**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

18 FROGNAL WAY LONDON NW3 6XE Planning application ref. 2020/0986/P Consultation period to 10 May 2020

## **OBJECTION**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this application. The original or 'host' building was designed in the early twentieth century by C H B Quennell, an architect who built a number of houses in the area, some of which are listed.

In the early 2000s the house was bought by a family who were in business as property developers and a large number of planning applications were submitted for extensions at the rear and side. This is a matter of record and is not dealt with in detail here. Most of these applications were refused by the council or at appeal, or were withdrawn.

From the dialogue between the council and the applicants emerged the principle that the proposed rear and side extensions should be subordinate to the host building which should be preserved as the dominant form. This led to planning permission being granted for a rear balcony extension starting below the side eaves and curving down to a lower level, preserving the form of the host building.

The current application breaches this principle by proposing to build up the side walls of the extension to eaves level so that the extension is no longer visually subordinate to the host building and the legibility of its original form is lost.

The applicant has indicated that because the proposal is at the rear of the house it does not affect the conservation area. This is not the case since the rear of the house is plainly visible from properties in Frognal Way, Ellerdale Close and Ellerdale Road; and I have myself viewed the property from all of these locations. I also see that another objector has – quite independently – expressed the same views regarding the proposed extensions.

It is also asserted that these are ground floor extensions ie. at the same level as the front entrance from Frognal Way. In fact because of the difference in ground level between front and rear – increased by excavation and landscaping works in the garden – they are in fact upper floor extensions.

We are in general agreement with the council's pre-application advice dated 05/12/19 which covers the foregoing points, and in particular would highlight the following:-

The proposal would be contrary to policy, on the grounds that it would introduce glazed extensions at high level and would be less than a storey below eaves. More importantly, it would harm the composition of the host building, to the detriment of the Hampstead Conservation Area. The principle of development in this location is unlikely to be supported.

and

The solid walls of the proposed extensions would also alter the profile of the building, reducing the legibility of the original building from the side.

and in conclusion the statement that:-

As submitted, the application is likely to be refused on design grounds

The pre-application advice mentions alternatives such as an extension centred on the rear elevation or involving alterations to the existing roof of the host building. We strongly disagree with these alternatives which appear to conflict with policy in a similar way to the present application and, in the case of the latter, would seriously compromise the roof form of the existing host building which is one of its most distinctive features. It is considered that the property has already absorbed as much extension and alteration as it can without further detriment to the host building, and in consequence harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

For the above reasons, we request that the council **refuse** this application in line with its own preapplication advice.

**Note:** due to the coronavirus pandemic and possible effect on the handling of correspondence, this objection is being sent both by e-mail to the planning department and via the online facility on the application webpage.



