

Planning Department, London Borough of Camden

5 St Pancras Square

LONDON

N1C 4AG

8th November 2016

Dear Sir or Madam,

Yesterday, I received a one-page copy of a Notice under Article 13 of Application for Planning Permission.

The proposed development was recognised on the form to affect 'Frognal Court, Midland Court and Warwick House'. Yet, when I went to the Camden Council website in order to offer an opinion, I found that I could not do what was suggested and 'add comments' to an application, for the simple reason that a search did not allow me to find the application. I could not add a comment because the form did not offer identification of the proposal. I then tried to feed in the name on the form 'Ralph Kline Ltd', which appears there while the name of the applicant is missing. This method of search was also fruitless. A suspicious mind might wonder if efforts have been made to frustrate comments from residents of Frognal Court, Midland Court and Warwick House. As I live on what has been till now the top floor of Warwick House, I find the difficulty of making comments by those most affected by the proposal worrying. In fact, it would be my first comment to note the absence of an identifying code for the proposal, or of an Applicant Name so that under 'Surname' the reader is referred to an agent who has been the Signatory. The proposal seems to be less than frank and to discourage comment from the parties most affected.

The comment I was going to make before I discovered that I could not follow normal practice was that there must be assurance of the structural strength of the buildings on which it is proposed to build. A busy railway tunnel lies under Warwick House. Some decades ago, the tunnel linking Frognal/Finchley Road and Hampstead stations was out of action for months because it collapsed under the weight of new building on it.

If the proposal goes ahead, there will be misery, particularly for those who have flats on the existing top floor. I don't expect that that consideration will be of much interest to the Council. The question of whether these will or will not be 'affordable' flats ought to be of more significance.

Yours sincerely,

J K MacKinnon (Professor)

Flat 6

Warwick House

Finchley Road

London

NW3 5HN

From: Agnes Kory [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 December 2016 20:07
To: Skelli-Yaoz, Tania; Planning; Gentet, Matthias; Deans, Toby
Subject: Application number: 2016/5923/P

To: Camden Planning

re: 2016/5923/P

I am opposing the application to build flats above our roof for the following reasons:

1.

Notwithstanding documentation possibly submitted by the applicants and presumably stating the opposite, I am deeply concerned that our building is not strong enough to carry further load. Every time a train passes through the tunnel below our block, my bed/chairs etc significantly rock.

2.

Notwithstanding documentation apparently claiming no loss of light as a result of the planned roof development, I beg to differ. I live at the premises (as have done so for the past forty-two years) and I know where and when the light enters my flat. The roof extension at the back block will already delay the early morning sun shining into my back bedrooms, kitchen and bathroom. The current application proposes access to the new flats through a solid walkway above my back bedrooms, kitchen and bathroom: this proposed canopy will seriously restrict the light currently entering my flat. Anybody who says otherwise is invited to see when and how the sun currently enters my flat.

3.

My water heater was very old and has been disconnected by National Grid. I am planning to install a new water heater before long. The flu goes through the chimney but current regulations will make the flu replacement much more difficult and much more expensive if the proposed roof development goes ahead.

4.

I am concerned about over-crowding. There is already great deal of argument about our car park which will not grow in size. On the other hand, sixteen new flats - that is eight at the back block and eight on the front - will significantly increase demands on the car park.

5.

I am concerned about increased noise level on the Estate. Sixteen flats with presumably up to eighty tenants will inevitable add to the existing natural and less natural noises. The use of the proposed lift towers will inevitably cause noise at the bottom as well as the top of the lifts for all to hear.

Conclusion

Even if the proposed new flats will not cause the collapse of our existing blocks - which is a possibility (see par.1) - the proposed roof development will inevitably lower the standard of living for those already living in Frogmal Estate. Some of us are long term owner-occupier residents. The proposed change of circumstances will make life for us much harder than as we expected when we purchased our leases (in my case forty-two years ago).

P.S.

I am interested in Camden's policy regarding affordable housing. Does Camden regard the front and back blocks of Frognal Estate as one or two sites? The roof development adds sixteen new flats to the Estate which includes 1 - 45 Frognal Court (1-12 at the front, 14 - 45 at the back) as well as Warwick House and Midland Court at the front.

Shouldn't affordable housing be provided by the developers? I do not mean buy-to-let high price properties but genuinely affordable flats with owner occupancy for teachers, nurses, etc?

Yours sincerely;

Agnes Kory
6 Frognal Court, 158 Finchley Road
London NW3 5HL England

To: Camden Planning
Your ref: 2016/5923/P
date: 20th December 2016

Dear Sir,

c/o Tania.Skelli-Yaoz

I am opposing the application to build flats above our roof for the following reasons:

1.
Notwithstanding documentation possibly submitted by the applicants and presumably stating the opposite, I am deeply concerned that our building is not strong enough to carry further load. Every time a train passes through the tunnel below our block, my bed/chairs etc significantly rock.
2.
Notwithstanding documentation apparently claiming no loss of light as a result of the planned roof development, I beg to differ. I live at the premises (as have done so for the past forty-two years) and I know where and when the light enters my flat. The roof extension at the back block will already delay the early morning sun shining into my back bedrooms, kitchen and bathroom. The current application proposes access to the new flats through a solid walkway above my back bedrooms, kitchen and bathroom: this proposed canopy will seriously restrict the light currently entering my flat. Anybody who says otherwise is invited to see when and how the sun currently enters my flat.
3.
My water heater was very old and has been disconnected by National Grid. I am planning to install a new water heater before long. The flu goes through the chimney but current regulations will make the flu replacement much more difficult and much more expensive if the proposed roof development goes ahead.
4.
I am concerned about over-crowding. There is already great deal of argument about our car park which will not grow in size. On the other hand, sixteen new flats - that is eight at the back block and eight on the front - will significantly increase demands on the car park.
5.
I am concerned about increased noise level on the Estate. Sixteen flats with presumably up to eighty tenants will inevitable add to the existing natural and less natural noises. The use of the proposed lift towers will inevitably cause noise at the bottom as well as the top of the lifts for all to hear.

Conclusion

Even if the proposed new flats will not cause the collapse of our existing blocks - which is a possibility (see par.1) - the proposed roof development will inevitably lower the standard of living for those already living in Froggnal Estate. Some of us are long term owner-occupier residents. The proposed change of circumstances will make life for us much harder than as we expected when we purchased our leases (in my case forty-two years ago).

P.S.

I am interested in Camden's policy regarding affordable housing. Does Camden regard the front and back blocks of Frogna! Estate as one or two sites? The roof development adds sixteen new flats to the Estate which includes 1 - 45 Frogna! Court (1-12 at the front, 14 - 45 at the back) as well as Warwick House and Midland Court at the front.

Shouldn't affordable housing be provided by the developers? I do not mean buy-to-let high price properties but genuinely affordable flats with owner occupancy for teachers, nurses, etc?

Yours sincerely;

Agnes Kory
6 Frogna! Court, 158 Finchley Road
London NW3 5HL

Young, Tony

From: Skelli-Yaoz, Tania
Sent: 22 December 2016 11:02
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Re 2016/5923/P Planning Permission for the front blocks of Frogna! Ct, Midland Ct amd Warwick Hse Finchley Rd NW3

From: LINA BASU [mailto:]
Sent: 16 December 2016 10:02
To: Skelli-Yaoz, Tania; Aditya Suchde
Subject: Re: Re 2016/5923/P Planning Permission for the front blocks of Frogna! Ct, Midland Ct amd Warwick Hse Finchley Rd NW3

Re Planning application 2016/5923/P for Frogna! Court (1-12) Warwick House and Midland Court Finchley Road, NW3

Further to the e-mail below of yesterday

- 1) Have Network Rail (the freeholder) been consulted and approved?
- 2) Is it safe for example to build on top of 1-12 Frogna! Court; for example would the foundations stand it?

With kindest regards

Lina (Basu)
(Long Leaseholder of 7 Frogna! Court, 154-156 Finchley Road, London NW3 5HL)

On Thursday, 15 December 2016, 21:01, LINA BASU <lina.basu@btinternet.com> wrote:

On Thursday, 1 December 2016, 17:06, LINA BASU <lina.basu@btinternet.com> wrote:

FAO the Planning Department

On Friday, 11 November 2016, 21:59, LINA BASU <lina.basu@btinternet.com> wrote:

Further to your recent communication regarding the above within the last 2 weeks, I object on the following grounds to the planning application

1. There would be restriction of light
2. There would be noise during construction
3. We may not be able to use the lifts usefully
4. This gets round Camden's policy for social housing by uncoupling plans for social housing - I object to this.

With kind regards
Lina Basu
Long Leaseholder of 7 Frogna! Court

Lina Basu
(Long Leaseholder of 7 Frogna! Court, Finchley Road. London NW3 5HL)

