

Dawson (development), Barry

From: Phillips, Kate
Sent: 13 October 2016 13:51
To: Phillips, Kate
Subject: 115 Frogna1 - pre-app response (Email 1)

Kate Phillips
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 2521



From 1 October 2016 you will not receive a letter from us if your neighbour submits a planning application. You can still find out about planning applications:

- on new improved posters on lamp posts
- by signing up to [planning e-alerts](#)
- in the planning section of the [Camden Account](#)
- through adverts in the Camden New Journal and Ham & High

You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.

From: Phillips, Kate
Sent: 30 June 2016 16:27
To: 'Philip Wagenfeld'
Subject: Pre-app response - 2016/2810/PRE - 115 Frogna1, London, NW3 6XR

Dear Mr Wagenfeld,

Re: 2016/2810/PRE - 2016/2810/PRE - Replacement dwelling (following demolition of existing)

Thank you for submitting the above pre-application request with the required fee on 18/05/2016. Please see my comments below:

Constraints

Hampstead Conservation Area
Underground development constraints – hydrological, subterranean (groundwater) flow, surface water flow and flooding, slope stability
Archaeological Priority Area
Local Flood Risk Zone
CIL Charging Zone C

Relevant Planning History

No.115 Frogna1

36052 - Alterations and erection of extensions at No. 115, Frognal – Granted 27/05/1970.

71156/20312 - The development of the site of the Lodge, Plot 6, "Frognal Grove", 115, Frognal, Hampstead, by the erection of a dwelling house and garage with facing materials as indicated in your letter dated 22nd March, 1955, and the formation of a new access to the highway – Granted 19/04/1955.

36022 - Alterations and additions to 'The Lodge', No. 115, Frognal – Granted 20/09/1954.

Nos. 105, 107 and 115 Frognal

35915 - Erection of five dwelling houses, the Council approves the details of a two-storey house at No. 7 Oakhill Way Hampstead – Granted 02/12/1963.

35957 - The construction of a new service road in the grounds of "Frognal Grove", Nos. 105-115, Frognal, Hampstead – Granted 21/08/1954.

35499 - Erection of a transformer chamber at the rear of Frognal Grove, Nos. 105-107-115, Frognal, Hampstead (adjoining existing garages fronting Oakhill Way) – Granted 10/06/1954.

35916 - The erection of an extension to the Lodge, 115, Frognal. Your application dated 31st December, 1953, regarding the elevational alterations of Nos. 105, 107 and 115, Frognal, forms the subject of a separate communication – Granted 05/04/1954.

34505 - The conversion of "Frognal Grove" Nos.105, 107 and 115, Frognal, Hampstead (to be known as "Montague House"), into four dwelling houses and the development of the garden by the erection of five dwelling houses – Granted 15/01/1954.

1 Oak Hill Way

2015/5165/P - Demolition of the existing house at No 1 Oak Hill Way and replacement with a new 6 bedroom house – Granted 03/05/2016.

2016/1695/P - Demolition of the existing house at No 1 Oak Hill Way and replacement with a new 6 bedroom house including new basement floor extension – Decision pending.

Pre-application comments

The principle of development

- The proposal would not result in a net loss or gain of dwellings, which is considered to be acceptable.
- The application site is within the Hampstead Conservation Area; however, the building is not listed and it is identified in the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (2001) as making a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- The Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (HCAS) notes that the Council will encourage the retention of those buildings which are considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and will only grant consent for demolition where it can be shown that the building detracts from the character of the area. On this basis, the Council would strongly encourage the retention and upgrading of the existing building rather than its demolition.
- If it can be demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that there is justification for the demolition of the existing building (i.e. for other reasons than its contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area), consent will only be granted for the demolition if

the replacement development would preserve and enhance the conservation area, and subject to all other material considerations (see sections below).

Design considerations and impact on the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area

- The application site is located within the Hampstead Conservation Area, wherein the Council has a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, in accordance with Section 72 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- Given the prominent location of the application site (i.e. elevated position adjacent to a road junction with wide views available towards the building), it is particularly important that any redevelopment of the site makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in accordance with DP24 and DP25.
- At the same time, despite the prominence of the application site, it is a semi-rural, green setting and new development must respond sensitively to this.
- Policy H21 of the HCAS notes that new development should be seen as an opportunity to enhance the Hampstead Conservation Area and should respect the built form and historic context of the area, local views as well as existing features such as building lines, roof lines, elevational design, and where appropriate, architectural characteristics, detailing, profile, and materials of adjoining buildings.
- Policy H22 of the HCAS notes that modern development in Hampstead has not always taken account of the area's history and its context, and modern architectural design will not be resisted per se, but it should be considerate to its context.
- The principle of a more contemporary design is considered to be acceptable; however, exemplary design will be required. Notwithstanding the fact that modern development in the area has not always taken account of its setting, Hampstead does provide many examples of buildings which represent the best building techniques etc. available at their time of construction, and it is considered that any new development at the site should seek to do the same.
- Currently, the Council's Urban Design and Conservation Officers have some concerns about the proposed design; it is felt that the building could be anywhere in London, or the country, whereas it should better reflect its Hampstead location.
- Furthermore, it is not considered that the proposed design would enhance the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area.
- The Urban Design and Conservation Officers do not have an issue with modern design per se; however, the design must reflect its surroundings.
- In Hampstead, particularly in the conservation area, the buildings are characterised by elegance, grace, restraint and modesty, whereas it is considered that the proposed replacement building would appear too confident and too loud for its relatively quiet setting.
- The overall scale of the new building is considered to be too large and the additional mass and bulk is considered to be too great.
- The central vertical section of the building is out of proportion and would draw unnecessary attention to the building; and the large, vertical panes of glass do not reflect the elevational design or architectural characteristics or proportions of surrounding buildings.
- Whilst a modern design would be considered acceptable, the elevations should be more carefully articulated and should be finer in overall scale.
- I would be happy to look at revised plans prior to the submission of a formal planning application.

Trees and landscaping

- Policy H45 of the HCAS notes that all trees which contribute to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area should be retained and protected. Developers will be expected to

incorporate any new trees sensitively into the design of any development and demonstrate that no trees will be lost or damaged before, during or after development.

- Policy H47 of the HCAS notes that applications for development should take into account the possible impact on trees and other vegetation, and state clearly whether any damage/removal is likely and what protective measures are to be taken to ensure against damage during and after work. BS 5837 shall be taken as the minimum required standard for protection of trees.
- The accompanying Arboricultural Report shows the removal of Tree 1, Tree 2, Tree 3, Tree 4, Tree 8, Tree 9, Tree 10, and Hedge G2. With the exception of Tree 1, which is a Category B tree, these are all Category C trees/hedges (i.e. trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years).
- A Tree Officer has visited the site (NB. He has only viewed the trees that are visible from the front of the property and would need access to the rear to properly assess the others) and notes that the large lime tree in front of the property (Tree 8) is a significant tree and contributes greatly to the character of the area. The Arboricultural Report states that the tree is in poor condition internally with extensive decay at the base and this is given as justification for its removal; however, due to its prominence and importance, further justification for the removal of this tree would be required if a formal application is submitted, for example quantification of the internal decay.
- If the removal of the lime tree can be justified, its replacement with another large tree of a similar species is likely to be considered acceptable.
- Additional planting in the rear garden to compensate for the proposed loss of vegetation is also recommended.
- The proposal retains a generous sized private garden, which is welcomed.

Impact on neighbouring properties

- Policy DP26 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours.
- The main properties that are likely to be affected by the proposal are No. 1 Oak Hill Way (to the west) and No. 113 Frognaal (to the south). [N.B. Planning permission exists to demolish and replace No. 1 Oak Hill Way]
- It is not considered that the new building would appear overbearing or cause any undue loss of outlook to neighbouring properties. The part of the rear projecting element (living room and study) nearest to No. 113 Frognaal would be lower in height than the main part of the building, which would reduce the impact on this property. The first floor element above the garage (gym) is unlikely to appear overbearing when viewed from No. 1 Oak Hill Way (or the replacement dwelling on this plot).
- There is unlikely to be any more overlooking from the new dwelling than the existing, which is considered to be acceptable.
- The proposal is unlikely to cause undue loss of light or overshadowing to the neighbouring properties, due to the orientation of the properties in relation to each other and the path of the sun.
- Policy DP28 notes that the Council will seek to minimise the impact on local amenity from the demolition and construction phases of development. Given the constraints of the application site and the nature of the works, the Council is likely to seek the submission of a Construction Management Plan (CMP), which would be secured by a section 106 legal agreement (more information, including details of the formal charge that has been introduced to support the implementation of CMPs, is available on our website [here](#)).

Living standards for future occupiers

- Policy DP26 requires new development to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space; facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste; facilities for bicycle storage; and private outdoor amenity space, wherever practical.

- It is considered that the new dwelling would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers.
- A formal planning application should provide details of facilities for recycling and disposal of waste, and bicycle storage (see next section).

Transport considerations

- The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3 (average).
- Policy DP18 seeks to ensure that developments provide the minimum necessary car parking provision. The proposal seeks to retain parking spaces within and in front of the garage, which is considered to be acceptable as long as there is no increase in parking provision on site.
- In accordance with The London Plan 2016, the new dwelling would require 2 cycle parking spaces.
- CPG7 guides that cycle parking for residents should be provided off-street, within the boundary of the site. It needs to be accessible and secure.
- Policy DP20 (Movement of goods and materials) seeks to minimise the impact of the movement of goods and materials by road. Given the constraints of the application site and the nature of the works, the Council is likely to seek the submission of a CMP, which should address the removal of demolition debris from the site and the delivery of construction equipment and materials.

Sustainability considerations

- In general, the Council prefers retrofitting and extending existing buildings rather than demolition and re-build, due to the unsustainable nature of this type of development.
- The existing dwelling dates from the 1950s and therefore, in line with Policy DP22, the proposal to demolish and replace the dwelling would need to be fully justified in terms of the use of resources and energy, and the energy and water efficiency of the existing and proposed buildings.
- If the demolition and rebuild can be justified, Policy DP22 requires development to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures and Policy DP23 requires developments to reduce their water consumption, pressure on the combined sewer network and the risk of flooding.
- Policy DP22 also encourages the use of green or brown roofs and green walls, wherever suitable.
- You are advised to refer to Policy DP22 of the Camden Development Policies and the accompanying text, as well as CPG3 (Sustainability). [Link to Planning Policy documents](#)

Conclusion:

The Council strongly encourages the retention and upgrading of the existing building rather than its demolition. However, if the demolition of the building can be justified, consent will only be granted if the redevelopment scheme would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area, and subject to all other material considerations. Please note that if the proposal involves the demolition of a building in a conservation area, the planning application would be determined at Planning Committee (if it is recommended for approval by officers).

This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.

Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Kind regards

Kate Phillips
Planning Officer
Regeneration and Planning
Culture and Environment
London Borough of Camden

Ph: 0207 974 2521

You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.

Dawson (development), Barry

From: Phillips, Kate
Sent: 13 October 2016 13:50
To: Phillips, Kate
Subject: 115 Frogna! pre-app (email 2)

Kate Phillips
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 2521



From 1 October 2016 you will not receive a letter from us if your neighbour submits a planning application. You can still find out about planning applications:

- on new improved posters on lamp posts
- by signing up to [planning e-alerts](#)
- in the planning section of the [Camden Account](#)
- through adverts in the Camden New Journal and Ham & High

You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.

From: Phillips, Kate
Sent: 12 August 2016 10:28
To: 'Philip Wagenfeld'
Subject: 2016/2810/PRE - 115 Frogna!, London, NW3 6XR

Dear Mr Wagenfeld,

Re: 2016/2810/PRE - 115 Frogna!, London, NW3 6XR - Replacement dwelling (following demolition of existing)

Thank you for coming into the Council last Wednesday to discuss the revised plans. Please see the comments below.

As noted in my initial advice, the application site is within the Hampstead Conservation Area and the building is identified in the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (2001) as making a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The conservation area statement notes that the Council will only grant consent for demolition of an existing building if it can be shown that the building detracts from the character of the area. Alternatively, you must provide satisfactory justification for its demolition. As discussed at the meeting, we consider that any replacement building at the site would have to be of greater architectural and design merit than the existing, to warrant the demolition of the existing.

After taking some time to consider the revised plans, we have concerns that the design has not significantly changed since the initial pre-app meeting and the changes to the proposal do not address the thinking behind our suggestions. We are not convinced that the proposed building

represents an improvement from the existing building at the site and therefore we would not be able to support a formal planning application if it came in in this form.

It is considered that the proposed building still has an extremely international feel to it. Peter has specifically commented that it looks like a luxury house that could be seen in Beverley Hills or Saudi Arabia. Furthermore, whilst the house would undoubtedly provide a secure and comfortable environment for its future inhabitants, it is not considered that it would complement the character of Hampstead or the immediate area in which it would be built. Having thought further about the application site, we feel that the only acceptable forms of development at the site would be a piece of exceptional contemporary architecture or a conservative and highly contextual house.

We accept that the proposal makes an effort to be 'polite' and 'modest' through the use of muted colours, brick and the overall 2 storey height. However, the building still looks like a fortified building and its character is distinctly sombre, heavy and monolithic, without the delicacy, lightness or delight that can be found throughout other buildings in the conservation area. We feel that the building doesn't immediately read as a domestic building which may go against the client's need for privacy. The vertical windows and granite wall read more as a public building which might even encourage passers-by to approach it.

The 'modern' listed buildings we were shown at the meetings were exceptional in that they were at the very forefront of modern, contextually responsive design. They all share a delicate approach to massing, fenestration and detail. The house at Fitzroy Park used its massing and materials to create a light and dynamically proportioned contemporary country house. It has nods to arts and crafts in the wooden details and 'chimney stacks' and it, and the other buildings, show a confidence, clarity of design and sympathy towards their contexts that we are not convinced that this proposal shows.

Good local buildings have light frontages without large expanses of unbroken material. The proposed granite surfaces on this proposal are considered to be too sheer and monotonous for the area. Whilst we accept that atypical materials can be found in the surrounding area, they are often used as accents and, in good examples, are not used in monotonous sheets over large areas.

Buildings in the local area have interesting and or varied roof lines which interact with their green backdrops and the sky by varying their roof lines and allowing views through. Virtually no local building has a flat or austere skyline or does not recede to the top. It is considered that the local buildings, whether new or old, are very 'London' and south-east in their vernacular or approach. They tend to have delicate details, rather than chunky, and they are light and vertical in emphasis, rather than horizontal. The proposed design needs to be revised so that it is more joyful and less austere.

With regards to the landscaping, we do not consider that masking the building with landscaping is a suitable approach. Currently, the existing house is very open at the front and it is considered that this open character is an important characteristic of the site and filling it in could result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Any proposal on this site needs to respond to this picturesque 'woodland glade' setting, the topography, existing trees, and be designed in such a way as to be acceptable and beautiful without needing to be masked by planting. The proposal needs to reinforce the informal, countryside feel as much as possible and we would welcome the retention of as much of the existing landscaping as possible.

Going forward, we recommend that you further examine the characteristics that define Hampstead, rather than looking at isolated examples, and a comprehensive character analysis should inform the design of the proposed new building at the site. We understand that you are working to a brief from your client, which appears to be for a secure yet austere looking home.

However, it is important to make it clear to your client that we will only allow the redevelopment of the site if the replacement building fully responds to and respects the special character of the Hampstead Conservation Area, and only if the design of the replacement building is exemplary. We feel it is possible for a secure, contemporary home to achieve this.

In future, it would be good to have revised plans in advance of a meeting, so that we have time to formulate our thoughts and provide better advice during the meeting, rather than afterwards. Peter has also suggested that the proposal should go to the Camden Design Review Panel. More information about this can be found on our website, at the following link: [Camden Design Review Panel](#).

Kind regards

Kate Phillips
Senior Planning Officer
Regeneration and Planning
Supporting Communities
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 0207 974 2521
Web: camden.gov.uk

Floor 2
5 Pancras Square
5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.

Dawson (development), Barry

From: Phillips, Kate
Sent: 13 October 2016 13:50
To: Phillips, Kate
Subject: 115 Frogna! pre-app (email 3)

Kate Phillips
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 2521



From 1 October 2016 you will not receive a letter from us if your neighbour submits a planning application. You can still find out about planning applications:

- on new improved posters on lamp posts
- by signing up to [planning e-alerts](#)
- in the planning section of the [Camden Account](#)
- through adverts in the Camden New Journal and Ham & High

You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.

From: Phillips, Kate
Sent: 21 September 2016 10:26
To: Philip Wagenfeld
Subject: 2016/2810/PRE - 115 Frogna!

Dear Philip,

Thank you for providing the revised drawings and illustrations.

Comments on revised drawings

- Generally, the materials, the balance and the confidence of the front elevation are much improved.
- Are large windows proposed on the flank wall?
- The return to brick and stone is welcomed (but the coloured elevation perhaps doesn't properly illustrate the materials or the effect of the tonal contrast as well as it might)
- The front elevation is starting to look a little fussy - it is queried whether the bronze 'bites' on either side of the porch are necessary
- As already discussed, we will require lots of detail about soft landscaping at the front of the site as part of the formal submission

Comments from 8th September meeting

- Is the set-back of the first floor necessary – strong rooflines are predominant in the local area (the render and the set-back are the opposite of expressing the roofline)
- Query the use of render - brick and stone contrast is predominant in the local area

- Fenestration – buildings typically have a fenestration hierarchy. In this case, the left-hand-side of the front elevation exhibits grandeur, whereas the right-hand-side is much less grand – this gives the building an odd hierarchy
- What is proposed for the side windows?
- The formal submission will need to include a ‘story’ of how you reached the final design
- Suitable case for Design Review Panel (not keen)
- Key issues with design currently:
 - Fenestration – difference from left to right across the building, size etc.
 - First floor set-back
 - Use of contrasting materials

Please let me know if there is anything else I can help with before you submit the formal application (please note that I am away Thu and Fri of this week). Also, as discussed, please let me know once the formal application is submitted so that I can pick it up (if you submit via the Planning Portal, please send me the Portal Reference No.).

I look forward to receiving the formal submission soon!

Kind regards

Kate Phillips BA Hons MSc MRTPI
 Senior Planning Officer
 Regeneration and Planning
 Supporting Communities
 London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 0207 974 2521
 Web: camden.gov.uk

Floor 2
 5 Pancras Square
 London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From 1 October 2016 you will not receive a letter from us if your neighbour submits a planning application. You can still find out about planning applications:

- on new improved posters on lamp posts
- by signing up to [planning e-alerts](#)
- in the planning section of the [Camden Account](#)
- through adverts in the Camden New Journal and Ham & High

You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.