

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1084/P	Mr P Koumis	16a Palace Court NW3 6DN	01/05/2025 13:14:28	OBJ	<p>Dear Planning Officer,</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to planning application 2025/1084/P. I am a long-term resident of Palace Court, residing in a flat at the rear of the building. All windows in my home directly overlook the Frognal Garages site. I work from home full-time and have invested significantly in creating a quiet, well-lit living and working space. This proposal, if approved, would have a materially harmful effect on the amenity, privacy, and security of my home.</p> <p>The revised development increases both the height and massing of the proposed building in close proximity to Palace Court. As confirmed by the applicant's own Daylight and Sunlight Report, multiple windows in our block including my own home which serve as primary living spaces — will experience reductions in Vertical Sky Component (VSC) far beyond Camden's accepted threshold of 20%. In several cases, losses exceed 50%, with one flat showing a reduction of more than 60%. These represent significant, tangible harm to the habitability of established residential dwellings.</p> <p>Camden's own pre-application advice (February 2025) confirms that "the overall daylight/sunlight impact appears worse than the refused scheme" and that the development "significantly impacts multiple windows on the ground and first floor in two different areas of Palace Court." This is a clear indication that the revised proposal has failed to address — and in fact worsens — the amenity impacts identified in the refusal of the 2024 application.</p> <p>In addition to daylight loss, I am particularly concerned about the increased overlooking and loss of privacy. The revised scheme eliminates the previously proposed basement-level privacy screen and reduces the set-back between the new building and Palace Court. As a result, new windows and terraces will directly overlook existing bedrooms and living areas at a horizontal distance as little as 1.5 metres. These relationships are incompatible with Policy D3 of the London Plan and Camden's Local Plan Policy A1, both of which require development to safeguard visual privacy between habitable rooms. The inclusion of obscure glazing in some sections does not mitigate the problem, especially when balconies, bathrooms, and full-height windows allow uninterrupted views into private residential spaces throughout the day.</p> <p>The proposal also includes a basement excavation of significant depth — up to 14 metres — on a narrow, sloped site. Palace Court is has known ground movement issues, which have already required monitoring and management. Camden's planning officers note that the applicant's Basement Impact Assessment fails to include structural calculations, is not authored or reviewed by a qualified structural engineer, and underrepresents the risks of settlement and subsidence. This omission is in direct conflict with Policy A5(n) of the Camden Local Plan, which requires applications to demonstrate that development will not cause harm to the structural integrity of adjacent buildings. The absence of a credible structural mitigation strategy places our building at unnecessary and unacceptable risk.</p> <p>This proposal also affects our communal garden which I enjoy using with my other residents. The increased scale of the new structure would lead to prolonged overshadowing, reducing the utility, privacy, and enjoyment of this shared area. Camden's own policies require protection of</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>such external amenity spaces, particularly in high-density areas where green space is limited.</p> <p>Given the cumulative harm to amenity, privacy, daylight, and structural safety — and the applicant's failure to address the Council's previous refusal — I respectfully urge Camden to refuse planning application 2025/1084/P.</p>
2025/1084/P	Justin Eskind	Ashley Court Frognal Lane Flat 10 NW3 7DX	01/05/2025 16:15:28	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Ashley Court, which sits directly beside the Frognal Garages site, and I wish to raise a formal objection to the above application.</p> <p>My concern centres on the structural risks associated with the proposed basement excavation, which appears inadequately assessed in the submitted materials. As confirmed in Camden's February 2025 pre-application advice, the Basement Impact Assessment lacks structural engineering input and does not meet the requirements set out under Policy A5 of the Camden Local Plan.</p> <p>Ashley Court is an older building situated on a gradient, and the proposed development involves a deep excavation (up to 14 metres) extremely close to our shared boundary. This introduces substantial risk of ground movement, soil displacement, and vibration damage — yet the developer's submission fails to account for existing ground conditions, the cumulative risk to neighbouring properties, or any mitigation backed by a qualified structural engineer.</p> <p>In fact, Camden officers noted the lack of clarity in the Ground Movement Assessment, and highlighted that the submission is not suitable for review due to its omissions. For a development of this scale and proximity, that is a serious failure. The consequences of foundation movement or subsidence could be long-lasting and costly — not just physically, but financially, through rising insurance premiums and potential building repairs.</p> <p>Until a fully detailed, independently reviewed structural plan is provided — and the risks are proven to be manageable — I believe this proposal poses an unacceptable threat to the integrity of adjacent homes. I therefore urge the Council to reject the application in its current form.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
2025/1084/P	Matin	Flat 4 Ashley Court, Frognal Lane, NW3 7DX	01/05/2025 23:28:59	OBJ	<p>To whomever it may concern,</p> <p>I am a resident at Ashley Court, Frognal Lane, next to the proposed build site as detailed in 2025/1084/P. After reading these new plans, I must voice my concerns and dislike for them</p> <p>The proposed buildings would block a significant amount of light, and are far too close to Ashley Court, which, being an older building, could face structural issues from having such a large structure installed right up against it.</p> <p>I do believe that this application is poorly thought through, and am vehemently opposed to their implementation.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Matin Sharkawi</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1084/P	Dr Pirlanta Omer Ali	27 Palace Court NW3 6DN	01/05/2025 13:05:09	OBJ	<p>Dear Planning Officer,</p> <p>My name is Dr. Pirlanta Ali, and I have been a resident of Palace Court since 1992. As one of the building's directors, I take an active role in maintaining the fabric of the building and ensuring the wellbeing of the community who call it home. I am writing to register my strong objection (once again!) to the proposed development at the Frognal Garages site.</p> <p>Palace Court is a long-established residential building with a stable, diverse community. As directors, we have a responsibility to ensure the property remains structurally sound, liveable, and safe for all residents — including the elderly and families with young children. This development threatens that stability.</p> <p>The most immediate concern is the significant loss of daylight that the scheme would impose on our homes and shared garden. Multiple ground and first-floor flats, including homes with vulnerable residents, face a substantial drop in natural light — in some cases exceeding 60% of current levels, as shown in the applicant's own daylight report. This is not a marginal impact. It has real consequences for comfort, wellbeing, and mental health. The garden, which serves as a calm, green space for quiet enjoyment, will also fall under permanent shadow. That loss cannot be replaced.</p> <p>As someone living on a higher floor, I am also alarmed by the anticipated noise impacts from this scheme. The submitted Sound Impact Assessment acknowledges that the proposal fails to meet Camden's "Green" threshold and instead lands in the Amber (adverse impact) category — even before factoring in the long-term reality of heat pumps operating in real-world conditions. The report relies on idealised noise levels from manufacturer data, which significantly understates the true acoustic footprint of this machinery. In practice, noise from mechanical equipment (including HVAC and heat pumps) typically increases over time, and the impact will be magnified for upper-floor flats like mine. These impacts are not hypothetical — they're predictable and lasting.</p> <p>The structural risk posed by the basement excavation is another major red flag. The proposed development sits just a few metres from Palace Court, on sloped ground, and proposes a basement reaching 14 metres deep. Camden's Basement Impact Assessment guidance requires consideration of existing subsidence — yet this development has failed to account for the visible damage already present in Palace Court. Camden's own Local Plan policy A5(n) makes clear that basement proposals must be refused where cumulative structural risk is not properly assessed. The technical documents show this risk has been underestimated, and frankly, that is unacceptable.</p> <p>This also has financial consequences. As directors, we are already receiving warnings that our building insurance premiums may rise due to the structural risks from excavation so close to our foundations. Residents will bear that cost — not the developer. And should subsidence occur, many will face personal stress and significant repair costs that no compensation would fully resolve.</p> <p>Lastly, our communal garden, enjoyed daily by families and elderly residents alike, will be</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>permanently affected. It is not only a source of greenery — it is a protected outdoor space, part of our wellbeing and sense of place. To lose it to shadow and proximity of this scale would erode a core part of what makes Palace Court a desirable and healthy home.</p> <p>As a resident and director, I can say with confidence that this proposal is not just inappropriate — it is unreasonable, risky, and harmful to those who live next door to it. I respectfully urge Camden to recognise the serious structural, amenity and environmental issues raised — many of which echo concerns in your own pre-application advice — and to refuse this application in full.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Dr. Pirlanta Ali Resident & Director, Palace Court</p>
