

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3530/P	Nick Simons	1a Gardnor Mansions Church Row London nw3 6ur	02/08/2015 12:05:42	SUPPRT	<p>I'd like to show my support for the application to build a replacement house in Froggnal Way as I believe it is better to redevelop the house than to allow the existing 'ruin' to continue rotting.</p> <p>My flat is in Church Row, an old street containing many beautiful listed buildings and Froggnal Way is a new street containing modern individual houses - Number 22 sets a low bar and it's a shame we have to look at this ugly 1970's building every day. It was never a good looking house when it was built and now that its derelict and in disrepair, its a blight on this part of Froggnal Way and is in need of renewal to bring it up to the quality of the other houses in Froggnal Way.</p> <p>This planning application offers a high quality thoughtful design that respects and integrates into the landscape and will be a marked improvement to the public views from Church Row and the foot path that connects us to Froggnal Way.</p> <p>Please add my support for this application.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Nick Simons Church Row</p>
2015/3530/P	(Mrs) Lin Cook	24 Perrins Walk Hampstead London NW3 6TH	04/08/2015 12:13:09	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms Haji-Ismael</p> <p>Application 2015/3530/P Re 22 Froggnal Way</p> <p>I have lived in Perrins Walk since 1982, and know and love the surrounding area. I am writing to object to the above planning application to demolish an existing building and replace it with a massive 19,600 square foot seven-bedroom mansion! In my opinion the current building makes a positive contribution to my local area. No sensible reasons for its demolition have been given. I know that the developers have done their best to destroy the building; this is unacceptable and they should be forced to re-instate it.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>(Mrs) Lin Cook 24 Perrins Walk London NW3 6TH</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3530/P	Hilton Nathanson	16 Church Row	03/08/2015 15:47:25	OBJ	3rd August 2015

Dear Ms Haji-Ismail

I am writing to object to Application 2015/3530/P The demolition of 22 Froggnal Way, and the construction of new house within the site, which is not in keeping with the local area and the size will of which will be out of character with the conservation area. The grounds for my objections are:

- The current building makes a positive contribution to the local conservation area and it should not be demolished
- No.22 Froggnal Way is a locally important building (a non-designated heritage asset as defined by the NPPF) that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area and the settings of listed buildings. Its demolition would mean the complete loss of its heritage significance and harm both the character and appearance of the conservation area and the settings of listed buildings.

Yours sincerely

Hilton Nathanson

2015/3530/P	sarah wilson	17 Broomsleigh Street west hampstead NW6 1QQ	06/08/2015 10:40:30	OBJ	Objection and request to suspend the consultation process until ALL the necessary notices and consultations with neighbours are fulfilled. Namely that St John at Hampstead Church which stands as a Grade I listed building and Graveyard, from which photographs for the application were taken, has not been included in the consultation process. The subject planning approval and all subsequent applications directly affect the setting of this important and historical site. I would ask that the London Diocese be informed about this application immediately, in addition Fthr Stephen and the Churches Wardens. After being provided with a complete file of information, the appropriate church officers must be given adequate time to respond in full to such an application.
2015/3530/P	Deborah Davis	27 Church Row London NW3 6UP	03/08/2015 23:14:45	OBJLETTE R	<p>The proposed dwelling would, by reason of its bulk and size, be an overly dominant feature to the detriment of the appearance of the immediate street scene. It would be contrary to Camden's local development policy.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling would, by reason of its external appearance, detailed design and materials, be detrimental to the appearance of the immediate street scene. It would be contrary to Camden's local development policy.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling would be out of context with the character of the Conservation Area, and would also be visible and impact adversely on the setting of nearby Grade II * listed buildings.</p> <p>The current building makes a positive contribution to the local conservation area and it should not be demolished.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3530/P	Mark Goodman	21 Perrins Walk Hampstead NW3 6TH NW3 6TH NW3 6TH	02/08/2015 13:47:35	SUPC	<p>The proposed scheme should be supported for the following reasons:</p> <p>the existing building has been in a largely derelict state for many years and is an eyesore of little, if any merit and should not be considered a positive contributor to the area</p> <p>the applicant is a family man with a large family and he is infinitely better than a commercial developer who will almost certainly seek a more elaborate and intrusive scheme; as far as I am aware, the applicant has the means to complete the proposal to a very high standard</p> <p>the height of the proposed development is not in any way materially higher than the existing and does not prejudice listed views</p> <p>the appearance of the new development has been sensitively accompanied by thorough landscaping with most within a metre of soil and is thus sustainable</p> <p>as far as Perrins walk is concerned, the nearest part of the new development is about 7 metres away and this is sufficient not to prejudice the character of Perrins Walk or 20 Perrins Walk</p> <p>the plant room/services plant area is located away from where it might effect neighbours</p> <p>bearing in mind the total area of land owned by the applicant, this would not appear to be overdevelopment</p> <p>My support is conditional upon hydrological surveys showing that surrounding properties will not be adversely effected, upon the landscaping being secured and no height increases permitted to the proposal, nor further extension of the formoutwards towards neighbours</p> <p>Mark Goodman</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3530/P	sarah wilson	17 Broomsleigh Street west hampstead NW6 1QQ	04/08/2015 13:18:15	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to The demolition of 22 Frogna Way, and the construction of new house within the site and the adjoining site known as 22 Perrins Walk. The new proposal is considerably larger in scale and massing than the existing development which has been submitted on the false pretence of the site being the whole site and not including land within the curtilage of no 22 Perrins Walk, which it clearly does. In doing so the application is falsely representing the true density of the proposal, which is not in keeping with the local area and the size of which will be out of character with the conversation area. It has already been established that increasing the footprint of buildings on the site at 22 Perrins Walk should be resisted - in essence this is exactly the same and flies in the face of that report.</p> <p>The proposal is also within site and has impact upon the Grade I listed Church and grounds, whom I don't believe have been consulted with. Any development within the surroundings of such an important building and site should be given particular attention to both English Heritage and the owners of those buildings. In addition the scale of the proposed basement element of this development can only be detrimental to the surrounding listed buildings which once damaged, represent losses to the entire community and beyond at National level.Church Row is considered one of the most significant early 18th century intact streets in existence and should be protected at all costs.</p> <p>The proposal for development at .22 Frogna Way does not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area and the settings of listed buildings.</p>
2015/3530/P	Mrs R I I Taube	15 Church Row NW3 6UP	05/08/2015 11:23:22	OBJLETTE R	I most strongly object to this application as the demolition of the current building & the proposed new build being some 6 times larger is totally inappropriate as well as not in keeping with the local conservation area.
2015/3530/P	Ian Angus	20 Church Row London	06/08/2015 16:28:56	COMMNT	This huge building which incorporates an entertainment complex is about six times larger than the current building and is of an inappropriate increase in size and bulk to the original building. I ask that the committee refuse planning permission
2015/3530/P	Claude Steele	32 Flask Walk Hampstead London NW3 1HE	02/08/2015 15:10:36	SUPPRT	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I wish to add my support to the construction of a new building at the site of 22 Frogna Way. The current building is a blight on the local area and the proposed house seems to be far more sympathetic to the local area. The derelict nature of the current site also risks attracting vandals and undesirable activity. I fully support this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3530/P	Sarah Millhouse	5 Glenmore Road	04/08/2015 14:01:22	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms Haji-Ismail</p> <p>I am writing to object to the planning application for 22 Frognal Way, I grew up in the local area and feel a real attachment to it. The house as it stands is part of the eclectic mix of housing there is locally, replacing it with a house over 4 times the size with a massive basement would impact the whole ecology of the surrounding area.</p> <p>While the original house may not be to everyone's taste this is not a reason to demolish it and replace it with a 'in trend' eco house, there is nothing eco about excavating for 36 weeks and then filling with thousands of tonnes of concrete, not to mention the extra strain on a very busy local traffic network the construction traffic would add.</p> <p>The new house will not make a positive contribution to the local area and while it is within a conservation area any planning must make a positive contribution to the local area.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Sarah Millhouse</p>
2015/3530/P	(Mrs) Lin Cook	24 Perrins Walk Hampstead London NW3 6TH	04/08/2015 12:13:08	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms Haji-Ismail</p> <p>Application 2015/3530/P Re 22 Frognal Way</p> <p>I have lived in Perrins Walk since 1982, and know and love the surrounding area. I am writing to object to the above planning application to demolish an existing building and replace it with a massive 19,600 square foot seven-bedroom mansion! In my opinion the current building makes a positive contribution to my local area. No sensible reasons for its demolition have been given. I know that the developers have done their best to destroy the building; this is unacceptable and they should be forced to re-instate it.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>(Mrs) Lin Cook 24 Perrins Walk London NW3 6TH</p>
2015/3530/P	Lucy fitzpatrick	18 Frognal way	02/08/2015 14:19:51	NOBJ	<p>I am in support of the present planning application of the above house. It will be a pleasure to see the derelict house being redeveloped in to a single family residence after such a period of time.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3530/P	Anthony Michaels	Flat Two 9 Prince Arthur Road London NW3 6AX	02/08/2015 14:28:56	SUPPRT	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>Planning application 2015/3530/P should be supported to build a replacement house at 22 Frognal Way NW3 6XE.</p> <p>I live just over 100m away on the corner of Ellerdale Road and Prince Arthur Road.</p> <p>This planning application benefits the Hampstead conservation area by providing a modern high quality design to replace the low quality dilapidated house that has had a negative impact on the area for a few years.</p> <p>The proposed house is low built, discreet and well designed. Please consider my support for the application as Frognal Way will benefit from the renewal of this property and the surrounding streets that overlook it will also benefit from improved views and settings.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Anthony Michaels Prince Arthur Road NW3</p>
2015/3530/P	(Mrs) Lin Cook	24 Perrins Walk Hampstead London NW3 6TH	04/08/2015 12:12:46	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms Haji-Ismael</p> <p>Application 2015/3530/P Re 22 Frognal Way</p> <p>I have lived in Perrins Walk since 1982, and know and love the surrounding area. I am writing to object to the above planning application to demolish an existing building and replace it with a massive 19,600 square foot seven-bedroom mansion! In my opinion the current building makes a positive contribution to my local area. No sensible reasons for its demolition have been given. I know that the developers have done their best to destroy the building; this is unacceptable and they should be forced to re-instate it.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>(Mrs) Lin Cook 24 Perrins Walk London NW3 6TH</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3530/P	Professor Dame Lesley Rees	23 Church Row Hampstead London NW3 6UP	06/08/2015 18:23:34	OBJ	I have lived in Church Row for some thirty-two years, and I am upset to see the current applicaiton to demolish the Pank building. The building fits well into the enviornment which everyone currently enjoys, and makes a "positive contribution" to the local area. It is even more abhorrent that the proposed replacement building is so large, necessitating two basement levels. I trust and hope that Camden Council will refuse planning permission.
2015/3530/P	ben caplan	1a prince arthur road London nw3 6ax	03/08/2015 15:14:37	SUPPRT	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I've lived close to this house in Hampstead all my life. I like to show my support for the planning application at 22 Frognal Way. The house that sits on this site is an unattractive 1970's house that has fallen into disrepair and has been empty for a long time. I welcome improvements to the area and the proposed application would revitalise a site thats been neglected for ages - and It'd be good to see a new family home built on the site after its been unoccupied and unwanted for so many years. I attended a public exhibition at the site earlier this year and was able to meet the architects, heritage consultants and new owners and I'm confident the new house would be a huge improvement to the area. The existing house is not a good example of 1970s architecture and is an unwelcome sight in an otherwise very attractive area. Many of the houses in the area are listed and this one is unlisted and of poor design by comparison and should not to be preserved. I was impressed that the new owners are involving themselves in the community and they seem to have the support of the residents of Frognal Way which is very rare these days that even their direct neighbours are fully supportive of their plans, as am I.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely,</p> <p>Ben Caplan Prince Arthur Road</p>
2015/3530/P	Robert Smithson	40 Platts Lane London NW3 7NT	03/08/2015 15:21:46	SUPPRT	<p>Dear sir,</p> <p>I am writing to support the planning application. The current building is relatively unsightly, and can only be improved by demolition and redevelopment.</p> <p>Hampstead can only be improved by the introduction of well built, well designed houses, especially given current constraints.</p> <p>Best,</p> <p>Robert Smithson</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3530/P	Cynthia Passini	16 Perrins Walk London NW3 6TH	09/08/2015 07:14:14	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to Application 2015/3530/P for the demolition of 22 Frogmal Way, and the erection of a new residential building of a considerably larger size. My objection is based on the grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The current building makes a positive contribution to the local conservation area and it should not be demolished</li> <li>2. The new seven bedroom dwelling and entertainment complex is some six times larger than the current building and is of an inappropriate increase in size and bulk</li> </ol>
2015/3530/P	Madeleine Wilson	Madeleine Wilson 66 Belsize Lane NW3 5BJ	02/08/2015 15:24:16	SUPPRT	<p>I am a local resident and frequently walk down Frogmal Way. This house has been abandoned for as long as I can remember and it always struck me as strange that no one had sought to develop this site. The proposed building looks to be differentiated yet sympathetic to the local area. I fully support this application and look forward to seeing something other than an ugly derelict building.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3530/P	Kurt Bjorklund	7 Frogmal Way London NW3 6XE	05/08/2015 10:29:05	SUPPRT	Dear Zenab Haji-Ismail

I am a resident of Frogmal Way and also chairman of the Frogmal Way Residents Association (the FWRA). The association has already separately filed its support and comments on the application (which I of course wholeheartedly endorse). I would like to add some personal comments below on behalf of myself and my wife.

We have owned our property on Frogmal Way since 2009 and during this whole time, and for a number of years before, the neglected construction site on number 22 has been an eye sore and increasingly a local safety risk. It no longer bears any resemblance to the original property on the site, has no functional use, and in any case is the least stylistically consistent building on the road. We have therefore been looking forward to finally reaching a resolution to what will happen to the site.

Earlier proposals by the previous owner of the site carried in our view clear risks to the nature of the conservation area and the "look and feel" of Frogmal Way, a unique part of Hampstead.

The project proposed by Jez and Natasha San however is very constructive and positive overall to the road and the environment. The San family have approached the project in a very collaborative fashion, seeking early input and views from residents of both Frogmal Way and Church Row.

The proposed building considers in our view may aspects of what is required for a building for the site. It is very thoughtfully planned to dramatically improve the views from Church Row, and is overall additive to the quality and nature of buildings on Frogmal Way.

I would like to add that there seems to be a very significant and coordinated campaign by residents of Church Row to oppose the project, for reasons that in their intransigence and lack of underlying rationale entirely escape me. It cannot possibly be better to retain the status quo of a derelict low quality building offering nothing but a real eye sore and a continued security risk to the local residents. No owner in his or her right mind would in my view invest the required very considerable capital to restore the old building as it would have very limited value at the end.

Therefore, the alternative to the project proposed by the San family would seem to be that the current status quo remains for the next decade and beyond.

Best regards

Kurt Bjorklund

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3530/P	John Cook	63 Flask Walk	07/08/2015 11:44:40	NOOBJEMPER	<p>I have known the applicant for many years; he has previously lived in Hampstead so is very familiar with it.</p> <p>As such, I believe his plans are in sympathy with the surroundings and sensitive to the challenges of construction in this area.</p> <p>Likewise, although I do not know extensive details of the proposed build, I would expect the development to have high design values and to add to the overall visual environment.</p> <p>Assuming that the various enquiries as to the impact of the build on neighbouring properties do not throw up any problems, I thoroughly support his plans.</p>
2015/3530/P	Jon Siddall	Hampstead Parish Church Church Row Hampstead London	06/08/2015 23:09:06	COMMNT	<p>I am responding on behalf of Hampstead Parish Church which is situated in Church Row, immediately adjacent to the proposed development.</p> <p>Our attention has been drawn to the proposed development only in the last two days (we have not received official notification of the proposed plans as should have been the case) and there has been insufficient time to give this matter due consideration.</p> <p>However, on first inspection we are very concerned about the implications of the proposed development on the surrounding area. We will respond in more detail in due course when we have had the opportunity to consider the matter more fully.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Jon Siddall Churchwarden</p>
2015/3530/P	Martin moshal	30 Heath drive	03/08/2015 19:13:22	SUPPRT	<p>This looks like a really fantastic development. It will be a really great addition to an important road of Hampstead. All the more so given what is currently there and what could otherwise be there but for these plans.</p> <p>Clearly, a lot of thought and sensitivity has gone into the planning of this home.</p> <p>We are absolutely in support of the proposal.</p>