

[REDACTED]

From: Tomas Kubica [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 September 2023 14:33
To: Planning Planning
Subject: Objection to 5 buildings at 14 Greenaway gardens

Application numbers:
2023/3072/P
2023/3074/P
2023/3078/P
2023/3081/P

Dear Sir or Madam

I would like to object to these 4 applications on the grounds of:

1. These 5 buildings were already rejected once; this is a repeat of the same application in 4 different applications. I do not understand why 4 different applications should lead to any different result than 1 application asking for the same thing. It seems to me like wasting taxpayers money.
2. This is a conservation area, where 5 modern building of this size/scale do not belong.
3. There is potentially significant impact on fauna and flora on the area. This area is now grass/trees, which now will be replaced to a large extent by 5 concrete buildings.
4. The house is already very large (and I understand further extended in the basement). Not sure how this extra space is needed and why it could not be accommodated in the main building.

Thank you for consideration

Tomas Kubica, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Pascal Heberling [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 September 2023 23:48
To: Planning Planning
Cc: Daniel Pope; Bethany Cullen; Elizabeth Beaumont; Alex Bushell; David Fowler; Gary Bakall; Angela Ryan; Tom Little; Geri Gohin; Linda Chung (Cllr); [REDACTED] Andrew Parkinson (Cllr); Gio Spinella (Cllr)
Subject: Objection to Applications 2023/3072/P, 2023/3074/P, 2023/3078/P, 2023/3081/P

Objection to Applications 2023/3072/P, 2023/3074/P, 2023/3078/P, and 2023/3081/P (14 Greenaway Gardens, London NW3 7DH)

Dear Madam/Sir

I just read with great consternation the renewed attempt by the owner of 14 Greenaway Gardens, NW3, to push through the previously refused five large outbuildings in their garden adjacent to ours. The plans appear in essence unchanged: they have simply broken down this massive development project into its various components, and added a personal statement to make the owner's case that each of these outbuildings be seen as incidental to his and his family's enjoyment of the main dwelling house. I reiterate my strong opposition to this proposal and urge Camden to stand its ground and stand by its thoughtful and well considered earlier decision to refuse this entirely.

Having read the latest materials which were only posted to the planning portal a couple of days ago on 8 September, I have a number of reactions.

Firstly, the leading comments about the owner's Ukrainian origins are simply disgraceful. Designed to elicit sympathy, they are both irrelevant to the case at hand and an insult to the brave Ukrainian people. We ourselves took in a displaced Ukrainian mother and her two young children when the war broke out. Our house did not expand; we made room for strangers in need of help. By contrast, the applicant seems solely preoccupied about his immediate family's and visiting friends' luxuries notwithstanding a palatial-sized home. While Ukrainian men of his age are fighting for their country's freedom and losing their lives, we are being asked to empathise over the owner's lower back problems and the pressing needs for his snooker table, swimming pool, jacuzzi, massage area, gymnasium, dance floor and art studio. I wonder what his countrymen would think if they read the sworn statement. It is shameful and has no place in this discussion.

Furthermore, a lot of the argument appears to centre around whether the various proposed outbuildings are truly incidental and reasonably required, and not simply a man's whim. Paradoxically, the sworn statement very much reads like a catalogue of whims: collecting coins requires a room to store them, enjoying swimming requires having a pool (UCS's is just around the corner), kids who paint and dance need a personal art studio and dedicated private dance floor, working out requires an own gym, playing snooker requires a games room, amateur modelling cannot be practiced without a craft room, the list goes on. This is a long list of common hobbies that everyone in this country regularly enjoys without "reasonably requiring" the facilities in their own home. They are each nice to have but not must haves. And they each would cause severe damage and seem completely out of proportion and character in the Hampstead Conservation Area. If one had wanted to come up with an illustration of "unrestrained whim", one could hardly do better. If tomorrow he were to pick up bowling perhaps a bowling alley might be next? And the fact that his current home at 41 Frognal has a number of these facilities is no argument for needing to replicate everything in the garden of his new home.

We already are contending with massive noise and disruption and completely appreciate the owner's desire and right to rebuild his home in line with the existing planning permissions, but the proposed outbuildings have been previously refused by Camden on the right grounds and that must be upheld. Much damage has already been done to multiple neighbours' amenity, to the local habitat (no more squirrels or songbirds), trees are being felled one by one, and gradually a once magical area of mature adjoining gardens becomes a built-up concrete patch of crass

proportions, with severe long-term impact on local biodiversity, decarbonisation and urban green space (see photos below).

Specifically, I also worry about noise pollution coming from the proposed pool machinery which the owner conveniently wants to house right where our garden begins, rather than underground beneath his proposed pool. The peace and quiet of this area must be preserved for all residents.

Added to that is the persistent pattern of deceiving both the Council and the neighbours, from the moment the first misleading planning application was submitted. Nothing here accords with the spirit of permitted development; it remains egregious. And rather than engaging with residents himself, the owner prefers to send paid advisers to deal with neighbours, in a manner that tends to be disingenuous and discourteous, despite the fact that everyone warmly welcomed him and supported his original planning application after he acquired the property, taking his word in good faith.

I do not see anything in the recent submissions that changes the conclusion that Camden already came to previously and urge you to uphold your decision to refuse.

This case also highlights once again the need for Camden to urgently consider an Article 4 Direction so as to protect this area from developers seeking to abuse the permitted development right provisions and putting the entire neighbourhood on the defensive over and over again.

Thank you for your kind consideration and I am available should you wish to discuss.

Sincerely

Pascal Heberling



Encl: before and after photos, to date

2020:



Today:



[REDACTED]

From: barbara alden [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 September 2023 23:55
To: Planning Planning
Cc: Angela Ryan; Gary Bakall; Daniel Pope; Alex Bushell; Bethany Cullen; Geri Gohin; Elizabeth Beaumont; Tom Little; David Fowler; Andrew Parkinson (Cllr); Gio Spinella (Cllr); Linda Chung (Cllr); [REDACTED]
Subject: 14 Greenaway Gardens
Attachments: 14 GG - certificate of lawfulness.pdf

To Camden Planning Department

Re Planning Applications: **2023/3072/P, 2023/3074/P, 2023/3078/P, 2023/3081/P**

I shall be sending in separate objections to each of these applications once I've looked through each one's plans, but I have some general observations that are relevant to all of them.

First and foremost, all 4 plans (for 5 outbuildings) were previously submitted under one application (2022/5583/P), and Camden rightly refused the owner a Certificate of Lawfulness, as shown here:

The reasons for refusal couldn't have been more clear or relevant, notably that the scale, number and intended use ... are contrary to Schedule 2 Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order, 2015 (as amended).

I received the above notification on 13 June 2023 and those same reasons must surely apply just 3 months later, whether those plans were submitted as combined or individual applications.

The applicant himself even states, in a short paragraph within the Cover Letters for each of these applications, that:

"As part of the overall development, four other single storey buildings are proposed in the large rear garden of the property These buildings have been submitted under separate Certificate of Lawfulness"

So, in reality, it's the same scheme that was refused a Certificate of Lawfulness.

It seems to me that the applicant is now taking a circuitous route to achieving the same aim as the original application, but by submitting each plan separately, hopes that planning officers and committee won't notice; by dealing with just one scheme at a time it might *look like* a more modest development. This is a blatant attempt to manipulate the planning system and I trust you will not be swayed by or condone such tactics.

Therefore I do urge Camden Planning Department to consider all four applications together, and to realise that the June Certificate of Lawfulness refusal was completely valid and still applies to each building.

Furthermore, the total change of use from a once tree and biodiversity-rich fully landscaped back garden to a substantial sports centre buildings development should not qualify for consideration under Permitted Development Rights.

Finally, surely all four applications fail to comply with the following:

Camden Local Plan
Camden Climate & Ecology Emergency Declaration
Redington Frognal Conservation Area Plan
RedFrog Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for considering these points

Yours sincerely
Barbara Alden





Application ref: 2022/5583/P
Contact: Geri Gohin
Tel: 020 7974 2047
Email: Geri.Gohin@Camden.gov.uk
Date: 12 June 2023

Development Management
Regeneration and Planning
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

Phone: 020 7974 4444

planning@camden.gov.uk
www.camden.gov.uk/planning

hgh Consulting
45 Welbeck Street
London
W1G 8DZ

Dear Sir/Madam

DECISION

Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Section 191 and 192

Certificate of Lawfulness (Proposed) Refused

Address:
14 Greenaway Gardens
London
NW3 7DH

Proposal:
Five single storey outbuildings in rear garden.

Drawing Nos: (0942)0001_PL03; (0942)0010_PL01; (0942)0012_PL01;
(0942)0013_PL01; (0942)0111_PL01; (0942)0112_PL01; (0942)0413_PL01;
(0942)0414_PL01; (0942)0414_PL02; (0942)0415_PL01; (0942)0416_PL01;
(0942)0416_PL02; (0942)0417_PL01; (0942)0418_PL01; (0942)0419_PL01;
(0942)2111_PL01; (0942)2211_PL01; (0942)3211_PL01; (0942)3212_PL01;
(0942)3213_PL01; Cover Letter dated 16th December 2022 (x 6 pages); Legal Advice
Note (x13 pages) dated 5th December 2022; Permitted Development Compliance
Document (x 15 pages) dated December 2022.

The Council has considered your application and decided to **refuse** a certificate of lawfulness for the following reason:

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposed outbuildings by reason of their scale, number and intended use, fail to be of a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse as such, contrary to Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

Informative(s):

- 1 If you intend to submit an appeal that you would like examined by inquiry then you must notify the Local Planning Authority and Planning Inspectorate (inquiryappeals@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) at least 10 days before submitting the appeal. Further details are on GOV.UK.

In dealing with the application, the Council has sought to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way in accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

You can find advice about your rights of appeal at:

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/appeals/guidance/guidancecontent>

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'DP', is placed over a faint, light-grey rectangular background.

Daniel Pope
Chief Planning Officer

[REDACTED]

From: Mike Hartley-Brewer [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 September 2023 08:10
To: Planning Planning
Cc: Daniel Pope; Bethany Cullen; Elizabeth Beaumont; Alex Bushell; David Fowler; Gary Bakall; Angela Ryan; Tom Little; Geri Gohin; Linda Chung (Cllr); [REDACTED] Andrew Parkinson (Cllr); Pascal Heberling; Gio Spinella (Cllr)
Subject: Objections to Applications re 14 Greenaway Gardens
Attachments: Objection to Games Room and gallery .doc; Objection to Pool Filtration etc.doc; Objection to Gymnasium.doc; Objection to Pool Hall.doc

Please find attached four letters of objection to the following Applications for Certificates of Lawfulness.

2023/3072/P

2023/3074/P

2023/3078/P

2023/3081/P

Please acknowledge receipt.

Best regards

Michael Hartley-Brewer

Michael Hartley-Brewer



Planning Department
London Borough of Camden
London
WC1H 9JE

11 September 2023

Dear Sir / Madam

Application Number: 2023/3078/P
Section 192 Application for Certificate of Lawfulness (Proposed Development) for an Outbuilding in the Rear Garden of 14 Greenaway Gardens, London, NW3 7DH

to accommodate a swimming pool hall, including Jacuzzi, sauna, treatment room and changing/shower facilities, together with relaxation/supervision area

I am writing to state my objections to this application.

1. The proposed works would conflict with one or more conditions imposed on the already implemented Planning Permission 2021/0984/P and therefore fall foul of Article 3(4) which provides:

'Nothing in this Order permits development contrary to any condition imposed by any planning permission granted or deemed to be granted under Part 3 of the Act otherwise than by this order.'

Planning Permission 2021/0984/P - Demolition of summerhouse in rear garden and landscaping works - authorised significant reconfiguration of the rear garden of the property. Condition 3 provides as follows:

'No development shall take place until full details of hard and soft landscaping and means of enclosure of all un-built, open areas have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. Such details shall include details of any proposed earthworks including grading, mounding and other changes in ground levels. The relevant part of the works shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thus approved.'

I submit that works have been carried out in preparation for the outbuildings proposed in this and other applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, works which were not approved under Condition 3. These works include excavations and the emplacement of metal and concrete foundations which were not required for the landscaping envisaged by Planning Permission 2021/0984/P.

Continued

On this matter, please see

- my e-mail to Bethany Cullen, 17 April 2023
- my e-mail to Elizabeth Beaumont, 20 April 2023, para 3.
- my e-mail to Elizabeth Beaumont, 18 May 2023, paragraph about concealed works.

I have received no adequate response from Council officials to my concerns about these works and my offer to guide officials to the location of buried works. In considering the Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness, Council officers need to uncover the facts about these works and whether they were approved under Planning Permission 2021/0984/P. If they were not so approved, this is a ground for refusing the Application.

I note that the applicant's legal adviser states in para 2.2 of her advice that "... even if the proposed works were inconsistent with the scheme permitted under Permission 2021/0984/P, there would be no 'conflict' with Condition 3, provided that the permission had been implemented in accordance with it, as I am instructed is happening "

She may have been so instructed by her client. However, I submit that some of the works already undertaken were NOT in accordance with the permission.

2. The proposed works cannot reasonably be regarded as being '*required for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house*' in accordance with paragraph (a) of Class E.

In *Emin v Secretary of State for the Environment* it was held that consideration of size alone when considering whether or not the development was 'incidental' was unlawful. The Judge went on to hold that the scale of activities proposed could be relevant and said that the question whether or not an activity was incidental '*could not rest solely on the whim of him who dwelt there but connoted some sense of reasonableness in all the circumstances of the particular case.*' However, the judge added that '*size might be an important consideration but not by itself conclusive*'.

The pool hall includes a large pool, a very extensive seating area on one side, a large space on the other side, changing rooms, a toilet, two lobbies, a jacuzzi and a sauna. Also included is a "Treatment Room", which can hardly be regarded as incidental to the enjoyment of the house. I am tempted to say that the scale of this proposal, along with the other out-buildings proposed in separate applications, is such that one might regard the house as having a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of these various facilities!

I submit that the sheer size of the proposed swimming pool hall is such that it is not reasonable in the circumstances of a house in a conservation area, and that the scale of facilities proposed does indeed represent the whim of the applicant, and that there is therefore reasonable ground for refusing the Application.

3. I further submit that the tactic of the applicant in submitting a number of separate applications for out-buildings previously covered by one refused application should not prevent you from looking at the applications together when considering whether the size of the proposed out-building is reasonable in the particular circumstances of this site.

Yours faithfully

Michael Hartley-Brewer

[REDACTED]

From: david stewart [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 September 2023 10:54
To: Planning Planning
Subject: 14 Greenaway Gardens - Application number: 2023/3072/P

Hi,

I want to register my objection to this planning application for a new pool and pool house in my next door neighbour's garden.

It is completely unreasonable. The owner Mr Kynsh, first applied for planning to transform the garden of his new house. There was no mention of any swimming pool. The plans only talked about how committed he was to planting a new garden.

I thought this was a great addition to the biodiversity of the area. I enthusiastically backed his proposals only for them to be junked when he applied for permitted development.

He now needs a pool and pool house. Something he seemingly wasn't aware of before submitting his original application. There are any number of swimming pools in the local area. It's a totally unreasonable addition to his plan.

The impact on the biodiversity of the local area is incalculable.

I strongly object to this proposed development.

All the best,

Dave Stewart
[REDACTED]

From: rachel oldroyd [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 September 2023 22:09
To: Planning Planning
Subject: Objection to 2023/3072/P

Dear planning officer,

I am writing about the plans submitted for the property 14 Greenway Gardens.

It appears four separate applications have been made for separate out buildings in the garden of the property. The plans suggest these are significant buildings that are far from temporary in structure or planned use.

Until recently I owned a neighbouring property and at the time objected to the original planning application submitted by the same owner at this property on environmental grounds and on the grounds that the plans would significantly change the nature of the locality. This was in response to plans for a landscaped garden which as I pointed out removed a number of mature native trees and cleared an important wildlife corridor which represented a tiny part of the garden on the boundary.

These original plans had at least envisaged a garden. The new plans involve the building of five separate buildings leaving no natural environment, let alone a wildlife corridor.

The frogged area is characterised by its large gardens and mature trees. Not only does this area harbour some of the oldest trees in the neighbourhood but the environment provides an important home for many species of wildlife including tawny owls, bats, common blue butterflies, jays, blackbirds, song thrushes, many species of tits etc. Some of these species are under threat. The trees in particular are also an important absorber of noise and chemical pollution from the neighbouring Finchley road. As a family area in a city desperately trying to clean up its air mature trees are vital. A newly planted tree absorbs a fraction of a mature one, which was the basis of my initial objection. This remains the core objection of my case.

The new plans pose a new environmental hazard with regards rain absorption. With underground water sources there is a high water table in the area and gardens can quickly become waterlogged. The impact of the buildings on water absorption levels in this large garden could have major consequences on neighbouring properties, and I am surprised that Camden Council (one of the local authorities to recognise early on the importance of planning around floods) is even considering letting the largest green space in the area disappear, and with it a vitally important rain sink.

The buildings are also likely to change the character of the distinctly green, tree-rich area.

With regards the specifics of this planning permission, it feels completely unnecessary to have two buildings for pool equipment, and we suggest that these could easily be subsumed into a single pool building - that if planned well could limit its impact on the natural environment.

Please consider these objections seriously.

Rachel Oldroyd

[REDACTED]

From: rachel oldroyd [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 September 2023 22:34
To: Planning Planning
Subject: objection to 2023/3072/P

Dear planning officer

I am writing to object to the plans submitted under 2023/3072/P

This objection is related to my objection submitted to [2023/3081/P](#) and can be read in conjunction to it. But please consider this a separate objection.

My core objections are:

1. The plans envisage totally unnecessary permanent structures being built in a garden environment
2. The plans will have significant impact on an important and well established wildlife ecosystem.
3. The plans involve the removal of vitally important mature trees and shrubs which act as absorbers of pollution from the nearby Finchley road. Any new planting will absorb a tiny proportion of mature trees.
4. The plans involve the removal of vitally important mature trees and shrubs which help to reduce Camden's carbon emissions
5. The garden at number 14 is one of the biggest in the area and the erection of a large outbuilding for an indoor pool removes critical rain soak soft landscaping which could have severe impact on neighbouring properties. I am particularly surprised that Camden Council has not considered this.
6. It feels unreasonable and unnecessary to build a separate gym, pool and pool house. With careful planning a single building could provide a pool and a gym - and one proportionate building would have significantly less impact on the environment than the five buildings currently envisaged
7. There is no previous precedent at the property - nothing of similar size or structure was in place.

Please consider this objection carefully

Regards Rachel Oldroyd

[REDACTED]

From: barbara alden [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 September 2023 16:47
To: Planning Planning
Cc: Angela Ryan; Gary Bakall; Daniel Pope; Alex Bushell; Bethany Cullen; Geri Gohin; Elizabeth Beaumont; Tom Little; David Fowler; Andrew Parkinson (Cllr); Gio Spinella (Cllr); Linda Chung (Cllr); [REDACTED]
Subject: 14 Greenaway Gardens

To Camden Planning Department

Re: Planning Application **2023/3072/P**

This application for a substantial building to house a swimming pool, associated jacuzzi, sauna, health treatment room, dedicated changing and shower facility, *plus* a 'relaxation area' including lounge chairs and a table, has been submitted as a single application for a certificate of lawfulness, but if such a certificate were to be agreed, it would surely enable the applicant to automatically claim a certificate allowing the construction of 2 further buildings they would require for the function of the pool building - one being to house pool filtration systems and the other to house irrigation stores.

These latter two have craftily been submitted in a separate application **2023/3081**, presumably so if one certificate was granted, the other(s) would then have to be granted, thereby gaining permission for 3 new buildings, not one, at the rear of a garden that unfortunately borders many properties in Chesterford Gardens, none of which have gardens to equal in the length and breadth of 14 Greenaway Gardens. So the adverse visual impact of this ((ie these) building(s) will be far greater for far more people over the boundary wall.

This is not an appropriate use of the planning system, to submit separate applications for inter-dependant buildings.

It's all very well to claim that 'the swimming pool is no larger in length and width than that which was on site recently,' but not acceptable to omit the fact that that was an outdoor pool and, by definition, did not have any *height*, which of course the proposed *building(s)* would have. The previous outdoor pool had no visual impact on the surrounding area, but a building (with its accompanying 2 further operational buildings) would have a detrimental visual impact on all the surrounding neighbours.

The applicant considers Application 2023/3072/P to be 'incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house as such' and invites Camden Planners to consider 'objectively' - 'that the swimming pool building is demonstrably reasonably required'.

By most people's standards, a swimming pool of any sort is not 'reasonably required' but a luxury and, in legal terms, an unrestrained whim. Luxuries of course are not wrong in themselves, but is it right for Camden Planners to preference one family's 'reasonable requirement' (whim) over and above the reasonable requirement of the many to have peaceful enjoyment of their established surroundings - which I don't think counts as a whim.

Thank you for refusing the previous certificate of lawfulness when this application was included with other building proposals for the site.

Please uphold that refusal again, for 2023/3072/P, as nothing in the plans has changed, apart from the applicant's inclusion of irrelevant family details.

Using his Ukrainian heritage as he does, to justify his 'reasonable requirement,' would no doubt be quite offensive to those fighting on the streets, or sheltering in fear, back in his homeland, or those struggling as refugees over here, as well as to the families who are generously hosting them.

Sincerely

Barbara Alden



[REDACTED]

From: Evangelia Kordomenidis [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 September 2023 08:13
To: Planning Planning
Cc: George Tourkolias; Daniel Pope; Bethany Cullen; Elizabeth Beaumont; Alex Bushell; David Fowler; Gary Bakall; Angela Ryan; Tom Little; Geri Gohin; Linda Chung (Cllr); [REDACTED] Andrew Parkinson (Cllr); Gio Spinella (Cllr)
Subject: STOP 14 Greenaway Gardens NW3 7DH Outbuildings Application numbers: 2023/3072/P, 2023/3074/P, 2023/3078/P, 2023/3081/P

Dear Sir/Madam,

My husband Georgios Tourkolias and I are the owners of [REDACTED] - located right next door to no. 14.

We are very concerned and strenuously object to all 5 of the proposed outbuildings in the rear garden. The application numbers are outlined below:

Application numbers to quote: 14 Greenaway Gardens London NW3 7DH

- 1) One single in rear garden (pool). Application number: **2023/3072/P**
- 2) One single storey outbuilding in rear garden (gymnasium). Application number: **2023/3074/P**
- 3) One single storey outbuilding in rear garden (games hall and gallery). Application number: **2023/3078/P**
- 4) Two single storey outbuildings in rear garden (pool filtration and irrigation stores). Application number: **2023/3081/P**

These applications were previously denied by Camden Council and we urge you to uphold your decision.

Our understanding was that the original plans for the garden, which were previously submitted and approved, involved a sympathetic landscaping plan mixing terraces and green spaces, in line with the surrounding gardens in this important conservation area.

These outbuildings, which would be located in the middle of adjoining gardens, are considerable in their surface area and almost look like a mini-development in their own right. We are very concerned about the visual impact for multiple neighbours which will be considerable, and for the urban wildlife and ecosystem in these gardens, it is equally worrying.

The proposed outbuildings are not a "reasonable requirement" for a family of four. The extensive basement area which has already been approved by the council could certainly house a number of the desired facilities (private pool, sauna, jacuzzi, gym, games hall, dance hall and art studio), many of which can also be found within the Hampstead community.

Noise pollution from the pool filtration and irrigation stores is a further concern. It will be constant and unyielding. The neighbourhood is suffering as it is from the non-stop drilling that is currently taking place and has been going on for almost a year and planned for at least one more.

We ask you please to look at the applications in detail and uphold your original decision to deny planning permission. Nothing has changed in this second round apart from an attempt to confuse the council by splitting one application into four.

Thank you in advance.

Kind regards,

Evangelia Kordomenidis

Georgios Tourkolias



[REDACTED]

From: Jayne Irving [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 September 2023 13:54
To: Planning Planning
Subject: COMMENT: 14 Greenaway Gardens Ap No: 2023/3072/P (Pool)

This is yet another attempt by the owners to cynically game the planning system. Having been refused permission to replace 'trees' (in their original application) with 5 buildings - 4 of them monstrous - they are now trying their hand at applying in 4 separate applications - maybe hoping you won't notice?

This swimming pool - plus the changing rooms, gym, dance studio, art gallery, games room, pool plant and garden store are more suited to a leisure centre or hotel than a home. They have already ripped out countless trees and irreparably damaged the biodiversity of this conservation area and seem to think their wealth will allow them to trample on the laws protecting this precious green space. So this application needs to be seen for what it is - an underhand way to pull the wool over the eyes of the council who have rightly already refused the replacement of 'landscaping and trees" with 'five buildings'. I urge you to stick to your original decision and refuse this application (and the other 3).

Jayne Irving
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Bradley Yam [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 September 2023 15:21
To: Planning Planning
Subject: planning objection to 14 Greenaway gardens

I would like to object to the following planning applications for 14 Greenaway Gardens , NW3 7DH .
2023/3072/P
2023/3074/P
2023/3078/P
2023/3081/P

These are five proposed structures that have already been denied as one application and have now been resubmitted as four separate ones .

The environmental impact to the local area , with noise pollution , air pollution and damage to nature is incredibly impactful .

The work will continue for at least 18 months . I have a young child with breathing difficulties (visits GOSH every 3-6 months) and the amount of work is very dangerous for her essentially living next to an industrial building site for 18 months at least .

Large articulated lorries are coming into the road on multiple occasions throughout the week which is very disturbing delivering and taking away building equipment etc which is way beyond any "normal" housing development . This work is on an industrial scale and the noise is beyond anything acceptable for a residential street.

The new buildings in our view would be impactful to the local environment and an eyesore and in essence a leisure centre is being built in a private garden .

We wholly oppose this application which originally was going to be just a new garden with new trees and shrubbery .

I would also like to object to the massive crane in the garden of 14 greenaway gardens as I feel is a danger to life if it was to fall in a residential street .

Bradley Yam
[REDACTED]

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail may constitute a communication that is an invitation or inducement to engage in investment activity (a financial promotion). It is intended for viewing by existing clients of JB Drax Honoré that are: (i) persons reasonably believed to be as is described in Article 19 (Investment professionals) of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 (Financial Promotion) Order 2005 (the "Order"); or, (ii) persons to whom its contents may otherwise be lawfully distributed or promoted under the Order (iii) persons reasonably believed to fall under the CFTC institutional suitability safe harbour described in section 23.434 (a)(b) of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) . Persons not falling within the above descriptions must not act upon or rely on the contents of this e-mail. The contents of this e-mail are for informational purposes only and do not constitute investment advice.

DISCLOSURES: <http://www.jbdh.com/disclosurestatement/>

JB Drax Honoré (UK) Limited ("JBDH") is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority under firm reference number 585303 and registered in England and Wales under company number 8137487. Registered office: 4th floor, 20 Gresham Street, London EC2V 7JE. This is neither an offer to sell nor a solicitation to invest. Past performance is not indicative of future results. The value of investments and any income generated may go down as well as up and is not guaranteed. No representation, warranty, or undertaking, express or limited, is given as to the accuracy or completeness of the information or opinions contained in this document by any partners or employees of JBDH and no liability is accepted by such persons for the accuracy or completeness of any such information or opinions.

Visit our website at www.jbdh.com