Matt McCarthy

Flat 3

53 Frognal

Hampstead

London

NW3 6YA

19th April 2014

For the attention of Niall Sheehan

Planning Application 2014/1616/P

Dear Mr Sheehan,

Before I raise my objections to the planning application I would like to point out that the letter that we received from Camden Council is in not a true and fair description of the proposed works.

The letter simply mentions a conversion of a single dwelling and partial demolition of the front extension – no reference at all is made of the proposed basement evacuation and swimming pool.

This omission is, in my opinion, calculated , misleading and underhand .

I believe that the application should be resubmitted with an honest and clear guide to the actual works proposed.

I would also like to point out that the planning application makes untrue claims that 44 Frognal is essentially surrounded by “fairly remote large houses glimpsed behind wall, trees and hedges “

This could not be further from the truth : 44 Frognal actually has 15 individual private dwellings running along the eastern boundary – I have copied a photo provided on the application as evidence.

55 Frognal has three flats and a separate bungalow .

53 Frognal has three flats

51 & 49 both have four flats

The latter two are not mentioned in the application at all although they will be directly affected by the noise , dust ,pollution and loss of light generated by the works – I believe they have been selectively “omitted”

I would now like to outline my objections to the proposal.

Firstly I question why on such a large plot (10,000 sq metres ) that Mr Glassberg feels it necessary to extend such a large property at all - especially as the majority of this work seems to be along the boundary of the neighbouring properties and seems to have been designed to cause the maximum nuisance and disruption to the most number of neighbours ( the majority of whom are families with children )

The claim that the proposal will maximize housing units in the area is simply not true – the extension is designated as a nanny’s flat on the plans and provides not extra accommodation for Camden residents.

The proposed basement & pool complex is disproportionate to the size of the original building and will require extensive excavation of the front garden resulting in noise and dust pollution to the adjacent properties.

I’m also very concerned about the works vehicle access to and from the site – Frognal Lane is very narrow and becomes gridlocked at rush hour – the turning into Frognal comes to a standstill when the school run is on twice a day and the large plant and lorries required for such a project will only add to this chaos.

I note from the Risk Management Geological Report that there is a very high reading of toxic materials on site and I’m very concerned about the dust generated by the works. This will cause a major loss of quality of life for all those living along the Eastern Boundary (15 individual flats )

I’m very concerned about the structural damage from the ground movement as the proposed works are designed to come right up to the boundaries of both 53 and 55 Frognal.

The proposed extension will cause loss of light to 51, 53 and 55 Frognal – although the plans have been submitted in such a way as to suggest otherwise ( more evidence of the misleading way the application has been put together)

I’m clearly asking Camden Council to **REFUSE** the planning application.

I reserve the right to make further objections at a later date if required.

Finally if any works are to take place on the property I request that none are allowed at weekends and restricted working hours of 9am to 5pm on week days are enforced.

Yours sincerely

Matthew McCarthy

