

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1084/P	REZA MOSHIRI	11 PALACE COURT 250 FINCHLEY ROAD HAMPSTEAD	16/04/2025 00:48:17	OBJ	<p>Hi</p> <p>I am writing as the resident of Flat 11, Palace Court. My elderly mother has lived in that flat for over two decades. I am extremely concerned about the proposed development at the Frognal Garages site, and I'm objecting on her behalf and in full support of the other residents affected. Flat 11 is without question one of the most directly and severely impacted properties. It sits at ground level, just metres from the site boundary. According to the developer's own reports, several of the flat's windows will experience unacceptable daylight losses — one by over 60%, which is an extraordinary level of harm in planning terms.</p> <p>My disabled mother spends most of her time inside the flat or in the shared rear garden. This space is vital to her wellbeing. The current plan places balconies and windows uncomfortably close to both the windows of her home and the garden itself. That kind of proximity — with such little regard for privacy — is deeply upsetting. It changes the feel of the home entirely.</p> <p>It's worth stating plainly: this is not a general or minor inconvenience. It's a direct, daily threat to the quality of life of a vulnerable person who has lived here peacefully for years. The building she lives in is not just close to the proposed site — it is the nearest, and Flat 11 bears the full brunt of this scheme's impact.</p> <p>What's worse, this application follows a previously rejected version that was already found to cause harm. Instead of improving, the new design is larger, more intrusive, and even more damaging to the neighbouring homes. Camden's own planning team raised serious concerns in their advice earlier this year, yet little has changed.</p> <p>This is not thoughtful development. It disregards the very people whose lives will be most affected. I urge you to reject this proposal again — not only on policy grounds, but out of basic respect for residents who deserve peace and dignity in their homes.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Reza Moshiri</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1084/P	SOROOR MOSHIRI	11 PALACE COURT 250 FINCHLEY ROAD HAMPSTEAD	16/04/2025 01:11:53	OBJ	<p>Dear Planning Officer,</p> <p>I am an 80 years old and have lived peacefully in Flat 11, Palace Court for over 20 years. I am utterly dismayed that this developer is once again trying to push through a scheme that so clearly threatens our homes, our wellbeing, and our community to make a quick profit!</p> <p>This new proposal is even worse than the last one Camden rightly refused. It brings the building even closer to our home's windows, towers over our private garden, and strips away the sense of light and privacy we've relied on for decades.</p> <p>I am disabled and spend most of my days in the flat or outside in the small garden behind it — a place I enjoy fresh air and a moment of calm in central London. Now the developer wants to build a wall of windows and terraces less than a metre away, overlooking everything. Where are we supposed to go to feel safe? Where is the respect for the people already living here?</p> <p>Camden's own officers have said the relationship to Palace Court is unacceptable. They've said the building will have a significant impact on windows like ours, losing light of over 60%! And still the developer comes back with an even bulkier plan — ignoring all the warnings, all the objections, and all the families they'll affect.</p> <p>Please reject this proposal — again — and make it clear that this kind of aggressive overdevelopment has no place in our neighbourhood.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>SOROOR MOSHIRI</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1084/P	N Shishkin	Palace Court 250	15/04/2025 09:56:53	OBJ	<p>I've lived in Palace Court for many years and own a first-floor studio flat that directly overlooks the rear of the proposed development. I work from home full-time, so any changes to light levels, noise, structural stability, or privacy would affect me significantly on a daily basis.</p> <p>This proposal represents a step in the wrong direction. Camden already rejected a previous version in 2024 due to its negative impact on neighbouring properties like mine. That decision should have closed the matter — but this revised design is actually larger and even more intrusive.</p> <p>Camden's own planning feedback acknowledged that the scheme would “significantly impact multiple windows on the ground and first floor in two different areas of Palace Court” — including my own home. My flat already suffers from limited daylight, and this development would reduce it even further. Given that I'm home throughout the day, I would feel this effect constantly.</p> <p>Privacy is also a serious concern. The new terraces and windows would sit just a few metres away from mine — which, under UK guidelines, is far too close. The Council has already noted that the current layout causes overlooking. Frosted glass is not a sufficient solution, especially since the developer hasn't clarified what type would be used. And when windows are open, they would have a direct line of sight into my living space.</p> <p>When I reviewed the updated plans, I also noticed the front layout seems overly congested. Bins, bicycles, and entryways are all crammed into a small space on the pavement. Camden previously described this as “packed together and of poor quality” — and very little seems to have changed. In fact, it may have worsened.</p> <p>The claim that the garages are no longer needed is also untrue. Many residents still use them, and removing them would only increase parking pressure on Frognal Lane. I don't agree with the assumption that future occupants will be car-free — it's far more likely they'll bring additional vehicles into the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Finally, the basement excavation poses a serious risk, especially in an area known for subsidence. The proposal appears to violate planning rules, as the dig under the front garden/hardstanding seems to exceed the 50% area limit.</p> <p>This development offers no real benefit to the community. Instead, it brings more disruption, strains local infrastructure, and worsens conditions for residents like myself. Camden made the right decision last time. Given the increased impact, I ask Camden to once again reject this application in the interest of local residents.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1084/P	SHIDEH MOSHIRI	11 PALACE COURT 250 FINCHLEY ROAD HAMPSTEAD	16/04/2025 01:19:40	OBJ	<p>Dear Planning Officer,</p> <p>I am the resident and owner of Flat 11, Palace Court, where we have lived for many decades. We are writing to raise our strongest objection to the proposed redevelopment of the Frognal Garages site.</p> <p>Our flat is on the ground floor and sits directly behind the proposed development. Based on the submitted plans and daylight assessment, it is clear that our home is one of the most severely affected. One of our windows is set to lose over 60% of its daylight — a figure well beyond what any planning policy should consider acceptable. Several other windows in our flat also fall below BRE guidelines. These are not just technical breaches — they represent a real, daily loss of comfort, wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>My disabled mother, who is in her 80s and has long-term mobility issues, spends most of her time in the flat and enjoying our private rear garden. That space is one of the few places where she can enjoy fresh air, light and greenery — all of which are important not only to her physical comfort, but to her mental health. The new building would block light, loom over our garden, and place balconies and bedroom and bathroom windows at such a short distance that she would feel completely exposed in what should remain a private, peaceful space.</p> <p>Camden's own planning officers previously confirmed that the development would "significantly impact multiple windows on the ground and first floor in two different areas of Palace Court." These concerns remain unresolved. The design continues to push massing and height to the edge of our boundary. The new windows and terraces are only a few metres from our home. This is not considerate development — it is an unacceptable intrusion and a risk to our security with windows opening directly onto private land!</p> <p>What is most frustrating is that the previous application was rightly refused in 2024, and yet this version is larger, more intrusive, and even more harmful. There has been no genuine attempt to reduce the impact on neighbours. If anything, the situation has worsened. It is difficult to understand how such disregard for Camden's own pre-application advice could be justified.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Shideh moshiri</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1084/P	Samer ELKHODAIR	12 Palace Court 250 Finchley Rd UCLH NW36DN NW36DN	15/04/2025 10:24:01	OBJ	<p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed redevelopment of the Frognal Garages site. My ground floor flat (to which I have lived and owned for over 13 years) directly faces the rear of the proposed development, and I have serious concerns (again) about the impact this would have on my family's quality of life — particularly the light, privacy and use of our private garden. I have three young daughters whose bedrooms face onto the garden at the back of Palace Court. This space is a vital part of our home — it's where the girls play everyday, and where we enjoy time as a family. The current proposal places multiple windows and terraces — including bedrooms and bathrooms — directly overlooking this area, with no meaningful separation or security. The loss of privacy would be substantial and unavoidable. Frosted glass or visual screens do not change the fact that this is an unacceptable intrusion into our home life. Camden's own planning officers previously raised this very issue, stating in their February 2025 advice that "the relationship between the rear of the site and Palace Court" remains a problem, and that the Council "does not support this relationship." We completely agree. The proposed development fails to meet the expectations of privacy set out in the London Plan (Policy D3), which requires outdoor space to be protected from direct overlooking within 10 metres — a standard that is not met here.</p> <p>We are also extremely concerned about the significant loss of daylight to our home. Our daughters' bedrooms and our living spaces already rely on limited natural light from the space between Palace Court and Ashley Court. The new building would block even more, and Camden's pre-application report confirms this: "The development significantly impacts multiple windows on the ground and first floor in two different areas of Palace Court." It is unacceptable for an already-rejected scheme to return even taller and with increased massing, knowing it will worsen these conditions.</p> <p>The basement element of the proposal also remains problematic. It exceeds Camden's 50% garden excavation rule under Policy A5, and the Council noted that the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) was inadequate. There are known subsidence risks in this area, and no sufficient structural evidence has been provided to reassure residents.</p> <p>Finally, the developer claims the garages are underused, but this is misleading. Many are still in regular use, including by Palace Court residents. Removing them simply pushes more cars onto already congested local streets.</p> <p>This proposal continues to conflict with multiple planning policies, including: Camden Local Plan A1, A5, and H4 (residential amenity, basement limits, lack of affordable housing) London Plan Policy D3 (privacy, overlooking, and light) Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan SD4 and UD1 (design character, underground development impacts)</p> <p>The Council rightly rejected the previous application in 2024. This revised scheme does not address the fundamental issues raised — in fact, it exacerbates them. On behalf of my family, I respectfully urge Camden to refuse this application once again.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1084/P	Paul Doherty	17 palace court Finchley rd	15/04/2025 10:26:53	OBJ	<p>Dear Planning Officer,</p> <p>I have been a resident of Palace Court for over 20 years, and I'm writing to express my strong objection to the proposed redevelopment of the garage site behind our building.</p> <p>This development introduces a dense, oversized structure into a confined residential space and would fundamentally alter the environment we've lived in for decades.</p> <p>I'm particularly concerned about the potential impact the basement excavation could have on the structural integrity of our building. Camden's own planning officers previously flagged that the basement plans breached policy limits and that the application lacked the necessary structural detail. To proceed without proper engineering input, especially in a location known for subsidence, feels reckless. As someone who lives here full-time, the idea of years of disruption and potential long-term damage to the building is incredibly unsettling.</p> <p>There are also broader issues. The design of the proposed building is completely out of character with the area. The front is cluttered with bins and bike storage squeezed into a narrow space — even Camden's officers described it as "packed together and of poor quality." This part of Frognal Lane has a distinct look and feel, and this development simply doesn't respect that.</p> <p>I'm also worried about the impact this will have on shared outdoor spaces. The rear garden at Palace Court is one of the few private areas where residents — including families and older tenants like myself— can relax. The new plans introduce windows and terraces that overlook this space at close range, which makes it feel less private and more exposed. That matters a great deal to those of us who rely on these spaces as part of our home life.</p> <p>This proposal doesn't reflect the needs of the local community and it doesn't address the serious concerns raised when the earlier version was rightly refused. Instead, it increases scale and pressure on the very people who have lived here long before the idea of this development even existed.</p> <p>I strongly urge Camden to reject this application once again.</p>