

[REDACTED]

From: Linell, Marcus [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 February 2015 16:59
To: Planning
Cc: Glasgow, David
Subject: Objection to Application Ref: 2014/7696/P 94 Frognal

88 Frognal London NW3 6XB

Tel. 0 [REDACTED]

email: [REDACTED]

27 February 2015

Dear Mr Peres Da Costa,

Objection to Application Ref: 2014/7696/P 94 Frognal

Yesterday I walked up Frognal and found on just one lamp post two duplicate notices for a revised planning permission for the Garden Room at 94 Frognal.

We have received no notice of this planning permission though we were assured we would be kept informed. Our disabled daughter at 12b Church Row NW3 6UT on whose behalf I am also writing and whose bedroom is now overlooked by the new garden room has also received no notification. How can this be as we have complained and now appear to be being side-lined? Can you please explain how this can have happened?

I have looked at the plans on your web site and as far as I can see there is no remedy proposed but simply a request for you as the Local Authority and us all to ignore the fact that the building is in all dimensions larger than detailed in the agreed planning permission of 2014.

We have the sense that, having disregarded the terms of the planning permission, 94 Frognal are getting their way by stealth through submitting a revised plan which

simply conforms to what they have built without any attempt to remedy the situation they have created or to meet our objections. Furthermore, they seem somehow to almost succeeded in dodging the requirements of such a revision through Camden's failure to notify the neighbours as is required. Only a notice in the street was posted which may or may not be seen. It is certainly pure luck that we saw it in time.

From our point of view the effect of the enlarged size of the Garden Room is that our garden which was hitherto private now is overlooked from close quarters. The solutions could be:

1. **Either:** To rebuild the Garden room to conform to the agreed permission.
2. **OR:** To raise the height of the party wall so that we retain our privacy.
3. **OR:** Perhaps to lower the Garden Room. The room is approached up five steps up from the garden so if it were lowered to ground level the window would be low enough for us to retain our privacy. It is the added height more than the other enlarged measurements which have created the problem for all of us.
4. **OR:** To block off the window on the south wall which is what invades our privacy so that the Garden Room outlook is only into their own garden and below the level of the existing party wall. The Garden room will remain unsightly and still has been built by stealth but perhaps we can live with that even if we now recognise that either our neighbours or their architect or the building contractors behaved unprofessionally or dishonestly and took advantage of neighbours who they do not know and presumably do not care about. The absence of consultation on the part of Camden is another matter.

Yours sincerely,

Marcus Linell

Hard copy sent by post

cc. David Glasgow, Principal Planning Officer, Appeals and Enforcement at



Sasha Savage, 90 Frognal and Miranda Linell, 12b Church Row.

Also by email on 27th February 2015 to planning@camden.gov.uk

Sotheby's,
Registered Office: 34-35 New Bond Street, London W1A 2AA
Registered in England and Wales, No. 874867

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and
intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they
are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify
the postmaster at postmaster@sothebys.com.

www.sothebys.com
