

Date: 01/06/2015

Our ref: 2015/1513/PRE  
Contact: Raymond Yeung  
Direct line: 020 7974 4546  
Email: [Raymond.Yeung@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Raymond.Yeung@camden.gov.uk)

George Kounnou  
GCK ARCHITECTS LTD  
6 Field Way  
Cambridge  
CB1 8RW

**Development Management**

**Regeneration & Planning**  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Argyle Street  
London WC1H 8ND

Tel 020 7974 3968  
[Raymond.Yeung@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Raymond.Yeung@camden.gov.uk)  
[www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

Dear George,

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)**  
**Re: 4 Frognal Close NW4 6YB**

Thank you for your enquiry received on the 13th March 2015, regarding additions and alterations including the erection of a part single storey with roof terrace above, part two storey side and rear extension, and replacement of windows to the ground floor front elevation.

After discussing your plans over the phone and a site visit by the Conservation Officer, I would advise that you take note of the following.

**Background**

The building was designed by Ernst Freud in 1936-37 and forms one of a group of 6 semi-detached houses grouped in pairs around a private cul-de-sac. Each house is terraced to follow the rising ground and the end houses (Nos 1 and 6) adjacent to Frognal, have a third storey to allow for a continuous roofline. The entrance is marked by a canopy, with the garage accessed from Frognal. The exteriors and the garden retaining walls are faced in 2 inch sand faced bricks with a rough texture and a buff colour.

Nos. 1 & 2 and 5 & 6 are Grade II listed and Nos. 3 and 4 are designated as buildings that make a positive contribution to the Redington/Frognal Conservation Area.

This interesting house of No.4, one half of a pair which are situated at the end of the road way facing you as you enter Frognal Close. The six houses all together, four of which were listed grade II in 1999. No. 4 and its partner are not listed. The listing report states that they were not considered for listing at that time due to the removal of the internal features.

**Relevant History**

There have been various applications on this site, but the most relevant is the previous application;

2010/0898/P for the additions and alterations including the erection of a part single storey, part two storey side and rear extension, excavation of a basement to create additional living space, gym and internal swimming pool, a light well to the front and replacement of windows. This was refused on the following;

- 1. The proposed side and rear extensions by reason of their size, bulk and detailed design would be detrimental to the appearance and proportions of the building, to the integrity of the side and rear elevations of the pair of semi-detached properties of which this house forms part and character and appearance of the wider conservation area contrary to B1 (General design principles), B3 (Alterations and Extensions), B7 (Conservation Areas) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.*
- 2. The proposed basement by reason of its front lightwell would be detrimental to the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the Redington/Frogna Conservation Area, contrary to policies B1 (General design principles), B3 (Alterations and extensions) and B7 (Conservation areas) of London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.*
- 3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing a Construction Management Plan, would be likely to have a detrimental impact on the local environment and traffic networks and on highway and pedestrian safety by virtue of inappropriate vehicular movements, contrary to policy T12 (works affecting highways) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan and guidance contained within Camden Planning Guidance 2006.*

## **Proposal**

### **The proposals are for the following;**

- Part two storey side and part single storey rear extension
- A part two storey and part single storey side extension following demolition of side extension
- Creation of a roof terrace at rear first floor level
- Replacement of windows to the ground floor front elevation
- Installation of a rooflight in main roof.
- Lowering ground floor level to provide level access

## **Policy Context**

The Council's planning policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions to existing buildings are proposed. The following considerations contained within policies CS5, CS13 of the Core Strategy, policies DP16, DP22, DP24, DP25, DP26, of the Development Policies Document are relevant to the application. Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011 are also relevant.

Camden's Development Policies Document is supplemented by planning documents to provide further detailed guidance, including Camden Planning Guidance including CPG1 'Design' 2013, and CPG6 'Amenity' 2011, whilst the Redington/Frogna Conservation Area Conservation Area Character Appraisal will assist with detailed design guidance relevant to the property and its surroundings.

## **Conservation and Design**

Extensions can alter the balance and harmony of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. The above policies and design guidance state that rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building

or character and appearance of the conservation area. Extensions, in general, should be subordinate to the host building.

Typically the exterior of the Froggnal Close houses are of narrow buff brick with stone copings and flat roofs. The various designs of the houses have strong rectangular proportions with a horizontal emphasis. The entrances have recessed porches and the plain brickwork is highlighted with pared back white painted elements. The fenestration is slim metal or hardwood framed rectangular windows set virtually flush within expressed brick panels - a sophisticated and minimal decorative feature.

Policy CPG 1 states that extensions that are higher than one storey below the eaves/roof level would be resisted.

### **Rear and side extension**

This proposed scheme seeks to extend the house full width at the rear and erection of a two storey extension to the side. The rear of the house is not considered to be of architectural merit. In principle the extent of the proposed extensions are considered excessive and while the pair Nos. 3 and 4 are not symmetrical, there is considered to be a fine balance of proportions. No. 4 sits within an attractive secluded garden plot which is considered proportional to the scale of the building.

It is considered that the proposed rear and side extensions would dominate the original building. The side extension much like the previous application is unacceptable because it would unbalance the composition of the property with its neighbour (No.3).

Normally full width rear extensions are considered contrary to Camden CPG 1. In this instance it is considered there maybe scope to extend the ground floor into the garden however any extension will need to be in proportion and scale with the host building. It should not overwhelm the rear elevation. All proposed details, including window to masonry, solid to void proportions should exactly match the existing to ensure the finely detailed exterior retains its original architectural character. It is considered anything less would compromise the 1930's aesthetic and thereby be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The side elevation/access could accommodate an extension. This location would be barely visible from the Close or from the garden and neighbouring houses. A single storey extension with materials and details to match the host property subject to sympathetic design may be acceptable.

### **Roof terrace**

Although the property is not listed itself, it is considered that the proposed rear terrace with the full width glazed balustrade is not considered complementary to the host property and would appear incongruous to this and neighbouring listed properties. Therefore it would fail to respect the site and setting and would harm the appearance of host property and the conservation area. There such is considered not acceptable.

### **Rear fenestrations**

As above, the extensive use of glass would not complement the host or neighbouring properties as it is considered that it would not preserve or enhance the appearance of the property within the conservation area. These alterations would dominate the original building and fail to respect the form, proportions, and character of the building and its setting contrary to policy.

These alterations and the extension would dominate the original building and fail to respect the form, proportions, and character of the building and its setting contrary to policy and therefore not acceptable.

It is considered a more traditional approach would be recommended using less glazing, timber framed single glazed openings.

### **Front and side elevation alterations**

The existing ground floor front elevation windows are UPVC framed. The replacement of these windows with aluminium is likely to be acceptable subject to detailing, thickness and materials.

The design of the windows to the proposed side elevation replicates the existing side elevation and incorporates a new window at first floor level within a projecting brick panel. The proposed first floor window serves an en-suite bathroom to the master bedroom which may be acceptable subject to detailing and materials.

### **Amenity**

With regards to amenity the proposal would be assessed against policy DP27. The proposed rear and side extensions are located sufficient distance from neighbouring properties. Therefore it is not considered that the additional height and bulk will adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of light and sense of enclosure.

The proposed roof terrace is considered to result in overlooking into the garden area of No. 3 Frogal Close. Therefore the proposed terrace would not be supported.

### **Other Matters**

#### **Trees & Landscaping**

It appears that there are several trees in the vicinity of the proposed works, including on adjoining sites. As such it is recommended that a tree survey and arboricultural report be commissioned to demonstrate that the proposed works would not affect the trees on site and outline how they should be protected during site works. The drawings should also include indicative planting proposals if applicable.

As stated above a roof terrace would not be supported. However officers would seek the flat roof of any extensions to be maintained as a green roof. Green roofs play important roles in achieving a sustainable development as it retain rainfall and slow its movement, provide insulation, provide habitats to promote biodiversity. This will include ensuring a sufficient soil depth is provided and selecting the correct substrate and vegetation.

#### **Highways**

A Construction Management Plan would be sought as part of any Section 106 agreement. It is acknowledged that your client is willing to enter into legal agreement for such clause. A Section 106 planning obligation to secure a CMP may be necessary for the site based on the scale of the proposal.

A Highways Contribution for the protection of the highway and footway during construction works may be sought as part of any Section 106 agreement should the footway adjacent to the site could be damaged as a direct result of the proposed works. Such a contribution may be refunded

subject to the roadway and footway being left in an acceptable condition (as inspected by the council) following the completion of the works.

## Building Control

The internal alterations would not require planning permission but please consider use of Council's Building Control services for assessment of the final build drawings. For more information, please visit their website, <http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/building-control/>.

## Required Documentation

Please submit the following documentation with the application:

- Metrically scaled drawings (plans, sections and elevations) as existing and proposed
- Design & Access Statement
- Tree Survey & Arboriculture Statement

## Conclusion

It is considered that the scheme as currently proposed would not receive officer support due to the scale and proportions of the proposed side and rear extensions which are not subordinate to the host property. The proposed alterations are considered harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, the setting of adjacent listed buildings and the conservation area. It is not considered the proposals are significantly different from the previously refused scheme and the current proposals do not address the first reason for refusal of 2010/0898/P.

Single storey extensions to the side and rear that are sympathetically designed may be supported. The roof terrace is likely to be resisted and should be omitted from the scheme.

**Please note that the information contained in this letter represents an officer's opinion based on the level of information supplied and is without prejudice to the further consideration of this matter by the Development Control section or to the Council's formal decision.**

I trust this information is of assistance. Should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact me by telephone on 020 7974 4546.

Yours sincerely,

Raymond Yeung  
Planning Officer – Development Management Legacy Initiatives Team