

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1084/P	Mama's Kubo	Unit 5/6 Palace Court  NW3 6DN	17/04/2025 20:04:11	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms Baptist,</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of Mama Kubo's, a long-standing hospitality business located directly behind the Frognal Garages site. We wish to submit a formal objection to planning application 2025/1084/P, on the grounds that the proposed development will significantly and unacceptably affect our staff's working conditions and operational environment.</p> <p>Our restaurant's kitchen and back-of-house areas are entirely reliant on a single rear window for natural light and fresh air. This window is located just metres from the Frognal Garages boundary. Based on the submitted plans and associated documents, it is clear that the proposed building — with its increased height, footprint, and proximity to our premises — would obstruct this sole point of natural daylight and ventilation. It is our understanding that the building will be constructed within close horizontal and vertical proximity, creating a severe visual and environmental blockage to this critical source.</p> <p>This poses serious implications for staff wellbeing and occupational standards. Under The Workplace (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations 1992, employers are required to ensure that all workplaces have "sufficient lighting," and that "where reasonably practicable, workplaces shall have natural lighting." The proposed development undermines our ability to meet this basic legal requirement, as the rear window serves as the only natural light source for our kitchen team, who work extended hours daily in a high-heat environment.</p> <p>Additionally, guidance issued by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) stipulates that ventilation must provide sufficient fresh or purified air, and that "where necessary, mechanical ventilation supplemented by natural ventilation should be considered." Our current setup relies heavily on passive air circulation through the rear window, and any obstruction to this would directly impair safe working conditions in a food preparation environment. This is not only a workplace rights issue, but one of public health and food safety.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the potential structural implications of the proposed basement excavation, which involves significant sub-surface works on a constrained site with limited separation from surrounding buildings. Camden's February 2025 pre-application advice noted that the Basement Impact Assessment "lacks clarity," fails to comply with several elements of Policy A5, and has not been reviewed by a structural engineer. Given that our restaurant shares a rear boundary with the site, and sits on a sensitive slope, the absence of a detailed structural review is worrying. Ground movement or vibration during excavation could cause damage to our foundations or compromise the stability of our kitchen area — something we cannot afford to risk.</p> <p>From a planning policy perspective, the February 2025 pre-application advice and the consultation feedback already raise serious concerns about overdevelopment, insufficient spacing to boundaries, and adverse impacts on surrounding properties. These observations are directly applicable to our case. The proposal fails to provide appropriate separation between commercial and residential use and introduces a massing strategy that overwhelms neighbouring buildings, including ours. The Council previously acknowledged that "the</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>relationship between the rear of the site and Palace Court remains problematic.” The same applies to our premises.</p> <p>We also note with concern that this revised application appears to perform worse than the previously refused 2024 scheme in several key areas. The overall height and massing have increased, and the building has been pushed even closer to the boundary we share. The developer has failed to resolve multiple issues raised in Camden’s previous refusal and pre-application advice — particularly in relation to boundary relationships, amenity impact, and design quality. From our perspective, the updated scheme intensifies the very problems that led to its initial rejection.</p> <p>Furthermore, this application does not appear to account for the presence or operational needs of nearby businesses such as ours, nor does it demonstrate how neighbouring commercial uses will be protected from long-term disruption, which is a core consideration under Policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan (Protecting Amenity), and Policy D1 (Design), which stresses the need for development to relate sensitively to existing surrounding buildings.</p> <p>We have worked hard to build a reputable neighbourhood restaurant and to create a safe and welcoming working environment for our team. This development, if approved in its current form, would compromise both — without any engagement or consideration from the applicant regarding the direct impacts on our business operations.</p> <p>For these reasons, we strongly urge Camden to refuse this application, or at the very least request material revisions to ensure protection of existing commercial neighbours and the welfare of local workers.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Mama's Kubo Management</p>

---

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1084/P	Anna Thomas	Palace court, 250 finchley road	17/04/2025 19:03:48	OBJ	<p>I'm a resident and leaseholder at Palace Court, and I'm writing to object to the proposed redevelopment of the garage site behind our building.</p> <p>My husband and I are welcoming our first child this year, and this development will take both daylight and privacy from the very room which we are turning into a nursery. When we bought our flat, it was because we liked the area and looked forward to starting a family here, it feels surreal that a large property development can have such a negative impact on this.</p> <p>Privacy is key concern. The design includes balconies and windows facing directly into our communal garden and rear windows. These aren't distant views — they're close. We use our garden often, and I'd hoped it would be a safe outdoor space for me and our baby to enjoy in the coming months. Knowing that people will be looking directly in from their bedrooms, bathrooms, and terraces changes the entire feeling of the space.</p> <p>This proposal is completely oversized. It's bulkier than the last version, which was already rejected by Camden, and many of the same problems remain — just pushed further. The harm to daylight and privacy hasn't been addressed, and from what I've read in Camden's own feedback, even the Council's concerns from earlier this year haven't been properly taken into account.</p> <p>We need homes that support the people already living in them, who invested in this area and use their properties to live and raise families rather than just turn a profit . I do hope Camden will take a stand again and refuse this application.</p>

---

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1084/P	Shevi	Flat7 Ashley court Frognal Lane NW3 7DX	17/04/2025 21:20:26	OBJ	<p>I am a new resident of Ashley Court and would like to submit my objection to the proposed development at the Frognal Garages site.</p> <p>Although I have only recently moved in, I've come to appreciate the character and layout of this part of Frognal, including the shared private garden at the rear of the building. My grandchildren regularly use the garden, and it is one of the few accessible outdoor spaces in the area suitable for young children. The proposed development introduces windows and terraces that would directly overlook this space at close range, raising concerns around privacy and future use of the garden by residents.</p> <p>In addition, the scale and massing of the proposed building appear overbearing in relation to the neighbouring properties. Camden's pre-application advice noted that the frontage remains visually cluttered and of poor quality, with bins, bicycle storage, and lightwells all concentrated into a relatively narrow area. These concerns appear not to have been addressed meaningfully in the updated submission.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the proposed basement excavation. Given the slope of the site and the age of Ashley Court, any structural works of this scale should be supported by a detailed and independent structural assessment. I note how Camden has already commented that the Basement Impact Assessment lacks sufficient technical input, and until that is provided, this remains a key issue.</p> <p>Finally, the current garages are not, as claimed, deserted. From my understanding, several are still in use or rented out by residents. Their removal would add pressure to parking in an already limited area, and the inclusion of a large new private garage in the proposal does not seem to align with a "car-free" approach.</p> <p>In summary, the scheme does not appear to be consistent with several Camden planning policies. I would therefore ask the Council to refuse this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Mrs Bamdad Resident, Ashley Court</p>