

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---------|--|
| 2025/1084/P | The Heath & Hampstead Society | P.O. BOX 38214 London NW3 1XD | 02/05/2025 14:35:46 | OBJ | <p>Ordinarily, we would not object to infill and in this case whilst the streetscape is not adversely affected by the scheme, this is only due to the fact that the present garages are unattractive, rather than the proposals being of outstanding quality. We would describe this as mediocre.</p> <p>Our main reason for objection is that the scheme, by reasons of mass and height, is too large for this site and have a very detrimental effect on the amenity of the existing residential units at the lower levels of Palace Court. These rooms shall be deprived of light and views and plunged into permanent shadow. The applicant has neglected to show this detail which could be illustrated as a simple section.</p> <p>We would also question the amount of external amenity space included for the new residential units, which looks very low and below the criteria for a family unit. .</p> <p>The plot would be suited to smaller, lower rise development, 2 stories at the maximum, with a demonstration of the effect to neighbouring buildings, and to provide suitable outdoor space.</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|------------------|--|---------------------|---------|--|
| 2025/1084/P | Dr Masood Moghul | Palace Court 250 Finchley Road NW3 6DN | 03/05/2025 22:22:50 | OBJ | <p>As a resident of Palace Court and an NHS doctor working frequent night shifts, I write to express my strong objection to the proposed development at Frognal Garages. The scheme would significantly and negatively impact both my professional wellbeing and my family's quality of life—including serious risks to structural safety, privacy, and the safe use of communal spaces.</p> <p>I rely on daytime sleep in garden-facing rooms following night shifts. These rooms—currently quiet, private, and naturally lit—will be directly impacted by this proposal. The developer's own Daylight & Sunlight Report confirms light loss well above BRE standards. My flat is in fact one of the worst affected flats with some rooms losing over 30% light in the most used rooms. Losing access to restful, darkened spaces will harm my health and my ability to safely care for patients.</p> <p>The new building will place residential and bathroom windows just metres from my own. The proposed use of frosted glass as a "solution" to overlooking is inadequate and frankly insulting. This development would result in continuous, unavoidable intrusion into our private living spaces.</p> <p>Our communal garden is a safe and essential space for our children to play, learn, and enjoy nature. That privacy and security will be obliterated. The proposed windows at the rear of the development are less than two metres from the Palace Court boundary. Not only will my two young children be under direct observation from multiple flats, but the window positioning also presents an obvious safety risk—it would be physically possible for someone to step or jump into the garden.</p> <p>This is not a theoretical concern; it is a clear safeguarding issue. Camden has a duty of care to the families living here and must not approve a scheme that creates such obvious and unacceptable risks to children.</p> <p>The garden-facing side of our flat currently provides the only reprieve from the constant traffic noise of Finchley Road. That relief will vanish under this proposal, replaced by noise from residents, HVAC systems, and years of heavy construction. For me, this compromises my rest; for my family, it destroys what little peace remains in our home environment.</p> <p>5. Structural Instability & Flawed Basement Assessment The independent audit of the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA), commissioned by Camden Council and conducted by Campbell Reith, exposes serious deficiencies: Historical subsidence has not been addressed, despite documented evidence in consultation responses—including buildings directly adjacent to the site. Contradictions exist between the BIA and its supporting documents on key structural assumptions.</p> <p>The ground movement methodology is not moderately conservative; the use of optimistic modelling (e.g., WALLAP) risks underestimating structural damage. Trigger values for monitoring exceed modelled damage thresholds, meaning cracks or settlement could reach Category 2 damage before mitigation is even considered. These are not technicalities—they are material failings that should halt this scheme. Camden's own Basement Policy A5 is not being met.</p> <p>The proposed development is inappropriate, unsafe, and incompatible with responsible planning. It compromises daylight, privacy, rest, safety, and stability. It creates risks to children and</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|---------|---|
| | | | | | families that cannot be mitigated by frosting glass or optimistic reports. And most damningly, it fails an independent audit against Camden's own planning policies. This application is not worthy of approval and should be refused in full. |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|--|---------------------|---------|---|
| 2025/1084/P | Shagun Shukla | Palace Court 250 Finchley Road NW3 6DN | 03/05/2025 22:17:41 | OBJ | <p>I am currently 6 months pregnant and expecting my baby in August. The prospects of this application are extremely worrying especially as a mother of a new born.</p> <p>The proposed building will severely reduce the natural light into my flat, particularly into the rooms we plan to use for our baby's nursery and daytime care. These rooms currently receive valuable daylight and face the communal garden—offering a peaceful and nurturing environment.</p> <p>Daylight is vital for children in supporting healthy circadian rhythms, Vitamin D production, and safe sleep patterns. The proposed overshadowing of these spaces is unacceptable and detrimental to the health of my baby.</p> <p>I am acutely aware of the importance of my mental wellbeing after childbirth. Access to natural light, fresh air, and safe, open outdoor space are widely recognised as key factors in supporting maternal mental health and preventing postnatal depression.</p> <p>This development would take all of that away:</p> <p>Loss of light in my home.</p> <p>Loss of garden space for fresh air and quiet moments with my child.</p> <p>Loss of privacy from windows directly overlooking our living spaces.</p> <p>Increased enclosure, making our home feel dark, boxed-in, and oppressive.</p> <p>These changes will not just make our lives harder—they will place my postnatal wellbeing at serious risk. I ask Camden to consider the human impact behind these planning decisions. This is not a theoretical planning issue—it is a real threat to a young mother's ability to recover and care for her child in a healthy environment.</p> <p>The communal garden is currently the only outdoor space where I would feel safe taking my newborn without having to walk far or navigate busy roads. It is essential for early bonding, fresh air, and moments of calm. With the next nearest park a 15-minute walk away, the loss of this garden—due to both enclosure and overshadowing—will leave me with nowhere suitable to go during the day with a small baby.</p> <p>The sheer scale of the proposed building—looming over our garden with windows less than two metres from Palace Court—is invasive and frightening. It robs us of privacy and security. I should not have to draw blinds all day in the middle of summer while feeding or soothing a newborn. Nor should I be left wondering whether strangers can step directly into our communal space from their windows.</p> <p>I am especially concerned by the proposal to excavate a basement directly adjacent to Palace Court. The site is already known to be structurally vulnerable, with a history of subsidence in neighbouring buildings. Expert review has already raised serious questions about the quality and reliability of the submitted basement impact materials.</p> <p>The scale of excavation, combined with years of construction noise, vibration, and dust, would make life extremely difficult for anyone—let alone someone recovering from childbirth and caring for a newborn. The risk to building safety, and the certainty of daily disruption, cannot be justified for a development that brings no benefit to existing residents.</p> <p>This scheme strips those things away for the benefit of seven luxury flats. It will leave our family—at one of the most sensitive times of our lives—feeling enclosed, shadowed, and isolated.</p> <p>I respectfully request that this application be rejected in full.</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------|--|
| 2025/1084/P | Bayan Sbano | 26 Palace Court NW3 6DN | 02/05/2025 12:43:41 | OBJ | <p>I live in Palace Court and have done for over 20 years where I enjoy my retirement with my partner, and how children and grandchildren who have their home in the building too. I note how the last application was very inappropriate for the space but was rightly rejected, however now this new one is bigger, more intrusive, and clearly puts our building at risk.</p> <p>I've read the Campbell Reith report and I'm objecting again as I am very concerned about the safety to my family in the build should the new application go ahead. The report has no mention of previous structural problems in the area, no solid engineering review and appears to be guesswork about what's in the ground and how much movement the building can take. The auditors note the proposal is unclear and lacking proper evidence.</p> <p>They've made the design even bulkier, it's going to block more light, eat into the shared garden we all use, and cram into the space like nothing else on Frogna Lane. We've said no last time. The Council said no last time. And yet here we are again! This isn't fair on residents — especially those of us who've made this place home and contribute to the local community. We urge you to reject it again.</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------|---------|---|
| 2025/1084/P | Dales Pharmacy Management | Dales Pharmacy NW3 6HN NW3 6HN | 03/05/2025 23:04:13 | OBJ | <p>We write on behalf of Dales Pharmacy, located very close to the proposed development at Frognal Garages. We are a long-standing and trusted part of the local community, serving a large number of patients from Palace Court, Ashley Court, Frognal Lane, and the surrounding area.</p> <p>We wish to raise our strong objection to the proposed development (Ref: 2025/1084/P), particularly due to the serious safety risks it poses to our patients and other vulnerable pedestrians.</p> <p>A Dangerous Obstruction on a Heavily Used Footpath: The pavement along Frognal Lane is already narrow and uneven, with several residents—especially elderly patients—reporting falls due to lifted paving stones and tree roots over the years.</p> <p>The frontage of the proposed building doesn't seem to have designated bin storage or bicycle storage. It comes right up to the path on Frognal Lane. The introduction of bins, equipment and bicycle along this route will make the path significantly more hazardous, if not impassable. This is unacceptable in a location regularly used by:</p> <p>Elderly and frail patients</p> <p>People with mobility aids, walkers, and wheelchairs</p> <p>Parents with pushchairs</p> <p>Patients recovering from surgery or undergoing long-term treatment</p> <p>We are gravely concerned that the development will result in serious injury to members of the public. Our own patient records confirm several individuals who have already suffered falls on Frognal Lane—and this would be a far more dangerous situation.</p> <p>We have received numerous comments from Dales patients expressing acute concern about the proposed building causing structural damage to surrounding buildings that are homes to several patients of ours. For many, coming to the pharmacy is one of their few regular outings. The risk of trip hazards, congestion, and visual obstructions will discourage them from accessing healthcare altogether.</p> <p>This is particularly concerning for those who collect essential medication in person, often due to communication or coordination challenges that make delivery unsuitable.</p> <p>As a community pharmacy, we not only dispense medication but also act as a first point of contact for minor ailments, medication reviews, and public health support. If access becomes difficult or dangerous, it could lead to:</p> <p>Delays in medication collection</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|---------|---|
| | | | | | <p>Reduced health monitoring for vulnerable residents</p> <p>This is a clear public health issue, not merely a planning inconvenience.</p> <p>In its current form, this development does not include any viable solution for safe pedestrian access, nor does it appear to account for the vulnerability of the residents who rely on this stretch of pavement daily. It is not compatible with Camden's responsibilities around accessibility, inclusion, and public safety.</p> <p>We therefore urge Camden Council to refuse this application in full, in order to protect the safety, dignity, and wellbeing of the very people it claims to serve.</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|---------|---|
| 2025/1084/P | Tanya Shukla | Flat 18 Palace Court 250 Finchley Road NW3 6DN NW3 6DN | 03/05/2025 22:40:50 | OBJ | <p>I have been a Palace court resident for about 10 years living with my family. I am extremely concerned about the implications of this planning application due to the following reasons:</p> <p>Three of our most heavily used rooms—our living room and two bedrooms—will suffer daylight losses far exceeding BRE standards. These garden-facing rooms are not just our brightest; they are our only refuge from the constant noise of Finchley Road. My children age 7 and 9 use these rooms for study and rest—quiet, calm, and light are essential. Instead, we are being offered shadowed, dark spaces overlooked by neighbouring bathroom windows. It's absurd to claim this is acceptable urban living.</p> <p>There will be direct, intrusive overlooking from multiple flats into our bedrooms and private garden. The frosted glass the applicant proposes as a solution is frankly laughable—how exactly does a blurred bathroom view compensate for losing one's privacy entirely?</p> <p>The new buildings are being crammed into a tight, constrained space, walling off the garden from all sides. This design will turn our only communal green space into a sunless pit, suffocating plant life, biodiversity, and morale. The garden will no longer be usable for families, children, or wildlife.</p> <p>Our road-facing rooms already endure relentless traffic noise. The garden-facing side was the one peaceful area in our home. With this development introducing a noisy cluster of residential units and mechanical systems at close range, that respite will vanish. The garden-facing rooms will now suffer from noise at both ends—a lose-lose scenario.</p> <p>The community garden is our children's only outdoor space. Nearby parks are not realistically accessible for unsupervised play—certainly not for younger children. Removing this amenity is not just an inconvenience—it is an active step backward in child-friendly urban planning. Camden claims to support family housing; this plan does the opposite.</p> <p>The frontage design shows no consideration for basic infrastructure. Where will bins and bicycles be stored? If left on narrow pavements, it will be a hazard—particularly for our elderly residents, children, and disabled neighbours. The developer appears to have designed this building in blissful denial of real-life logistics.</p> <p>Being one of the Directors of Palace Court and having an active role in overseeing building management and maintenance, I am acutely worried about the disastrous impact that the building works may cause, particularly the basement excavation. There are already multiple cases of subsidence on Frogal Lane—three immediately adjacent to the site. These are under active monitoring. The proposal flagrantly ignores Camden's Basement Policy A5 and risks destabilising surrounding homes. The Basement Impact Assessment has glaring inaccuracies, overly generous assumptions, and conveniently avoids any reference to known local subsidence. This is a disaster waiting to happen—and all for just seven new poorly designed homes?</p> <p>It is critical to highlight that our service charges are already disproportionately high—primarily due to soaring building insurance costs. The structural risks introduced by this development</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|--|---------------------|---------|---|
| | | | | | <p>would inevitably drive those insurance premiums even higher, pushing already stretched households toward unaffordability. For many residents, this could be the tipping point that makes remaining in our homes financially unsustainable.</p> <p>Palace Court is also planning on investing heavily on adding better facilities to our garden especially for children and retired persons to keep them active and mobile in a secure environment. This planning application seriously threatens our plans to create better living for over 100 people that live in the building and have unanimously agreed to invest in the communal garden space.</p> <p>I can undoubtedly state that this development is not “optimising land use.” It is overreaching, overbuilt, and overhyped. It fails to meet Camden’s policies on amenity, design, sustainability, biodiversity, inclusivity, and safety. Seven luxury flats are being prioritised at the expense of more than sixty existing homes, families, and a well-functioning community. The idea that this is “sustainable development” is almost admirable in its creativity.</p> <p>Please reject this proposal firmly and decisively.</p> |
| 2025/1084/P | Jessie Hammond | Flat 20, Palace Court 250, Finchley Road London NW3 6DN | 05/05/2025 00:17:38 | OBJ | <p>My name is Jessie Hammond and I live in Palace Court. I’m writing to object to this application in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>The scheme may have been revised, but its core issues remain — or have worsened. For those of us affected by the developement, it brings three serious problems: too close, too tall, too risky. My home, like others in Palace Court, relies on unobstructed light from the rear. This development cuts that down significantly — confirmed by the applicant’s own report. Some flats will lose over half of their daylight. That’s not minor; that’s unacceptable.</p> <p>The new building looks directly into our windows — bedrooms, living spaces, work areas — all within a few metres. It’s a textbook case of overdevelopment with no regard for separation. Frosted glass won’t undo the damage of placing terraces and bathrooms just outside our line of sight.</p> <p>Digging a deep basement on a slope, next to old foundations, without proper engineering analysis is reckless. Camden officers have already flagged the missing information and the risk to surrounding buildings. We share that risk, and we’ll bear the consequences if anything goes wrong.</p> <p>This isn’t about resisting change. It’s about resisting a scheme that overreaches on every front. I hope Camden stands by the concerns already raised and refuses this proposal once again.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jessie Hammond Resident, Palace Court</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|---------|--|
| 2025/1084/P | Tanya Shukla | Palace Court 250 Finchley Road NW3 6DN NW3 6DN | 03/05/2025 23:23:45 | COMMNT | <p>My comment is aimed to raise serious concerns about the validity and ethical basis of several supportive comments submitted in favour of this scheme.</p> <p>A number of individuals supporting the application do not live in the immediate vicinity of the development and will suffer none of the consequences. It is deeply troubling that these external voices are actively endorsing a proposal that has been found, through independent professional scrutiny by Campbell Reith, to fail to rule out serious structural risks, especially in relation to the basement excavation and its impact on already fragile buildings.</p> <p>The independent audit raised substantial questions about the basement impact assessment, including understated risks, non-conservative modelling, and failure to account for known subsidence issues. For anyone—particularly those not personally affected—to ignore or diminish these findings and still support the application is not only irresponsible but also calls into question the integrity of that support.</p> <p>Let us be clear: this is not a matter of preference or aesthetics. This is a development that, if approved, could compromise the safety and structural stability of neighbouring homes and the wellbeing of vulnerable residents, including elderly individuals, children, and disabled persons. To endorse such a scheme from the sidelines, with no stake in the outcome, is not simply inappropriate—it is ethically indefensible.</p> <p>I urge Camden Council to give greater weight to the objections of those who actually live adjacent to and around the proposed site. Their voices reflect the real-world consequences of this proposal—consequences that distant supporters will never have to endure.</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|---------|---|
| 2025/1084/P | J Robson | St Andrew's Badminton Club St Andrew's Church Frognal Lane NW3 7DY | 03/05/2025 13:09:26 | OBJ | <p>Dear Planning Officer</p> <p>I'm writing to you on behalf of St. Andrew's Badminton Club on Frognal Lane to raise our objection to the new planning application for the proposed development at the Frognal Garages site.</p> <p>We are group of badminton players who come together, using the St Andrew's Church Hall every week, to meet and play socially. It is very much part of our local community life which has been meeting for decades - and we are a group of people comprising all ages from people in their 20's through all age groups, right up to members in their 70's and 80's. We are a quiet bunch, and keep ourselves happy playing badminton - not troubling anyone else in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The proposed demolition and redevelopment is very inconsiderate to our members & the local community, and potentially dangerous. The works will inevitably cause major disruption to everyone in the neighbourhood for many, many months. The traffic management and related safety concerns of the development is our main concern. As frequent users of this stretch of pavement we see at too-close hand how tricky it is already for traffic to navigate this busy junction, day and night. As you will know, traffic already struggles both up and downhill at that pinch point - the addition of a major new access point for diggers, excavators and vans will create a major, dangerous bottleneck for pedestrians.</p> <p>I am convinced that these works would likely dissuade members of our club from attending whilst the works continue. How are they supposed to dodge all the works, vans, scaffolding , cars and pedestrians? They will likely just stay at home instead.</p> <p>I have not mentioned the noise & dust which will drown the neighbourhood for all these months. The workers will no doubt have ear defenders and masks - for good reason. Nor the long-term subsidence risk to the church hall where we play potentially caused by the major basement works - digging down into the side of a steep hill whose foundations have been settled for many decades, does not seem to be a very sensible thing to do.</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------|---|
| 2025/1084/P | Ahmad Sbano | 26 Palace Court NW3 6DN | 02/05/2025 12:41:48 | OBJ | <p>Dear Planning Department,</p> <p>I'm a retired resident of Palace Court and have lived here for over two decades. I am writing once again to object to this development!</p> <p>You rightly rejected the previous version of this development in 2024 because of the harm it would do to our homes. Now the developer is back — not with a scaled-back plan, but one that's even larger, even closer, and even more damaging!! It's incredibly frustrating to see our concerns being ignored.</p> <p>I've read the independent basement report by Campbell Reith and it's very concerning! The experts clearly say the developer's Basement Impact Assessment is not good enough. It doesn't assess past subsidence, it uses soft assumptions about the ground, and no qualified engineer has signed off on it. They couldn't even be clear about what's holding the building up. How is that acceptable?</p> <p>He wants to dig metres-deep next to old buildings like ours and Ashley Court, which is on a slope, and with shared walls and foundations — and yet they can't demonstrate it's safe! That alone should be grounds for refusal.</p> <p>On top of that, the impact on daylight to my flat and our shared garden is substantial. The new design pushes the building closer and higher, casting even more shadow. Our communal garden, which so many of us rely on, will be completely overshadowed. We've lived peacefully here for years, and suddenly we're being forced to accept major damage to our light, privacy, and safety for the sake of a luxury development with no community benefit.</p> <p>This feels relentless, and it's not right. I urge Camden to stand by its earlier decision and reject this application again — this time for good.</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response |
|---------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|---------|--|
| 2025/1084/P | Meenu Shukla | Palace Court 250 Finchley Road NW3 6DN NW3 6DN | 03/05/2025 22:51:22 | OBJ | <p>I am writing to express my strong and deeply personal objection to the proposed development at Frogna! Garages. I am a disabled woman living in Palace Court. I underwent multiple spinal surgeries and a hip replacement following a series of serious falls. I have not yet fully recovered. I live with limited mobility, chronic vertigo, and fragile mental health. This development poses a clear and immediate threat to my safety, health, and independence.</p> <p>Natural daylight is critical to both physical and mental recovery. I spend most of my time indoors due to my condition. The garden-facing rooms in my flat are currently filled with light and relatively peaceful—offering me a vital sense of stability and dignity.</p> <p>If this development proceeds, I will lose that light. These rooms will be cast into shadow by a tall, overbearing structure. This will severely impact my ability to maintain a healthy daily rhythm and will worsen the vertigo and depressive symptoms I already struggle to manage.</p> <p>Following my surgeries, the communal garden has been my only accessible outdoor space and a lifeline. I use it for fresh air, sunlight, and a rare sense of freedom and connection to nature. It has been a cornerstone of my slow and difficult recovery.</p> <p>This development will render the garden unusable—dominated by building mass, overshadowed, and directly overlooked by windows just metres away. The garden will no longer feel safe or restorative. It will feel hostile and exposed. I will be left with nowhere to go.</p> <p>I already live with fragile mental health. The idea of losing my light, my garden, and my privacy is deeply distressing. I have worked incredibly hard to manage my condition and reclaim my independence after a traumatic year. This proposal threatens to undo all of that.</p> <p>It is not just discouraging—it's devastating. I feel overlooked and disregarded. This development sends a clear message: the needs of disabled residents are an afterthought.</p> <p>I live in constant fear of further physical injury. Palace Court is already vulnerable to subsidence. The proposed basement excavation, so close to our building, is aggressive and risky.</p> <p>The idea that my home could become unstable, noisy, or unsafe because of a private development is terrifying. I simply would not cope.</p> <p>I should not have to fight to keep the little light, space, and dignity I have left. I am trying to recover from major surgeries, manage chronic health conditions, and live a peaceful life. This development would take away the few things that support me: natural light, outdoor access, privacy, and safety.</p> <p>I urge Camden Council to recognise the real human cost behind this application. Please reject it—not only because it fails to meet planning policy, but because it fails to protect the most vulnerable residents in your borough.</p> |