

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5923/P	Joanna Douglas , Linda Poulson	44 Frognal Court Finchley Rd NW35HG	07/01/2017 16:10:19	OBJNOT	<p>As owners of 44, Frognal Court we protest against the proposed application - 2016/5923/P</p> <p>The creation of 8 new flats on top of the front buildings will trigger a requirement for social housing as in a previous High Court ruling (Long Acre Securities ltd v Karet case) mentioned by other objectors.</p> <p>The new single storey will block the light of the flats behind. The lifts for these flats are being built in the car park, it is specifically stated that this car park is for residents cars and dustbins. The lift shafts will be unsightly and will block the light of the flat owners next to them.</p> <p>The flats are built on land which has already caused concern from the tunnels underneath, adding more weight by building on top could be disastrous .</p> <p>Thank you for taking into consideration our objections. Please would you let us know approximately when this matter will be considered by committee.</p> <p>Many thanks Linda Poulson and Joanna Douglas</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
-----------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------

2016/5923/P	Riccardo Di Blasi	135 Wood Street Barnet London	09/01/2017 23:41:31	OBJ	Dear Sir/Madam,
-------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	-----	-----------------

I am the owner of Flat 11 Frogna Court, which currently is a top floor flat. I have recently been made aware of the application for a roof extension. I had not received anything in the mail and am now concerned that I have not had enough time to consider the implications of this application. As such I will note a few points of objection.

1) There has been a history of subsidence on this property. Previously Flat 11 had made an insurance claim for subsidence damage. Repairs were made. If you climb the stairs next to the passage, you will see bricks cracked in half and continuously getting worse. there were also large crack in the passage, however these have conveniently been repaired. I am concerned with the history of subsidence, and the fact that there are train tunnels beneath the flats, that an objective opinion is required from a specialist that the tunnels can withhold the additional weight of the extra floor.

2) Being a top floor flat, I am concerned that the noise from the construction will be to obstructive. I currently have family living in the property and am concerned about the impact of the noise and the effect it will have on their rights.

3) I currently use the chimney Flues and am not sure whether this will effect their use. I did respond that they were in use and have not been consulted about how the works will effect my right to them.

4) Currently there are circa 50 flats and a limited amount of parking spots for them. The additional 16 flats will dilute the availability of these car spots, and additionally if they are sold with car spots, will greatly reduce the availability for the remaining spots to the existing tenants.

5) We currently have on going issues with the density of the existing flats. though there are 50 flats, many of these are rented on a per room basis, with many of the lounges being converted to two additional bedrooms. There have already been many instances unsociable behaviour as a result of the limited amenities being shared with so many people and the additional 16 flats having the potential for another 48 rooms will add to this.

6) As per the ruling in the Long Acre Securities v Karet case, It was adjudicated that all the buildings should be regarding as 1 building, no matter how the landlord tried to divide the titles of the buildings. I believe that much effort has been made by the landlord to try and separate titles, leases and ownership to try and get around their obligation to providing social housing. In all there will be 16 dwellings as part of the combined development and as such should attract Social Housing obligations. This was previously raised in previous applications, and in light of the ruling made by the High Court.

7) Part of the car park will be used for the lift. this is a breach of the Deeds of Variation which specifically states it is for the parking of flat residents cars and dustbins.

8) I believe the development is not in character of the existing buildings. I feel it will be an eyesore and a submission is required for plans more in tuned with the current building.