

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6967/P	Mr taraq farooqui	14 frognal court finchley road nw3 5hg nw3 5hg	20/03/2018 21:05:38	OBJ	<p>We very strongly OPPOSE this development and give our reasons below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Our flat is located very next to existing Hotel building and above the garages in Frognal Court that Hotel uses for parking their customers cars and storing bed linen and other items. Deliveries come at any time during twenty four hours, no respect for rules, they make noise, bang the pallets on the floor, start cars at any time of the night.</li><li>2. The Hotel is already OVERFLOWING towards Frognal court due to lack of space, Frognal court is a residential block of flat, NOT a commercial premises, hotel already store goods get deliveries, and use our car park, WHY, because they have no space, ONLY A NARROW STRIP of land, not suitable to build a hotel.</li><li>3. If they get planning permission to build an other 150 or so rooms, it will more then double the traffic in Frognal court, and put more pressure on us.</li><li>4. WE are already fed up with the taxis, cars, mini buses and big coaches coming in our car park very close to our building, night and day, talking loudly and making noise.</li><li>5. This narrow strip of land is situated right in the middle of residential area, very close to girls school, this small strip of land is sure not suitable for this kind of development.</li></ol> <p>Mr.&amp; Mrs Farooqui</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6967/P	Riccardo Di Blasi	135 Wood Street	29/03/2018 19:40:20	APP	<p>Dear Madam,  RE: Application 2017/6967/P : Holiday Inn Express 152-156 Finchley Road, NW3 5HS  I am the owner of Flat 11 and Flat 24 Frogнал Court. I have recently been notified of the proposed planning application for the Holiday Inn Express, 152-156 Finchley Road NW3 5HS.</p> <p>I would like to communicate my objection to this proposal for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We currently have various taxi's that come and pick up hotel guests. These taxi's clog up the entrance to flats and make it very dangerous when entering and leaving the site with a vehicle.</li> <li>2. We already have numerous large articulate vehicles enter and leave though our parking area because of the hotel. These vehicles have caused damage to the parking surface, to the vehicle ramp and have actually damaged the building of our flats. The increased rooms will only mean increased traffic. This is not only dangerous but impacts on our ability to enjoy our</li> <li>3. I believe that Frogнал Car Park was not intended to be used for Heavy Vehicles which seems to be the case for all the deliveries for the hotel. We have numerous linen deliveries and other goods that wake us up as a result.</li> <li>4. If they construct the proposed building this will require cranes and other building vehicles/materials to use our car park. This will severely disrupt the residents who use this as a car park and as our walk way for entering the flats</li> <li>5. The proposed building will reduce the limited light we already receive in the back garden and for the flats at the front building.</li> <li>6. I have not been consulted or had any prior consultation regarding this application. I was only told about this in passing with one of the residents.</li> <li>7. The Frogнал Carpark has restricted access and parking for residents only. How will this building be constructed without impacting on our right to land and use of the car park?</li> <li>8. I believe no consideration has been given for the impact this construction will have on the lives and well being of the tenants/Owners of Frogнал Court. It is clear that access to the Frogнал Car Park will be required which will affect the use and rights of the people accessing these areas and live in Frogнал Court. We already have to deal with lorries and guests parking in our spots, this will only get worse.</li> <li>9. This area already has a high use and density and this will only add to disruptions for Frogнал Court.</li> <li>10. The impact of further excavations can be detrimental to Frogнал Court.</li> </ol> <p>Please keep me informed of any committee meeting that will discuss this application as I would like to strongly communicate my objections to any considerations given to this proposal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6967/P	Riccardo Di Blasi	135 Wood Street	29/03/2018 19:40:16	APP	<p>Dear Madam,  RE: Application 2017/6967/P : Holiday Inn Express 152-156 Finchley Road, NW3 5HS  I am the owner of Flat 11 and Flat 24 Frognal Court. I have recently been notified of the proposed planning application for the Holiday Inn Express, 152-156 Finchley Road NW3 5HS.</p> <p>I would like to communicate my objection to this proposal for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We currently have various taxi's that come and pick up hotel guests. These taxi's clog up the entrance to flats and make it very dangerous when entering and leaving the site with a vehicle.</li> <li>2. We already have numerous large articulate vehicles enter and leave though our parking area because of the hotel. These vehicles have caused damage to the parking surface, to the vehicle ramp and have actually damaged the building of our flats. The increased rooms will only mean increased traffic. This is not only dangerous but impacts on our ability to enjoy our</li> <li>3. I believe that Frognal Car Park was not intended to be used for Heavy Vehicles which seems to be the case for all the deliveries for the hotel. We have numerous linen deliveries and other goods that wake us up as a result.</li> <li>4. If they construct the proposed building this will require cranes and other building vehicles/materials to use our car park. This will severely disrupt the residents who use this as a car park and as our walk way for entering the flats</li> <li>5. The proposed building will reduce the limited light we already receive in the back garden and for the flats at the front building.</li> <li>6. I have not been consulted or had any prior consultation regarding this application. I was only told about this in passing with one of the residents.</li> <li>7. The Frognal Carpark has restricted access and parking for residents only. How will this building be constructed without impacting on our right to land and use of the car park?</li> <li>8. I believe no consideration has been given for the impact this construction will have on the lives and well being of the tenants/Owners of Frognal Court. It is clear that access to the Frognal Car Park will be required which will affect the use and rights of the people accessing these areas and live in Frognal Court. We already have to deal with lorries and guests parking in our spots, this will only get worse.</li> <li>9. This area already has a high use and density and this will only add to disruptions for Frognal Court.</li> <li>10. The impact of further excavations can be detrimental to Frognal Court.</li> </ol> <p>Please keep me informed of any committee meeting that will discuss this application as I would like to strongly communicate my objections to any considerations given to this proposal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6967/P	Dr Michael Anson	36 Frognal Court Finchley Road Hampstead London NW3 5HG	27/03/2018 16:01:55	COMNOT	<p>Application 2017/6967/P : Holiday Inn Express 152 – 156 Finchley Road, NW3 5HS I am the longleaseholder and resident for 30 Years of Flat 36, Frognal Court, part of the Frognal Estate adjacent to the current Hotel and its proposed extension. I am OPPOSED TO THE DEVELOPMENT: some of my objections are listed below.</p> <p>1 The proposed extension represents a gross over-development of the site already dominated by a large building and tiny car park, further restricting light and air to the adjacent properties and is bound to decrease air quality during construction and further when in use due to increased heating load, in an already over polluted area adjacent to the heavily trafficked Finchley Road.</p> <p>2 No proposals have been made to ensure access to the Hotel during construction and or following development without using Frognal Estate Land .</p> <p>3 The Car Parking Area of Frognal Estate is restricted to access and parking by FLAT RESIDENTS and THEIR VISITORS ONLY: a County Court Order is in place enforcing these restrictions.</p> <p>4 That the area currently resembles a builders' yard is due to illegal temporary appropriation and trespass by the Developers and Constructors of the Mansard Roof Extensions over the rear blocks of Frognal Court (14 – 29 and 30 – 45 , Blocks B and A), which is subject to legal challenge and cannot be used to establish precedence for its use by the Hotel and its Developers.</p> <p>5 During the excavation of the area at the rear of the hotel, currently used as a small car park, a serious threat of major land slip was declared resulting in an emergency exercise of extensive shoring up the rear and Frognal Estate sides. It would appear that detailed land stability impact studies have not been carried or have been suppressed.</p> <p>6 The permission to use the Frognal Estate entrance road way from the Finchley Road is subject to many restrictions and will not cope with the additional traffic generated by doubling the Hotel size let alone constructional vehicles, building material storage and parking.</p> <p>7 Currently Frognal Estate is used by large lorries servicing the Hotel which park in the access way and turn around on our land: this has resulted in collision with and the demolition of the wall protecting the entrance to the garages (since remade) and considerable damage to the corner of 30 – 45 Frognal Court (Block A) which may still be seen.</p> <p>8 During the original construction of the Hotel heavy vehicles were not supposed to enter Frognal Estate Land: this was ignored resulting in extensive damage to the Car Park which was never repaired. In particular the concrete ramp between Blocks A and B that gives access to the fronts of the rear blocks still carries the unrepaired damage caused by tracked heavy plant used during hotel construction. The current Mansard Roof development has not used this ramp for vehicles or plant and only erected scaffolding over it.</p> <p>In summary no account has been taken of the impact of construction or usage of the Hotel of the adjoining land or effects on residents , both short and long-term. It is unnecessary infill over development and should be opposed by the Planning Committee.</p> <p>I wish to be informed of the meeting of the Committee at which this proposal will be considered as I would like to submit a deputation possibly in alliance with others.</p> <p>Dr Michael Anson 36 Frognal Court, Tel: 020 7435 9513</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Finchley Road, Haqmpstead London NW3 5HG</p> <p>Mobile: 07725 580 873 E-mail: mike.anson@btinternet.com</p>
2017/6967/P	ANDREAS DRAKOU	144-150 Finchley Road LONDON NW3 5HS	26/03/2018 07:35:20	OBJLETT ER	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Firstly, after checking with current legislation and consulting with my solicitors I understand that the works to be carried out are "major works" and as such a notification should have been sent to us by the Council. We were only recently notified of these proposed works by one of our residential tenants.</p> <p>We have also seen that the developers have two letters, about these proposed works which appear on your web-site. One letter was addressed to our leaseholder All Aboard Shops Limited and one to myself.</p> <p>For your records these letters were never received by either party.</p> <p>As such we would have liked more time to make our objections and this also applies to our leaseholders Who have shops in the properties mentioned below, and who we believe will also object to this planning application.</p> <p>I am a Director of the companies' beneficial owners of properties at 144-150 Finchley Road, and wish to object to the above extension which will undoubtedly create serious problems to our properties and surroundings. Namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All gardens of our residential units as well as for other residential units in the area will be overshadowed by the proposed 6-floor extension.</li> <li>2. Access will be completely cut off with escape hazard in case of fire</li> <li>3. Many of hotel rooms will overlook the gardens stilling privacy from existing houses and community structures.</li> <li>4. Noise and privacy factors. All Properties at the rear and adjoining the hotel are residential units.</li> <li>5. Health and safety issues. Party Wall issues</li> </ol> <p>We need to first study related environmental impact including light/space architectural design. As we have been advised just now of this proposed extension, we require time to appoint specialists to consider full impact of this proposed extension on our properties. Therefore, we request postponement of related hearing until proper evaluation from our specialists will be completed.</p> <p>With all our owner's rights reserved</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6967/P	Mayer Hillman	7a Netherhall Gardens	25/03/2018 19:56:49	OBJEMAI L	<p>I am writing in my capacity as both a resident of the lower end of Netherhall Gardens and in my capacity as a former architect and town planner.</p> <p>I have now had the opportunity of examining the detailed proposals for the extension of the Holiday Inn.</p> <p>I live in one of the properties backing onto the Holiday Inn and wish to raise two substantial objections to the proposal.</p> <p>First, it seems to me that the proposal is an example of 'backland' development which Camden typically objects to. The applicant will no doubt cite the fact that adjacent properties have been developed in this way, notably the rear blocks of Frogna Court. However, I would point out that because this bad practice was approved decades ago, it does not establish a precedent.</p> <p>Second, the proposed development backs onto the Junior Branch of South Hampstead High School. This means that all the windows on the back elevation will have a full view of the playground at the back of the school. Under Para 2.10 headed "Site and Surroundings", it is stated that the properties backing onto the proposed development at the lower end of Netherhall Gardens are residential properties. In this instance, however, it is the playground of a girls' school. This definition, therefore, is incorrect and highly misleading.</p> <p>In para 5.38, it is stated that too that "the proposed development complies with relevant policies designed to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers", clearly, in this instance that protection is not afforded.</p> <p>In the circumstances, it is felt that the proposal should be rejected as it is just not possible to prevent this degree of immediate oversight of the playground.</p> <p>I would be happy to be contacted for further elucidation of the issues outlined above.</p> <p>Best wishes</p> <p>Dr Mayer Hillman</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6967/P	Mayer Hillman	7a Netherhall Gardens	25/03/2018 19:56:31	OBJEMAI L	<p>I am writing in my capacity as both a resident of the lower end of Netherhall Gardens and in my capacity as a former architect and town planner.</p> <p>I have now had the opportunity of examining the detailed proposals for the extension of the Holiday Inn.</p> <p>I live in one of the properties backing onto the Holiday Inn and wish to raise two substantial objections to the proposal.</p> <p>First, it seems to me that the proposal is an example of 'backland' development which Camden typically objects to. The applicant will no doubt cite the fact that adjacent properties have been developed in this way, notably the rear blocks of Frogna Court. However, I would point out that because this bad practice was approved decades ago, it does not establish a precedent.</p> <p>Second, the proposed development backs onto the Junior Branch of South Hampstead High School. This means that all the windows on the back elevation will have a full view of the playground at the back of the school. Under Para 2.10 headed "Site and Surroundings", it is stated that the properties backing onto the proposed development at the lower end of Netherhall Gardens are residential properties. In this instance, however, it is the playground of a girls' school. This definition, therefore, is incorrect and highly misleading.</p> <p>In para 5.38, it is stated that too that "the proposed development complies with relevant policies designed to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers", clearly, in this instance that protection is not afforded.</p> <p>In the circumstances, it is felt that the proposal should be rejected as it is just not possible to prevent this degree of immediate oversight of the playground.</p> <p>I would be happy to be contacted for further elucidation of the issues outlined above.</p> <p>Best wishes</p> <p>Dr Mayer Hillman</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6967/P	Mayer Hillman	7a Netherhall Gardens	25/03/2018 19:56:14	OBJEMAI L	<p>I am writing in my capacity as both a resident of the lower end of Netherhall Gardens and in my capacity as a former architect and town planner.</p> <p>I have now had the opportunity of examining the detailed proposals for the extension of the Holiday Inn.</p> <p>I live in one of the properties backing onto the Holiday Inn and wish to raise two substantial objections to the proposal.</p> <p>First, it seems to me that the proposal is an example of 'backland' development which Camden typically objects to. The applicant will no doubt cite the fact that adjacent properties have been developed in this way, notably the rear blocks of Froggnal Court. However, I would point out that because this bad practice was approved decades ago, it does not establish a precedent.</p> <p>Second, the proposed development backs onto the Junior Branch of South Hampstead High School. This means that all the windows on the back elevation will have a full view of the playground at the back of the school. Under Para 2.10 headed "Site and Surroundings", it is stated that the properties backing onto the proposed development at the lower end of Netherhall Gardens are residential properties. In this instance, however, it is the playground of a girls' school. This definition, therefore, is incorrect and highly misleading.</p> <p>In para 5.38, it is stated that too that "the proposed development complies with relevant policies designed to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers", clearly, in this instance that protection is not afforded.</p> <p>In the circumstances, it is felt that the proposal should be rejected as it is just not possible to prevent this degree of immediate oversight of the playground.</p> <p>I would be happy to be contacted for further elucidation of the issues outlined above.</p> <p>Best wishes</p> <p>Dr Mayer Hillman</p>
2017/6967/P	martin hay	1 Bridge lane london NW11 0AE	19/03/2018 16:09:09	COMMNT	<p>I am writing on behalf of Metropolitan and County holdings Ltd who are the adjoining owners of a long lease over Froggnal Court and 1 to 16 Froggnal Parade. We have not received any communication or consultation about the application. In any event we consider the application should be rejected n that it is a gross over development of the site. In addition it shows development within 15 metres of Ancient woodland which is against government guidelines. It will also cause a problem with light We also have concerns about the impact on the ground loading and vibration and the innpact given the railway lines that run close underground.</p>