

2 Frogmal Close
London
NW3 6YB

22 April 2017

We object to Planning Application 2017/2141/P as being excessive overdevelopment and the traducing of the original nature of the one house, being an integral of the six that form Frogmal Close as designed by Ernst Freud, for the following reasons:-

1 We rely on statements emanating from the Conservation Officer and Planning Officer as set out in Camden Council's Pre Application Response letter to the Applicant's architect dated 1 June 2015 for a previous, but not dissimilar, scheme. This all centres on the building's role and relationship with the other 5 of the group, 4 of which are Grade 2 Listed, and which itself is designated as a 'building that makes a positive contribution to the Redington / Frogmal Conservation Area'. This is a material consideration.

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 Frogmal 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.

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 principal 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.

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.

2 The First floor rear proposed windows are out of scale with the rooms that they serve.

Windows of this scale would alter the probable usage of the bedrooms beyond that normally of simply being places for sleeping. This could possible create both light and noise pollution for the occupants of 3 Froggnal Close and those beyond in

To illustrate the point these are the approximate floor areas of the Bedrooms and their proposed windows as against those existing. As an illustration the normal rule of thumb is for the windows to be of the order of 10% of the floor area, and the existing windows areas are already well in excess of this.

Existing

Bedroom 1 – Window area as a percentage of floor area = 16.5%

Bedroom 2 – Window area as a percentage of floor area = 21%

Bedroom 3 – Window area as a percentage of floor area = 19%

Proposed

Bedroom 1 – Window area as a percentage of floor area = 25%

Bedroom 2 – Window area as a percentage of floor area = 66.5%

Bedroom 3 – Window area as a percentage of floor area = 36.5%

3 We believe that the full height windows at the First floor rear allow and encourage access to the adjacent flat roof.

The proposed enlargement of the windows at First floor, consisting of floor-to-ceiling height windows, are not required for what are small'ish bedrooms looking out onto a flat roof. Suspicion exists that this flat roof would then be used as a terrace, resulting in a serious overlooking of the garden and bedrooms of 3 Froggnal Close. The plans state that the windows will be fixed, but only two large panes are shown for each opening and the *'Proposed Materials'* key states:- *'Windows – All new windows to be high performance slim profile aluminium powder coated casement frames with Pilkington 'Suncool' double glazing'*. Casement windows mean that they are side hung, so that with single panes of the size shown they will effectively be glass doors.

4 The heat gain from solar sources that will inevitably occur with the proposed First floor windows is against planning policy.

All of the fenestration on this elevation faces south south-west and large areas of glazing proposed will, even with low-E glazing / triple glazing and the like, vastly increase the solar gain and, thereby, heat load of the building fabric. This is unsustainable development, and is a material consideration.

Reference is made to *Policy 5.9 Overheating and Cooling* of the London Plan, particularly *B2 reduce the amount of heat entering the building in summer through orientation....fenestration...*

5 None of the proposed elevational drawings makes clear which windows are to be openable casement windows, and which panes are to be fixed.

The elevational drawings of the existing building does make the distinction between the two forms of glazing, and this is important for the visual appearance of the building, particularly along the front elevation where it directly affects and impinges on the nature and setting of the six houses that form Froggnal Close. As drawn all of the windows of the proposal could be openable, or all could be fixed. This is a material consideration, given the Listed buildings and their setting that is affected.