residents, a disproportionately large residential building, the usual risks regarding basements and the loss of a much loved locally listed property on a distinctive leafy plot which is famous for its wild flower seedings.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2026/P	Ben Watt	1 Frognal Close	29/04/2015 20:22:08	OBJ	Dear Ms Haji-Ismail

Please find enclosed our comments dated 29 April 2015 re Application Ref 2015/2026/P lodged for 41 Frognal NW3 6YD. They are to be read in concert with the overarching comments (to be) submitted by MDA Planning on behalf of owner/occupiers in Frognal Close.

Here are our own additional personal views.

We OBJECT to the application on the following grounds:

1. Lack of meaningful consultation:

Camden's Zenab Haji-Ismail wrote to Chris Deeks of DP9 (the planning consultants and applicant) on 17.2.15 among other things stressing THREE times the need for local consultation:
 'We would advise entering into consultation with local residents and the Redington and Frognal CAAC at this stage, in order to fully understand and address their concerns before an application is made'
 'You are strongly encouraged to engage with neighbouring occupiers, the neighbourhood groups (Hampstead and Churchrow and Perrins Walk) and CAAC at an early stage in the process, given the likely concerns residents will have with the comings and goings of construction / delivery vehicles particularly if a demolition and excavation of basements construction are proposed. Although adjoining occupiers will be notified of any application by us, initial consultation may help offset any concerns neighbours have before any application is submitted.'
 'Again, we strongly recommend that you consult the neighbourhood groups, CAAC and adjoining neighbours at an early stage given the history of the site and concerns expressed by neighbourhood groups.'

No such early consultation was made. All we received was a scant one-page letter from the applicant dated 18.3.15, but not arriving until 23.3.15, a mere ten days before the application was submitted. The letter presented a water-colour of the proposed house plus a brief description and invited comments but there was no hint of the scale or complexity of the project, nor any time for a meaningful response.

Furthermore, since the application was submitted on April 2 - carefully chosen perhaps to coincide with the time-consuming distractions of Easter bank holiday weekend - at least one adjoining neighbour, and another in Frognal Close, have still not received consultation letters as promised from Camden. Ours was only received on 13 April, eleven days after submission of the application. Nor have Camden as yet posted any lamp post notifications in the area. Anxious word of mouth has spread in the past few days, but in general this seems extremely unfair process, and gives the impression of disregard for local residents' opinions before a deeply invasive scheme is given full voice.

2. Heritage:

We support in full the comments (to be) submitted by MDA Planning on behalf of owner/occupiers in Frognal Close on this topic. It would seem not only is 41 Frognal itself deemed of particular

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

architectural note but the whole cluster of buildings from 39 Frognal to Frognal Close is unique. The planning proposal alters this relationship completely particularly in terms of scale, inappropriate massing, inappropriate relationship to neighbouring properties, loss of original features and lost historical interest. All these run counter to large sections of Camden's local conservation policy. Most notably Camden's Redington and Frognal Conservation statement says: 'The Council will seek the retention of those buildings considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the area.' 41 Frognal is a noted contributor. The proposal claims to be 'refurbishing' the existing house. In reality, apart from the façade, it appears most of of Flinder's beautifully proportioned 1968 house - noted in Pevsner's Building of England - is to be demolished, replaced or built upon.

3. Scale:

We support in full the comments (to be) submitted by MDA Planning on behalf of owner/occupiers in Frognal Close on this topic. The additional massing - from 4.5k sq ft to 20.5k sq ft, an increase in 450% - cuts into and bolts onto to the original design and alters it beyond recognition radically changing its original humble and elegant design of sweeping horizontal lines. The proposed new upper story significantly alters the form, character and symmetry of the house. The house's existing low Prairie-style ground-hugging design is one of its most appealing characteristics when seen in long view from the street. The application makes continual coy reference to the creation of a 'modern family home with a single-story basement' and 'a home for a young family and their young children'; the house at 4.5k sq feet is already bigger than many of the family homes in the vicinity. Enlarging by 450% to 20.5k sq ft seems beyond excessive in a neighbourhood and conservation area of more modest domestic proportions. The modestly described 'single-story basement' is in fact a large complex of cinema rooms, underground swimming pool, gym, sauna and steam room extending well beyond the curtilage of the original house.

4. Loss of amenity:

The scale of the works, if approved, will involve serious disruption for two years including vast excavation, underpinning, drilling, lorries, skips, and huge tipper trucks four times per day collecting 5.25k cubic square feet of waste and spoil, which is modestly referred to as 'a robust amount'. Both my wife and I are professional self-employed writers and recording artists. We work largely from home. The access road where the lorries will arrive and reverse will be - according to the drawings - only two metres from our workspace, the full length of which runs immediately behind the boundary wall between our two properties. It is where we write, rehearse and often record. This will be impossible during working hours for anything up to two years. Furthermore, dust will inevitably blow through the air bricks and extractors on the boundary wall and through the skylight used for ventilation jeopardising computers and other valuable electronic and musical equipment. It is an understatement to say our lives and livelihood will be seriously compromised by the proposed works. I am not against local re-development and refurbishment per se - we have all refurbished homes - but development on this scale seems particularly anti-social and beyond what one might expect from domestic alterations for a 'a home for a young family and their young children'. Development Policy 26 (DP26) references noise and vibration by stating; "The Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity.”

5. Subsidence and movement:

Nos 1 and 2 Frogna Close are Grade II listed. Both already suffer from uneven floors and internal cracking. Are the planning officers confident the disruptions caused by the excavation and vibrations, and in particular the long-term arrival and departure of heavily-laden tipper trucks so close to the boundary wall, will seriously not jeopardise the structure of these two Ernst Freud houses, protected in large part for their unique brickwork and elevations. Furthermore, in spite of its scope and broadly upbeat conclusions, the Basement Impact Assessment draws attention to risks such as unknowable future heave and further groundwater issues from nearby underground rivers with 100m of the site, and accepts conclusions have currently been drawn from only two small exploratory bore holes drilled on the site, one of which was drilled well away from the house only a few metres from the dwarf wall on the boundary to Frogna. Is this adequate sampling from which to draw such confident conclusions?

6. Screening / Overlooking:

We support in full the comments (to be) submitted by MDA Planning on behalf of owner/occupiers in Frogna Close on this topic. The entire new top floor will overlook our bedrooms, bathrooms and back garden, significantly invading privacy, while cutting out autumn and winter sunlight.

7. Trees and Wildlife

The BIA states: “Trees will be felled during the development. It is likely that a number of trees will be felled during the proposed development and a number of trees have already been felled.” The site has already lost a number of trees, all habitats for local wildlife. In the absence of tree protection orders, what is being done to protect further casual felling? Furthermore, it is suggested that the large plane tree between 2 Frogna Close and the new development would have its crown lifted to 6 metres thereby removing the very screening the proposal claims to retain. Owls are a regular night time feature in the planes trees between the properties. Only this evening a female sparrow hawk was spotted on one of the very branches of the plane tree to be lifted. What has been done to assess the impact on these and other wildlife?

8. Acoustics:

In my capacity as a recording artist and studio producer I am concerned about the science in the acoustic report provided in the application and the threat to ambient noise to houses in Frogna Close after completion. Even if the calculations are accurate - and without the time to recalculate at this stage given the scant consultation time we have been given - I deem the leeway for error extremely tight and the conclusions very optimistic. The report’s conclusions are based on equipment being meticulously installed and rigorously maintained. Furthermore, issues of phasing are commonplace between these kind of units which could cause significant upping of low frequency sound levels, something that isn’t addressed in the acoustic report. A conversation with leading London recording engineer, Crispin

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Guilde, confirmed my fears. Phasing was 'likely', he said. To add further weight to my suspicions, I decided to approach Jochen Veith, a top acoustics engineer recommended to me through Abbey Road Studios, and ask his opinion on the report. Based on the information available - and in the absence of newly measured data through severe time constraints - he drew the following conclusions, which re-inforce my concerns about margins of error. (See APPENDIX below). All in all, it seems to me the planning proposal is asking for an excessive amount of competing industrial-standard HVAC units in a quiet domestic conservation area that could very easily and quickly become a long-term nuisance to the rear elevations of houses on the south side of Froggnal Close.</p> <p>9: Increase in use of land:</p> <p>We support in full the comments (to be) submitted by MDA Planning on behalf of owner/occupiers in Froggnal Close on this topic.</p> <p>10. Traffic</p> <p>In 2011 I wrote to councillor Chris Knight regarding near fatalities on the zebra crossing immediately outside 41 Froggnal. He subsequently alerted colleagues from Traffic Engineering and Parking and I received further correspondence from Simi Shah (Design Team Manager in Environment and Transport, Camden Council). It can be an extremely dangerous pinch-point when downhill city-bound traffic, school traffic, local traffic and school pedestrians converge. I have witnessed several near misses on the crossing itself as irate drivers overtake cars loitering on the white zig-zags. 41 Froggnal is within the zig-zags with poor sightlines to the south. Increased heavy traffic to and from the site will only make matters worse. Furthermore, the applicant's motion report suggest tipper trucks will arrive outside school-run hours via Arkwright Road. The junction at Froggnal and Arkwright Road is a tight crossroads. Left-angled uphill turns into Froggnal are not easy even in a car, and the road next to the junction outside UCS is also often impeded by a phalanx of school coaches parked up on yellow lines encroaching into the highway DURING school hours. Wide-turning lorries will cause major congestion, even bottlenecks. The immediate neighbourhood is simply unsuited to the proposed traffic impact.</p> <p>Final comments:</p> <p>We trust these objections will be fully considered and assessed in the light of Camden's stated relevant policy, and in concert with the overarching comments provided by MDA Planning on our behalf. In spite of the council's urging, the applicant appears to have excluded locals from the debate until the eleventh hour to deter objections, while it would seem Camden itself has not fully informed the local public of the lodging of such a major application. In the meantime we have watched a neighbouring protected house fall into a two-year state of neglect to lend weight to a case for redevelopment.</p> <p>To re-iterate, we are not against refurbishment per se, simply demolition and redevelopment that masquerades as refurbishment - particularly on such a gargantuan, neighbour-snubbing and anti-social scale - while simultaneously threatening well-documented safeguarded and listed houses in a noted</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**
conservation area.

Yours sincerely

APPENDIX

Comments from email from:

Jochen Veith
jv-acoustics
Audio & Acoustic Consulting
Münchner Straße 22,
85649 Brunnthal bei München.

“In Table 6.1 they display background noise measurement values for daytime, evening and night time and here always as an average level and an lowest/median LA90 level. Here it could be important to notice, that they marked the lowest LA90 level in the evening (36dB) as an anomaly, and the median level (41dB)” shall be taken”. These values lead to the recommended or proposed noise limits for daytime, evening and nighttime in table 7.01. They are 5dB lower than the measured LA90 noise levels of table 6.1 due to the recommendations of the NPSE/NPPF for NOAEL – Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level. NOEL – No observed Effect Level would be -10dB. In other words, they set the planning criteria for the units 5dB below the background noise level LA90.

In the following they explain that they had to convert the given data from the spec sheet of the Carolex Pool AHU from sound pressure levels (in 3m distance) to sound power levels in the ducts. These are approximate levels with the possibility of uncertainties (7.06). They further explain, that calculated expected values of the units in table 7.2 are based on stated attenuators for these units (see 7.07 and 7.09).

The crucial table is table 7.3 (marked as table 7.2 due to the fact that table 7.2 is marked as 7.1 once

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

again). Here the comparison between the predicted noise level of the operating plants is compared to the planning criteria, which is given at 5dB below the environmental noise floor during day, evening and night (see also above). It is shown that during daytime the predicted noise level of the plants is 3dB below the planning criteria and during evening and night time it matches the planning criteria. The following has to be kept in mind regarding these results:

- Tolerances of the units are not taken into account (my experience is, that from time to time units exceed their spec values).
 - It is assumed, that some of the units are switched off during night. If this will match reality is not known.
 - Reflections from other buildings are not taken into account.
 - The noise level measurements took place on a weekday not during a weekend or holidays. During the weekend or holidays the environmental noise levels could be lower.
 - It is not known, if the correction of the noise level for the evening time (+5dB higher) is realistic. Especially during the weekend and on holidays this may not be realistic.
 - The values of the Carolex Pool AHU have an uncertainty due to the conversion of the given data.
 - Wind is not taken into account.
 - There is no reserve of a few dBs
 - It is absolutely crucial, that the attenuators are properly placed and built.”
-

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2026/P	Nancy Mayo	Redington Frogmal Conservation Neighbourhood Forum	30/04/2015 13:29:14	OBJ	<p>Redington Frogmal Conservation Neighbourhood Forum would like to register an objection to the above proposal for a two to three storey rear and side extension and the creation of an additional self-contained dwelling at 41 Frogmal.</p> <p>We consider that the proposed increase in floorspace and hard surface would be harmful to the Redington Frogmal Conservation Area in a number of ways.</p> <p>The current low-built house is unobtrusive from Frogmal and is harmonious with its neighbours in Frogmal Close. Its setting forms a very important positive contribution to the Frogmal streetscape.</p> <p>The proposed rear and side extensions and the addition of a third storey would be highly damaging to the street scene from both Frogmal and Frogmal Close and would cause shading and loss of light and privacy to the gardens of neighbouring properties in Frogmal Close.</p> <p>We object to the proposed fellings of mature trees, purely to make way for the development, on this important bat and owl corridor. We consider it essential that a Phase 1 Habitat Survey is conducted prior to commencing any work on this sensitive site.</p> <p>The extent of the loss of soft surface is unnecessary and unacceptable, due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the side and rear extensions • the garage and extravagant space for car parking, i.e. over and above the present arrangement and notwithstanding the addition of a proposed garage. Two parking spaces should be more than sufficient and could be parked on soft surface • the excavation of a basement, which extends excessively beyond the footprint of the existing house, plus the attendant light wells. <p>We also object to the light pollution which would be created in this environmentally sensitive area, and its adverse impact on birds and bats.</p> <p>Gaps between properties are a key feature of the Redington Frogmal Conservation Area and it is essential that gaps be maintained. This proposal does not respect this important Design Guideline.</p> <p>The existing house by Alexander Flinders is harmonious with the neighbouring properties by Ernest L. Freud in Frogmal Close. The bulk, massing and design of the current proposals are inappropriate in relation to the neighbouring properties and constitute a severe over-development of the site. The building will be highly visible from Frogmal during the winter months, when the deciduous trees are not in leaf.</p> <p>Furthermore, we disagree with a number of assertions on pages 13-15 of the Basement Impact Assessment:</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>3.1.1, question 2 and 4.1. We estimate that the basement is about 50 metres distant from the eastern tributary to the underground River Westbourne, which flows down Frognaal by the willow trees at University College School</p> <p>3.1.3. Question 6. The area is known to be at risk of flooding. Flooding has previously occurred in Arkwright Road and at University College School.</p> <p>Nancy Mayo</p> <p>Secretary</p> <p>Redington Frognaal Conservation Neighbourhood Forum</p>
2015/2026/P	Mr A.Suchy	33 Frognaal London Nw3 6yd	29/04/2015 16:47:46	OBJ	<p>I object to this application on three main grounds..</p> <p>First. The size of the basement reconstruction will entail the removal of very large amounts of soil etc in large trucks over a period of up to 2 years. This will have a substantial effect on an already crowded road. Noise, nuisance mess being side effects. Second. I am very concerned that in a road which historically had a number of streams running through that this application may affect the water table of houses below No 41, including our house.</p> <p>Third. Our house and a number of other houses in this part of Frognaal are Victorian and I am very concerned of the possible effect of substantial substrata building works on the structural integrity of our house. I should just stress that I have no objections to works being done to improve No41. It is the substantial nature of the works and in particular the basement works which seems far in excess of what is reasonable having regard to the urban location of the site and the likely environmental impact for a prolonged period on the neighbourhood that I object to.</p> <p>Q</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2026/P	Natasha and Jez San	22 Frogna Way London nw3 6xe	06/05/2015 14:14:21	SUPPRT	<p>Application No: 2015/2026/P Case Officer: Zenab Haji-Ismael</p> <p>Dear Ms Haji-Ismael</p> <p>As owners of 22 Frogna Way, we are writing to you in support of the application at 41 Frogna.</p> <p>We have viewed the proposed design and relevant documents online, and welcome regeneration projects such as this on a site that is sorely in need of renewal.</p> <p>I believe that this regeneration will be assisted by the proposed new landscaping of the site. I was also pleased to see that the construction traffic has been structured to avoid peak school drop-offs and pick-ups.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Natasha and Jez San OBE</p>
2015/2026/P	Brian Susskind	30 Ellerdale Road London NW3 6BB NW3 6BB	01/05/2015 17:19:26	COMMNT	<p>I wish to confirm my support for the proposal and have seen the planning application for 41 Frogna.</p> <p>I overlook the site and my wife and I take are involved with the local area. The proposal offers a sensitive design and fits in well with the surrounding buildings. It is good that the existing building and landscape will be revitalised.</p> <p>It appears that the CMP properly addresses the traffic issues and we welcome the renewal of this site which sorely needs it.</p>