

From: Adina Kohn
Sent: 08 September 2018 17:06
To: Young, Tony
Subject: 106 Frognal NW3 6XU Planning Application 2018/4111/L URGENT

Dear Mr Young

I'm writing to vehemently object to the above proposed building application.

Has anyone from your planning committee visited the site, to understand the impossibility of the proposed scheme?

The current owners of 106 Frognal my next door neighbors, I live at 108 Frognal, have tried on several occasions to get all sorts of planning for their modest terraced grade 11 listed house, as they are really opportunistic developers trying to add maximum value to their property and then sell it on to the highest bidder. They might try and sell it with the planning permission and never do the works themselves, as I don't believe they have the means? They have rented it out for years, whilst they live abroad and have never looked after the property, which is now in a very poor state of repairs.

We live in a beautiful conservation area and the footprint of his proposed back garden extension is nearly the size of his total garden. The materials that he wishes to use are not in keeping with a grade 11 listed property. It will intrude on the amenities enjoyed by neighbors at 104 and 108 and it is surely unacceptable the the proposed extension is designed to rest on top of the grade 11 listed and protected walls of 104 and 108 which are already weak and will not withstand such a development even if he only wishes to abut our walls? Also if he intends digging into the garden to keep the height of the proposed garden extension below my garden level, this will definitely cause damage to both sets of walls and also impact the surface water flow and flooding, groundwater and structural stability cannot be fully considered on the basis of the submission and the applications should be refused. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policy DP27 and the criteria set out within it.

Cracks to the fabric of our houses, and water problems, which occurred when the previous developer renovated 106 several years ago were never addressed and paid for and we are still experiencing problems to date.

We already suffer from noise and light from his ugly temporary conservatory and it's gutters are never cleaned and water continues to ingress my property.

The rear 110ft grade 11 listed wall of 18 Frognal Gardens fell into my garden a few years ago and it was a nightmare. My neighbor did not wish to contribute in any form and left me to rebuild it. 106 has never been forth coming with contributions either nor has 110 when our front grade 11 listed wall came down.

Therefore I enquire if a party wall agreement has been supplied by 106?

I also enquire if you have received a BIA report and Heritage Assessment? The Heritage Statement should provide information about:

- 1) the significance of the architectural and historical interest and character of the building or structure;
- 2) the principles of and justification for the proposed works; and
- 3) the impact of the proposal on the special interest of the listed building or structure, its setting and the setting of adjacent listed buildings.

I believe the five terraced properties 110, 108, 106, 104 and 102 date back to around 1640 thereby being one of the oldest terraces in Hampstead and they should be protected.

The drawings submitted with the applications are considered to provide an ambiguous view of the site and its surroundings. The drawings present the appearance that the site and the adjacent properties are at the same land level and that a tall level height wall runs along the boundary between no's 106 and 108 Frognal. In reality there is a significant difference in the height of the land levels, not only between the properties but also within each property's boundary. For example the garden of 108 rises from the rear elevation of the house to the rear boundary of the garden. The result of the variation in land and wall levels is that the proposed extension and lights would be more visually dominant to 108 than it appears it would be from the drawings. The visibility of the proposed conservatory to both 104 and 108 Frognal will be further exacerbated by the removal of most of the mature evergreen plants, trees, ivy, which currently provide an attractive feature and screening to adjacent properties.

I don't believe that a Case Officer Report has been prepared by the Council setting out a detailed analysis of the Application and the consultation responses.

The drawings and report are not at all clear how 106 intends building this mindless proposed scheme? Frognal is a very narrow road, with double yellow lines on either side, traffic is already heavily restricted. Any lorry that parks outside their property even on the pavement, reduces the road to a single lane and snarls up the traffic in both directions for a considerable way, particularly during school runs and rush hours. I am the only house of the five with parking and I'm fed up with delivery lorries continually blocking my garage right of way.

How do they intend getting heavy materials and equipment to their postage stamp of a back garden, over the property? How do they intend excavating and or moving all the unnecessary soil from the rear garden? They have a single front gate and railings which are all listed. They have no side entrance to their garden so everything has to go thru their single grade 11 listed front door? It's just not realistically feasible? Has a full Construction Management Plan been submitted?

In 2012 an application was refused under planning permission ref 2022/6296/P, for the rear extension being excessive in size. In 2015 planning permission was granted for a smaller rear extension but was never implemented by the applicant and has

subsequently expired on the 4 September 2018. The applicant has now submitted a further planning application with further amendments to the now expired planning permission.

These amendments seek to increase the height of the previously granted rear extension by 0.3m to be in level with the recent extension of the adjacent building of 104 Frognaal. I would like you to take a physical look at the extension at 104 before considering 106's proposal as I believe it is not in keeping with the approval obtained, it is far bigger, incredibly modern, not at all in keeping with the brickwork of their Grade 11 listed house, totally overlooks both 106 and 108 and the full blaze of continual lighting until 2am in the morning and noise disturbs our once peaceful conservation area.

104 Frognaal has a much bigger footprint than 106.

The build at 104 took much longer than anticipated, the builders worked all hours of the clock and weekends and the disturbance in Frognaal streets, was a total nightmare for all concerned.

They now use the roof of this extension for their personal pleasure accessing it from a first floor window. They have also planted flower pots. This was not in the original agreement and should be addressed with the proposed building at 106 too please? Obviously when they are standing on their roof my privacy is invaded, which of course was not the case before the dwelling was erected.

Further objections to the proposal of 106 are;

- 1) Lack of a heritage impact assessment,
- 2) The proposal is wholly inconsistent with the Council's published policy for the Conservation Area,
- 3) The proposal fails the guidelines set out in CPG1 and the Hampstead CAS,
- 4) The proposal fails to identify the type or location of the extraction equipment that will be required,
- 5) Total lack of a construction management plan.

Despite the similarities between these current applications and previous, there are a few points which cause me to object. These are related to procedural planning matters, procedural heritage matters and design considerations. There are also new planning policies and guidelines that have been released since 106 previous consents were granted.

Have 106 provided on site testing by their own recent boreholes to test the precise case make and prediction of the Ground on the site and the groundwater conditions? Using this they should make a prediction of Ground movement which will result from the excavation and construction as their first element.

Also missing is a structural survey of 104? Any predicted cracks wider than 4 or 5mm should be deemed unacceptable to Camden.

We need clarification of what they propose to build in the basement and second floor with full drawings, as I am still experiencing continued damp, and structural problems especially to my basement and ground floor annex, which abuts 106, which have amenity, structural and financial implications. The concern is that any new basement or second floor works at 106 would have further detrimental impact on 108.

I respectfully request that the above objections are taken into account when you consider the proposed application and you reject it wholeheartedly.

Kind regards

Adina Kohn