Flat 10, The Heights, 97 Frognal, London NW3. 19 August, 2024.

Camden Planning,

Attention Ewan Cambell

Dear Sirs,

RE: Planning Application 2024/0030/P -- Proposed Development at 99 Frognal, NW3

I am the leaseholder of the above flat in the property adjacent to 99 Frognal.

I would like to object to the application and support all the objections raised to date.

Whilst I do not wish to re-iterate all the objections in detail there are a few matters which I consider pertinent and would like to draw to your attention.

The proposed application is not sympathetic to the early Georgian character of 99 Frognal especially given its historical importance being the residence of General Charles De Gaule during the War. The proposal is an in-appropriate over development of the site which will harm the setting of this historic house.

As a number of objectors have already mentioned the disruption to local residents for such a large scale development will be intolerable. The road outside the property is very narrow and totally unsuitable for heavy construction traffic over a prolonged period, I believe up to four years. The noise, disruption, pollution and disturbance which local residents will endure is totally unacceptable over this period of time. In fact the application does not meet your policy D2 on heritage where you state you "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". In this case there is no public benefit.

However, my over-riding objection is to the scale and depth of the excavation (7m x 30m x12-20m). Whilst I am no engineer I consider there must be substantial risks to an excavation of this scale. I note Thames Water have raised a number of objections relating to the potential impact including flooding and the close proximity to a strategic sewer.

There are obviously also potential risks of ground movement and subsidence. This is of particular concern to the substantial listed wall between our properties let alone the potential impact on the building at 97 Frognal. The wall is a considerable height (approaching 50 ft?) and in poor condition, there are a number of cracks in it and the slightest movement could result in a partial collapse. I would also like to stress that the property is located on a hill which is likely to exacerbate any movement.

In light of the above please reject this application in its entirety.

Yours faithfully,

Teresita Cutting