

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5214/P	Peter Oppenheimer	06/12/2020 19:14:16	OBJ	<p>The new application takes very little account of the majority of objections on the previous version of the application in terms of massing, and colour of the building; in terms of the the scale of project, the adjustments suggested are relatively modest - particularly in the removal of just 35cm from the height.</p> <p>I understand that the materials proposed and the overall build quality would be very high and that the building would be much better built than the existing one and it would also be more sustainable, all of which is to be welcomed. However, that does not mean that this design is suitable or compatible with this particular location being, as it is, in a very prominent and sensitive site at the top of the hill which will be seen from each direction. In this sense the colour and scale of the proposed build would overwhelm and dominate the street and for that reason it appears to contradict a number of Camden's policies and the local Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>My main objection relates to the scale and the colour of the facade used. The height and scale would overwhelm aesthetically both the neighbouring buildings to the right (including its adjoining terrace) and the bright green tile facade would not be sympathetic to the street but rather dominate it aesthetically. The side elevation to the east is made of brick - a material (or at least a tone/colour) that would be much more sympathetic and complementary to the street architecture, character of the conservation area and its overall aesthetic language (even if the design itself were unchanged).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The Camden Local plan states that the building design 'integrates well with the surrounding streets' - which it does not as there are no building in any of the surrounding streets which are bright green; a brick material or even brick coloured tiles would fit more easily into the built environment.</li> <li>2) 7.4.1 on the heritage statement stated that the council 'pay special attention to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The National Planning Policy Framework states that in decision making local authorities should give great weight to conservation of designated heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance' - it is not clear that this has been done given the materials proposed.</li> <li>3) The design in this particular location fails to meet the objectives of the Hampstead neighbourhood plan DH1. It states that a building should be ' Responding positively and sympathetically to the existing rhythm, proportion, height, scale, massing, materials and storey heights of surrounding buildings' the height, massing and green tiled materials do not meet this criteria</li> <li>4) The Hampstead neighbourhood plan point 3.18 states that the 'New buildings should relate to the scale, density, mass and detail of the local character ' - again this does not appear to be the case.</li> <li>5) The basement also seems to raise risks to the neighbouring properties and water course - while basements can be a useful utility to save space (according to the guidelines) it does not seem convincing that a plunge pool is worth the risks that it poses to the environmental bio diversity, water course and surrounding buildings given the uncertainties involved around the Burland scale assessment</li> <li>6) There has also been no posting of this application on lampposts</li> <li>7) The application impact statement document makes the argument that Hampstead has a history of modern buildings that were not popular at the time. This is absolutely true, and innovation is refreshing, but this does not mean that a new building that is unpopular at the time necessarily lasts the test of time - after-all, the</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5214/P	Lars Bane	09/12/2020 13:36:46	COMMNT	<p>existing building - which is now being demolished after roughly 50 years - was probably not popular at the time. While quality of a build is key to longevity, and this building would be much better constructed than the one that it replaces, there is a real risk that the colour does not fit and the scale is also too big for the site and risks dominating and overwhelming it rather than being complementary and sympathetic. Adjustments based on these considerations could make it a much more successful and popular building over the long run.</p> <hr/> <p>I made a comment/complaint in connection with the previous submission. In short, this is not materially different. The building looks more or less the same and although it could look great in a different setting it simply does not fit into the surrounding area. We had commissioned an expert report last time and that one is still valid</p> <p>Last time there were more than 130 objections. Camden should take that on board.</p> <p>In terms of due process it is notable that no notification has been made outside the house (last time it was put up very late). I understand that there has been hearings but none of the complainants have been informed or invited. I doubt the process is in the spirit of the regulation. Why not manage the process properly? This is a democratic embarrassment.</p>
2020/5214/P	Mary Stokes	13/12/2020 12:48:58	SUPPRT	<p>I support the planning application. The design is bold and imaginative. The area does not have any single, coherent architectural style but a tradition of some very fine modern houses, which this house would contribute to. The house will make a big and playful statement, but will not overwhelm its surroundings because the tiles are a very soft green with much detailing, and there will be plenty of plants. An interesting addition to a leafy street, which I used to live in.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5214/P	Dr Joanna Myers	06/12/2020 20:57:27	OBJ	20 Frognal Gardens London NW3 6XA  Mr Ben Farrant Senior Town Planner Contact Camden Reception 5 Pancras Square London N1C 4AG

Dear Mr Farrant

Re: 2020/5214/P

I am writing to object to the re-submitted application of 18A Frognal Gardens, NW3 6XA. This application has caused considerable upset and concern to the local neighbours and I think the proposed build in its current form will be a mistake for the area. The revision proposed by the developers following the withdrawal of their previous application (2019/5348/P) is minimal in terms of the overall scale and offers, therefore, no real compromise between the aspirations of the developer on behalf of their applicant (Roger Pigrim) and those that object to the new build and do not feel it is appropriate for the street. I understand that it is standard practice to re-attach the previous objections to the new application and I request this is done.

In my opinion whilst the building looks like it is of very fine specification it architecturally is not suitable in its current form for this prominent location. It is adjoining 18B Frognal Gardens, making this look out of proportion and scale with no guarantee that this house could eventually be redeveloped in a similar way making it more incongruous to the low level buildings to its left and opposite (7 & 20 Frognal Gardens and 98 Frognal). This building if it went ahead in its current form would damage the beauty of the area and would not be an asset. This is a view shared by many including those with a professional design and architectural background that I know. There are, in my view, many very stunning modern builds in Hampstead but the sheer size and colour of this is going to be overwhelming in terms of its aesthetics in a sensitive conservation area.

I am finally concerned that the basement proposed would damage nearby houses (including my own) which is very upsetting and it is stated in the developer's own submission there is a chance of subsidence and other damage. I would like to know what are the safeguards to protect vulnerable neighbours from this possible eventuality and I question whether the risks involved make this a necessary part of the build given its proposed function and the already significant scale of the home.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Your sincerely ,

Dr Joanna Myers

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2020/5214/P	william taylor	13/12/2020 17:00:31	SUPPRT	<p>I am writing in support of this Planning Application</p> <p>I believe that the proposed family house, designed by an award winning practice would represent a significant contribution to both the Conservation Area and to the acknowledged collection of fine modern and post modern houses in Hampstead and the Borough, many of which contrast architecturally with their immediate neighbours (for example as at 49a Downshire Hill, NW3).</p> <p>Whilst referencing the massing and modulation of other buildings in the area, the design is distinctive and is of its own time. It appears to sit well in its context whilst possessing its own strength of character and materiality, in a manner similar to that of the Artists Cottage at 14 South Parade in Bedford Park by C F A Voysey, which is a white rendered building at the heart of a very red brick Garden Suburb.</p> <p>The quality of the existing building on the site is at best unremarkable, yet it occupies a position of some townscape significance. As the illustrations highlight, the long view up Frogna Gardens in particular will be significantly enhanced by this fine design.</p>

---