

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to object to the proposed planning application 2019/2895/P . [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

As you are aware, the same owner/developer has already built above the flats located on the back of the property of Frogna Court. The construction of the back flats started in the autumn of 2016 and the works are still not complete. There have been many issues with this construction period, all of which should be considered as the owner/developers did not rectify many of these and the leaseholders were left to bear the cost.

The council should not pass this application based on what has already happened at the other building. It is clear that the landlord/developer have not taken responsibility for the damages caused by their development and the leaseholders have suffered severe hardships both economical and emotionally. The council now has a responsibility to reject this planning application on this basis. Please note some of the issues below.

During construction 3 of the 4 top flats in our building 14-29 were flooded and the occupiers had to vacate the property. Furthermore the noise was intolerable.

The developers would not compensate for the flooding, albeit they acknowledged the fault and as a result the insurance premiums for our flats have increased [REDACTED]
Why should the leaseholders now be liable for these increased insurance costs, let alone the direct costs that the leaseholders of the directly owned flat have had to bear.

Other issues that we experienced was flooding down the main stairs, damage to the external doors and my flat had a piece of scaffolding fall down and hit the window. Again the developer had accepted the incident but will still not compensate.

During construction the builders tapped into our communal electricity supply and contributed to the bill for 1 year only. There was at least another year if not more where they were still using the electricity but not contributing towards it.

The flats have now reached lock up stage, however they are not contributing to any of the service charges. The site has done extensive damage to the car park with the cranes and used other services however the rest of the flats are still bearing the costs of the service charges. Some of the repairs done to the building as a result of the development have been paid by the current flats.

As a result of the development we were required to contribute to the new elevators in the building. None of these elevators are operational. They were the wrong size and extensive work had to be done to the resizing of the elevator housing on each level. As a result the space in front of my door entry has been reduced. I can no longer move in large furniture or items through the main stairwell, and will have to bring them through the fire escape which is dangerous and poses a safety risk whenever furniture is moved.

As the owner [REDACTED] within the building which the new planning application is for, I now risk all the issues experienced by the back building, knowing that the developer has not made good any of the damages they caused, and all the leaseholders will be out of pocket again.

The council cannot allow this application to proceed knowing that the leaseholders of the back building had suffered at the hands of the developer/owner and had to pay for any damages caused by the construction.

The planning application allows for the stairwell to be extended to the roof. This will directly affect my flat being on the top floor. The damage/noise and possible safety risks will affect my flat. I also run the risk of having the occupiers vacate the flat without recourse. If this application is passed there must be safeguards regarding compensation for the above flats held by a 3rd party. No leaseholders should suffer any economic loss as a result.

The roof above my flat is a honeycomb concrete flat roof. There is no insulation between the roof and flat and as such the noise will be intolerable for the occupiers below. There will be safety risk for all the leaseholders as the stairwell will be used.

The leaseholders of Frogna Court have suffered greatly over the last 15 years since the change of landlord. We have had to attend several court cases regarding the actions of the landlord.

The issues experienced during the development of the back building block reflect the lack of responsibility, integrity and accountability that the developers/landlord has shown to the leaseholders.

This needs to be taken into account for this current application as the leaseholders for the front blocks will bear the impact of damage, noise and any emotional distress.

I fear for my own wellbeing, let alone those that live directly below the proposed development as I know what the consequences will be if this development is allowed to proceed. The council has a responsibility to protect the leaseholders from such developers/landlord.

The planning application allows for the construction above the 4th floor flats. There is currently no elevator and as such will require the extension of the existing internal stairwell which will cause great inconvenience, noise, damage to the existing flats. How can a development with 4 existing levels allow for a fifth by only extending the internal stairwell and fire escape.

I trust the Planning Committee to take into consideration all I have said and make the right decision. I am sure they will take into account the past experiences of the leaseholders at the back block, the economical and emotional losses that they had to endure and benchmark the developers/landlords performance when deciding the suitability of this planning application.

Finally I still use the chimney flues in my flat. I cannot see any allowance for them to be incorporated into the extension. They must be incorporated and allowed to be working for the flats below. Furthermore a steel flue liner must be inserted down them. This was not done in the back flats and as a result my flat has suffered as there is not enough draft down the flues to suck out the emissions through the flue. Which could lead to carbon monoxide poisoning.

Kind Regards

Riccardo Di Blasi



Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for consulting Network Rail regarding the above application. After examining the plans I would like to inform you that Network Rail have no comments to make.

Kind Regards,


Nick Donoghue
Town Planning Technician | Property
Network Rail
1 Eversholt St | London | NW1 2DN



The content of this email (and any attachment) is confidential. It may also be legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure.
This email should not be used by anyone who is not an original intended recipient, nor may it be copied or disclosed to anyone who is not an original intended recipient.

If you have received this email by mistake please notify us by emailing the sender, and then delete the email and any copies from your system.

Liability cannot be accepted for statements made which are clearly the sender's own and not made on behalf of Network Rail.
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited registered in England and Wales No. 2904587, registered office
Network Rail, 2nd Floor, One Eversholt Street, London, NW1 2DN



Dear Sir , Madam

I have read Mr Diblasi's objection statement to the planning application. I can confirm everything in Mr Diblasi's report is accurate and true.

I am the owner of [REDACTED] and I too have had horrendous disruption over the past several years, water damage to my flats of which no financial compensation was ever given.

The value of the apartments has no question been permanently devalued since the building works has been completed. Further building on the front blocks will further create loss of light as it will make the car park far too "canyon-like". Already nearly all apartments in the back blocks require lights to be turned on all

throughout the day due to lack of light. Furthermore sound encroachment into the flats will be further increased considerably due to the echoing from building to building, emanating from the carpark. We already have had increased sound due to the increased traffic on the stairwells and noisy metal lifts right outside our main doors (<3feet!)

Best regards

John Curry [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to object to the proposed planning application 2019/2895/P . [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

As you are aware, the same owner/developer has already built above the flats located on the back of the property of Frognal Court. The construction of the back flats started in the autumn of 2016 and the works are still not complete. There have been many issues with this construction period, all of which should be considered as the owner/developers did not rectify many of these and the leaseholders were left to bear the cost.

The council should not pass this application based on what has already happened at the other building. It is clear that the landlord/developer have not taken responsibility for the damages caused by their development and the leaseholders have suffered severe hardships both economical and emotionally. The council now has a responsibility to reject this planning application on this basis. Please note some of the issues below.

During construction 3 of the 4 top flats in our building 14-29 were flooded and the occupiers had to vacate the property. Furthermore the noise was intolerable.

The developers would not compensate for the flooding, albeit they acknowledged the fault and as a result the insurance premiums for our flats have increased [REDACTED] Why should the leaseholders now be liable for these increased insurance costs, let alone the direct costs that the leaseholders of the directly owned flat have had to bear.

Other issues that we experienced was flooding down the main stairs, damage to the external doors and my flat had a piece of scaffolding fall down and hit the window. Again the developer had accepted the incident but will still not compensate.

During construction the builders tapped into our communal electricity supply and contributed to the bill for 1 year only. There was at least another year if not more where they were still using the electricity but not contributing towards it.

The flats have now reached lock up stage, however they are not contributing to any of the service charges. The site has done extensive damage to the car park with the cranes and used other services however the rest of the flats are still bearing the costs of the service charges. Some of the repairs done to the building as a result of the development have been paid by the current flats.

As a result of the development we were required to contribute to the new elevators in the building. Non of these elevators are operational. They were the wrong size and extensive work had to be done to the resizing of the elevator housing on each level. As a result the space in front of my door entry has been reduced. I can no longer move in large furniture or items through the main stairwell, and will have to bring them through the fire escape which is dangerous and poses a safety risk whenever furniture is moved.

As the owner of [REDACTED] within the building which the new planning application is for, I now risk all the issues experienced by the back building, knowing that the developer has not made good any of the damages they caused, and all the leaseholders will be out of pocket again.

The council cannot allow this application to proceed knowing that the leaseholders of the back building had suffered at the hands of the developer/owner and had to pay for any damages caused by the construction.

The planning application allows for the stairwell to be extended to the roof. This will directly affect my flat being on the top floor. The damage/noise and possible safety risks will affect my flat. I also run the risk of having the occupiers vacate the flat without recourse. If this application is passed there must be safeguards regarding compensation for the above flats held by a 3rd party. No leaseholders should suffer any economic loss as a result.

The roof above my flat is a honeycomb concrete flat roof. There is no insulation between the roof and flat and as such the noise will be intolerable for the occupiers below. There will be safety risk for all the leaseholders as the stairwell will be used.

The leaseholders of Frognal Court have suffered greatly over the last 15 years since the change of landlord. We have had to attend several court cases regarding the actions of the landlord.

The issues experienced during the development of the back building block reflect the lack of responsibility, integrity and accountability that the developers/landlord has shown to the leaseholders.

This needs to be taken into account for this current application as the leaseholders for the front blocks will bear the impact of damage, noise and any emotional distress.

I fear for my own wellbeing, let alone those that live directly below the proposed development as I know what the consequences will be if this development is allowed to proceed. The council has a responsibility to protect the leaseholders from such developers/landlord.

The planning application allows for the construction above the 4th floor flats. There is currently no elevator and as such will require the extension of the existing internal stairwell which will cause great inconvenience, noise, damage to the existing flats. How can a development with 4 existing levels allow for a fifth by only extending the internal stairwell and fire escape.

I trust the Planning Committee to take into consideration all I have said and make the right decision. I am sure they will take into account the past experiences of the leaseholders at the back block, the economical and emotional losses that they had to endure and benchmark the developers/landlords performance when deciding the suitability of this planning application.


Finally I still use the chimney flues in my flat. I cannot see any allowance for them to be incorporated into the extension. They must be incorporated and allowed to be working for the flats below. Furthermore a steel flue liner must be inserted down them. This was not done in the back flats and as a result my flat has suffered as there is not enough draft down the flues to suck out the emissions through the flue. Which could lead to carbon monoxide poisoning.

*** This email is classified OFFICIAL only***

Regards

Riccardo Di Blasi

Level 11



NG Bailey

www.ngbailey.com



PASSION | INTEGRITY | EXCELLENCE

The information contained in this e-mail (and attachments) is confidential. It must not be read, copied, disclosed, printed, forwarded, relied upon or used by any person other than the intended recipient. Unauthorised use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error immediately contact the sender and postmaster@ngbailey.co.uk then permanently delete it and any attachments. NG Bailey may monitor email where it is considered proportionate to any perceived risk.

This email has been sent on behalf of an NG Bailey company, if in doubt ask the sender to clarify which company. The NG Bailey companies include NG Bailey Limited (342778), NG Bailey IT Services Limited (2338401), NG Bailey Facilities Services Limited (5472032) and NG Bailey Group Limited (1490238). All of the companies are registered in England with registered office at Denton Hall Ilkley West Yorkshire LS29 0HH.