

REPAIRS AND RENEWALS

2 FROGNAL CLOSE

LONDON

NW3 6YB

HERITAGE STATEMENT

To be read in conjunction with Dunthorne Parker Architects drawings

SEPTEMBER 2018

Contents

1.	Executive Summary	3
2.	Introduction	5
3.	The Site and its History	7
4.	Heritage significance.....	7
	The heritage context of the site and its surroundings	7
	The relevant heritage assets.....	7
	Assessing heritage significance.....	8
5.	The Policy Context	9
	The National Planning Policy Framework.....	9
	Camden’s Council’s Core Strategy and Development Policies.....	13
6.	The proposed scheme and its impact on heritage assets	16
	The proposed scheme	17
7.	Compliance with policy and guidance	19
	The level of ‘harm’ caused by the proposed scheme	20
	The balance of ‘harm’ versus benefit.....	20
	The National Planning Policy Framework.....	21
	Camden’s Local Development Framework	22
8.	Summary and conclusion	22

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The majority of the proposal serves simply to repair or rectify issues with the building that detract from the nature and original design intent of the architect for this Grade 2 Listed building.
- 1.2 The scale of repairs / replacements are minor and will be barely noticeable to even the tutored eye, and will serve to sustain and maintain the building for the future.
- 1.3 There are three areas where the works are of any consequence, two of which are in timber and impermanent. One is the timber terracing, aping that presently existing in the rear garden of the adjacent 1 Frognal Close, and the other a timber 'garden room' that infills the narrow space between the rear of the garages and the boundary, aping that constructed as a more substantial and permanent form of construction at the adjacent 3 Frognal Close.
- 1.4 The only significant alteration of the building itself is the division of an existing bathroom to provide 2 bathrooms, by encompassing two small storage cupboards. This will then provide a second bathroom to serve the presently under-provided 4 bedrooms that do not have the ensuite facility that the 2 other bedrooms do.
- 1.5 The proposals will significantly enhance the environmental performance and, therefore, sustainability of the buildings.
- 1.6 The proposals will significantly improve the relevance and vitality of the activities of the site usage, in line with the Council's policy, and the

consequential usability of the buildings.

- 1.7 For these reasons, the proposed scheme complies with the law, and national and local policy and guidance for listed buildings and conservation areas.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 This report has been prepared to support the planning application for the repairs and renewals to the fabric of 2 Frogna Close.
- 2.2 The purpose of the report is to consider the significance of the relevant heritage assets according to national and local policy and guidance and assess the impact of the proposals on those heritage assets.
- 2.3 This report should be read in conjunction with the drawings and Design & Access Statement prepared by Dunthorne Parker Architects.

Notes on research, analysis and sources

- 2.4 It should be noted that in common with many historic buildings and sites, it is not always possible to provide a truly comprehensive analysis of the historic development of a building or its context.
- 2.5 This desk-based and archival research has been combined with a visual assessment and appraisal of the buildings. Further sources and evidence that add to our knowledge and understanding of the buildings and their history may become available.

Author

2.6 The lead consultant and editor of this report is Mal Parker. He has been a practicing architect since 1971, with a range of major projects involving Listed buildings and sensitive conservation areas in many areas of the UK. Born in Cambridge and studying for his architecture diploma in Oxford he has a natural affinity with England's rich architectural history.

2.7 As director in charge he has worked on many sensitive and important historic buildings developments in England, including:-

St John's College, St Giles, Oxford.

The Golden Cross complex, Oxford.

Eagle and Child PH, Oxford

The Red Lion Hotel complex, Colchester.

High Street, King's Lynn [owner]

Frogna Close, Hampstead, London [owner]

2.8 Mal Parker lives in Hampstead in London, where his home is a 'Modern Movement' house designed by Edmund Freud, and which was scheduled as Grade 2 Listed some years after completion of his extension to it. He is sensitive and alive to the dichotomy of retaining Listed buildings and conserved townscapes, yet having to allow them the dynamic of responding to modern needs in order to ensure their sustainability and viability.

3 THE SITE AND ITS HISTORY

3.1 This section of the report describes the history and development of 2 Frogнал Close.

3.2 Historic England's entry for the Listing of the building at 2 Frogнал Close, is - *CAMDEN*

TQ2685SW FROGNAL CLOSE 798-1/37/1778 (South side) Nos.1 AND 2 including walls to street

GV II

Pair of houses. 1937-8. By Ernst L Freud. Narrow buff brick with stone copings, flat roofs. 2 and 3 storeys on sloping site, with slightly raised centre. Upper (second) floor of No.1 set back behind roof terrace. Projecting porches on single piloti, that to No.2 to side. No.2 with original metal casements, those to ground floor of three and four lights with vertical glazing bars, those to upper windows tripartite with horizontal glazing bars in side windows. No.1 has windows of a similar pattern but replaced in aluminium.

INTERIORS: not inspected. SUBSIDIARY FEATURES: walls of identical brick stepped as land rises sharply from Frogнал are an important part of the composition. Form a symmetrical composition with Nos.5 and 6 opposite (qv).

(Architects' Journal: 1 September 1938: London: 374-75).

- 3.3 This enclave of six brick houses was designed by Ernst Freud in 1936-7. They replaced a derelict Victorian priory that had fallen into disrepair and are part of a group of important modern buildings erected in this area in the 1930's by émigrés from Europe arriving during the inter-war year, a group which includes Sun house (1935), Hill house (1938) and 66 Frognaal, designed by Connell Ward Lucas in 1938, and slightly further afield, 1-3 Willow Road by Erno Goldfinger (1940).
- 3.4 The semi-detached blocks, with front doors and canopies at each end, suggest an enclosed court-yard. The raised brick band around the upper storey and the nautical feel of the entrances are very much of the period. The large windows set into buff brick are reminiscent of Mies van der Rohe's brick houses at Krefeld of 1930.
- 3.5 Freud (1892-1970), who trained in Vienna and Munich, came to London in the 1930s, where he set up in practice. His work included houses and flats, a number of refurbishments including his own house in St Johns Wood. In the design of living spaces for individual clients, as well as for himself, he generally opened up the plan to create long views and a sense of openness.

4 HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

- 4.1 This section of the report assesses the heritage significance of 2 Frognaal Close and its context.

The heritage context of the site and its surroundings

- 4.2 2 Frognal Close is a Grade 2 listed building and sits within the Redington / Frognal Conservation Area.
- 4.3 There are a number of statutory listed buildings in the vicinity of 2 Frognal Close, all listed at Grade II. Immediately adjacent are the attached 3 Frognal Close and, opposite, 5 and 6 Frognal Close. The inexplicably un-listed 3 and 4 Frognal Close complete the Close. A short distance away lies the University College School complex, and Kate Greenaway's house by Norman Shaw at 39 Frognal is also listed Grade II.

The relevant heritage assets

- 4.4 In terms of the assessment of the proposals for 2 Frognal Close, the heritage assets within Camden's most relevant to considering the effect of the scheme on the nearby Listed buildings.
- 4.5 The effect of the proposed scheme on these assets will be on the character and appearance of the local historic area and on the setting of the other Listed buildings.

Assessing heritage significance

- 4.6 The local historic area, Listed buildings and buildings on Camden's Local List in the vicinity, are 'designated heritage assets', as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF]. Other buildings and structures that make a positive contribution to the local historic area can be considered as 'non designated heritage assets'. By way of it's Listing 2 Frognal Close is defined as making a positive contribution to the

character and appearance of the historic townscape

- 4.8 'Significance' is defined in the NPPF as 'the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic'. The English Heritage 'Planning for the Historic Environment Practice Guide' puts it slightly differently – as 'the sum of its architectural, historic, artistic or archaeological interest'.
- 4.9 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the sustainable management of the historic environment' [English Heritage, April 2008] describes a number of 'heritage values' that may be present in a 'significant place'. These are evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal value.
- 4.10 In terms of the conservation area, its significance is best articulated in its special architectural or historic interest.

5 THE POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1 This section of the report sets out the range of national and local policy and guidance relevant to the consideration of change in the historic built environment

The National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.2 The legislation governing Listed buildings and conservation areas is the Planning [Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas] Act 1990. In July

2018, the Government published the new National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF].

5.3 The NPPF says at Paragraph 189 that:

‘In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation’.

5.4 A description and analysis of the heritage significance of 12-13 Magdalen Street and its surroundings is provided earlier in this report.

5.5 The NPPF also requires, at Paragraph 190, local planning authorities to ‘identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal [including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset] taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of

a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal’.

5.6 At Paragraph 192, the NPPF says that:

‘In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a] the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b] the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c] the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness’.

5.7 At Paragraph 193, the NPPF says that:

‘When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation [and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be]. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance’.

5.8 The NPPF says paragraph 196 says:

‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use’.

5.9 Further advice within Section 16 of the NPPF in Paragraph 197 urges local planning authorities to take into account the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset when determining the application. It says that

‘In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset’.

5.10 Paragraph 200 of the NPPF advises local planning authorities to

‘look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably’.

5.11 Paragraph 201 says that:

‘Not all elements of a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building [or other element] which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 133 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 134, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole’.

5.12 The NPPF now incorporates many of the essential concepts in the now replaced Planning Policy Statement 5 ‘Planning for the Historic Environment’. PPS5 was accompanied by an ‘Advice Note’ titled ‘Making Changes to Heritage Assets’, published by Historic England in 2015

‘to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties in implementing historic environment legislation, the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF] and the related guidance given in the Planning Practice Guidance [PPG]’.

5.13 The ‘Advice Note’ at paragraph 2

‘promotes positive, well-informed and collaborative conservation, the aim of which is to recognise and reinforce the historic significance of places, while accommodating the changes

necessary to ensure that people can continue to use and enjoy them. Change to heritage assets and their settings is, of course, acceptable where it is sustainable in terms of the NPPF; change is only unacceptable where it harms significance without an appropriate balance of public benefit’.

5.14 Paragraph 3 of the ‘Advice Note’ also seeks

‘The best way to conserve a building is to keep it in use, or to find it an appropriate new use if it has passed out of use, either that for which it was designed or an appropriate new use which would see to its long-term conservation. Even recently restored buildings that are vacant will soon start to degenerate. An unreasonable, inflexible approach will prevent action that could give a building new life; indeed it can eliminate that use. A reasonable and proportionate approach to owners’ needs is therefore essential’.

Camden Council’s Core Strategy and Development Policies

5.15 Camden Borough Council adopted its Core Strategy and Development Policies on 3 July 2017.

The stated ambition of the Heritage policies is ‘The Council will preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden’s rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens and locally listed heritage assets’.

5.16 Policy D2 deals with ‘Designated Heritage Assets’ and says: ‘Designed heritage assets include conservation areas and listed buildings. The Council will not permit the loss of or substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, including conservation areas and Listed Buildings, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a. the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site;
- b. no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;
- c. conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d. the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

The Council will not permit development that results in harm that is less than substantial to the significance of a designated heritage asset unless the public benefits of the proposal convincingly outweigh that harm’.

5.17 Policy D2 also deals with ‘Conservation Areas and says: ‘Conservation areas are designated heritage assets and this section should be read in conjunction with the section above headed ‘designated heritage assets’.

In order to maintain the character of Camden’s conservation areas, the Council will take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management strategies when assessing applications within conservation areas.

The Council will:

- e. require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area;
- f. resist the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area;
- g. resist development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character or appearance of that conservation area;
and
- h. preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character and appearance of a conservation area or which provide a setting for Camden’s architectural heritage.

5.18 Policy D2 also deals with ‘Listed Buildings’ and says: ‘Listed buildings are designated heritage assets and this section should be read in conjunction with the section above headed ‘designated heritage assets’. To preserve or enhance the borough’s listed buildings, the Council will:

- i. resist the total or substantial demolition of a listed building;

- j. resist proposals for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where this would cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the building; and
- k. resist development that would cause harm to significance of a listed building through an effect on its setting.

5.19 Policy D2 also deals with ‘Other Heritage Assets and Non-designated Heritage Assets’ and says ‘The Council will seek to protect other heritage assets including non- designated heritage assets (including those on and off the local list), Registered Parks and Gardens and London Squares.

The effect of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, balancing the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset’.

6 THE PROPOSED SCHEME AND ITS IMPACT ON HERITAGE ASSETS

6.1 The design of the proposed alterations and extensions is described in documents prepared by Dunthorne Parker Architects. This section of the report assesses its effect on the heritage significance described earlier in this report.

6.2 Dunthorne Parker Architects have worked on historic and Listed buildings in London and throughout England in the past so this project offers the opportunity and advantage of a continuity of approach.

6.3 The proposals take into account the comments raised during the Planning Applications for repairs and brickwork cleaning to 1 Frogmal Close in 2003.

The proposed scheme

6.4 The existing building has been in the possession of the architect / owner applicant since 1984, and well before the Listing in 1999. He is responsible for the 1980's refurbishment of the building / design of the rearward extension kitchen / upper part picked out by various commentators as being extended 'in sympathetic style'.

6.5 The proposals are generally for the repair of the existing structure of the building, and so seek to maintain and enhance the Listed building and its setting. This covers brickwork cracking, replacement doors 'as is', and replacement patio windows in a style, construction and size more fitting with the building's original design and opening dimensions.

6.6 The repairs are listed thus:-

1. Replacement of the painted electrically operated up-and-over steel garage doors with new, but with horizontal features to match other garage doors in the Close.
2. Replacement of garden access ledged-and-framed door with matching, but in painted hardwood.
3. Replacement of double ledged-and-framed doors from the garden into the rear of the garages.
4. Repair of cracked brickwork in various locations by way of inserting Helibar and repointing.

5. Reseating and repointing of various parapet stones.
6. The taking up, leveling, and relaying, of the existing and original mosaic timber parquet flooring in the Living Room that, according to Alan Baxter in 1988, probably slumped when it was originally constructed but lay unnoticed until the wall between the Living Room and Dining Room was removed prior to 1984 when it was purchased by the Applicant.
7. Reconstruction of the rusting corner-piece of the feature projection over the corner window of the First floor extension.

6.7 The alterations are listed thus:-

1. The replacement of the existing aluminium sliding patio doors, with slender framed aluminium opening patio doors within the original openings, and removal of the false make-up pieces of the existing windows.
2. The replacement of the existing close-boarded or trellised garden fencing with horizontal strip timber fencing.
3. The replacement of the concrete slab and brick paving to the rear and side terrace and replacement with timber decking at the level of the internal floor.
4. The construction of a timber garden shed / room at the rear of the garages.

6.10 The architectural elements of the proposals remain exactly as the

originally detailing or in accord with the architectural language of the original building.

7 COMPLIANCE WITH POLICY AND GUIDANCE

7.1 This section of the report demonstrates how the proposed scheme complies with national and local policy and guidance for the historic built environment. This section should be read with the analysis of the proposed scheme and its effects provided earlier in this report.

The level of ‘harm’ caused by the proposed scheme

7.2 As outlined in Section 4, the NPPF identifies two levels of potential ‘harm’ that might be caused to a heritage asset by a development: ‘substantial harm...or total loss of significance’ or ‘less than substantial’. Both levels of harm must be caused to a designated heritage asset – in this instance, the Listed and locally listed buildings adjacent to and in the vicinity of the site.

7.3 The proposed scheme does not lead to ‘substantial’ harm or any meaningful level of ‘less than substantial’ harm. As has been explained in this report and as the Design & Access Statement illustrates with views and drawings, the proposed scheme, involving a design that respects and relates to the local area and the setting of the adjacent Listed building, causes no meaningful harm to these heritage assets. The sensitively designed buildings will both enhance the setting and townscape architecturally and also in terms of environmental sustainability.

The balance of ‘harm’ versus benefit

7.4 In any event, and even if some level of harm was to be caused by the proposals, the scheme provides a tangible public benefit in the form of providing the building with a sustainable future. This would more than outweigh what very low level of ‘harm’ if any that might be asserted to be caused by the various interventions proposed. The contribution that 2 Froggnal Close presently makes to the local area is significantly enhanced by the proposal.

The National Planning Policy Framework

7.5 This report has provided a description and analysis of the significance of 2 Froggnal Close and its local setting, as required by Paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7.6 In respect of Paragraph 131 of the NPPF, the scheme can certainly be described as ‘sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets’. It maintains the ‘positive contribution’ that the heritage assets assessed earlier make to the historic built environment and the local area.

7.7 The proposed development complies with Paragraph 133 of the NPPF. It does not lead to ‘substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset’, for the reasons given above. It also complies with Paragraph 134 – regarding ‘less than substantial harm’ for the reasons given in detail earlier in the previous section of this report.

7.8 It is our view that the alterations proposed cannot reasonably be considered to cause harm to the character or appearance of the architectural setting of the surrounding area when measured against the

overall significance of the area, or the setting of nearby Listed buildings.

The scheme strikes the balance suggested by Paragraph 134 of the NPPF – it intervenes in 2 Frognal Close in a manner that retains the particular contribution that it makes to the local area and its significance is described in detail earlier.

- 7.9 The scheme also does the relevant things that the ‘Planning for the Historic Environment Practice Guide’ urges in its Paragraph 79. For the reasons explained earlier, the proposed development ‘makes a positive contribution to... sustainable communities’, and ‘is an appropriate design for its context and makes...a positive contribution to the appearance, character, quality and local distinctiveness of the historic environment’.

Camden’s Core Strategy Policies

- 7.10 As has been shown, and for the same reasons that are given in respect of the NPPF, the scheme would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the local historic context and the setting of other Listed buildings by creating a building group that will not change its contribution to the immediate area, but will improve its environmental sustainability.
- 7.11 For these reasons, and those given earlier, the proposed development is consistent with National Planning Policy Statements 1 and 5, and Camden’s Core Policy D2 – Heritage.

8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The proposed scheme is respectful and well considered and takes its cue from the existing architectural composition of the buildings in the vicinity

and within the context of the local vernacular. The proposals will significantly enhance the environmental performance and therefore sustainability of the building.

- 8.2 The effect of the works on the heritage significance described earlier is therefore positive. The works will preserve the character and appearance of the historic area in which it sits and the setting of adjacent and nearby Listed buildings – the setting of the building will be retained and the key elements of the architectural style of the building will remain legible and appreciable.
- 8.3 For these reasons, the proposed scheme complies with the law, and national and local policy and guidance for Listed buildings and conservation areas.

t 0207 258 0411

a Unit 22 | The Artworks | Elephant Road
London | SE17 1AY