2019/2895/P Itusein Almide 2607/2019 16:12:28 OBJ Planning Application - 2019/2895/P Objection from Hussein Al Mahdi Squaremelon Ltd. Business Distructor. Objection from Hussein Al Mahdi Squaremelon Ltd. Business Distructor. Objection from Hussein Al Mahdi Squaremelon Ltd. Business Distructor. 10 Forganal Parade, NW3 5HH Using to this object to this application for oof extension over the front blocks of Froganal Estate on the following grounds: 10 Hussein Almond					Printed on: 29/07/2019
Objection Hussein AI Mahdi Squaremedon Ltd. Business Director. 10 Fregnal Parade, NW3 5HH I wish to object to this application for roof extension over the front blocks of Fregnal Estate on the following grounds: 1. Hazards causing risk to the business customer 2. Deliver and other site vehicles 3. Coverage of store fagade 4. Loss of light 5. Parking 6. Traffic 7. Noise, dust and vibration 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other opticat cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other opticat cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other opticat cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other opticat cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other opticat cause is a stirger in not be used to determine any optic to light cause is acristly the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in cause is acristly the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in cause is acristly the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in cause is acrostly there is a concern over right to light their. The assessment of loss of light in cause is acrostly the legal requirements surrounding the right to light there is a concern over right to light there is a concern over right to light there is a concern over right to light there is a provade development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light there is a protate is a provide the start and the site within	Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
Siguaremelon Ltd. Business Director. 10 Frogon Parade, NW3 SHH I wish to object to this application for roof extension over the front blocks of Frognal Estate on the following grounds: 1. Hazards causing risk to the business customer 2. Deliver and other site vehicles 3. Coverage of store fragade 4. Loss of light 5. Parking 6. Traffic 7. Noise, dust and vibration 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered 12. Boy Soft Safet	2019/2895/P	Hussein Almahdi	26/07/2019 16:12:28	OBJ	Planning Application - 2019/2895/P
10 Frognal Parade, MV3 6HH I wish to object to this application for roof extension over the front blocks of Frognal Estate on the following grounds: 1. Hazards causing risk to the business customer 2. Deliver and other site vehicles 3. Coverage of store façade 4. Loss of light 5. Parking 6. Traffic 7. Noise, dust and vibration 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Heattin and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BOP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and carnot be used to replace or safety the login equivements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used to determine any right to light for existing building, windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infining rights to light. The is a concern over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full with across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that "The proposed development has been designed to be car-free built also acknowledges that there is already a car prak: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courly are alable to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, will an additional di					•
I visit in object to this application for roof extension over the front blocks of Frognal Estate on the following grounds: 1. Hazards causing risk to the business customer 2. Deliver and other site vehicles 3. Coverage of store façade 4. Loss of light 5. Parking 6. Traffic 7. Noise, dust and vibration 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as ilfe) endangered Loss of light Brooks Devolopment Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration. This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing bulling windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in RP 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BP 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The 4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that "The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' built also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private pary and display' parking area in the courtyrad available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area; In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents at 0-14 Midland court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area; In fact, be private parking area is sone or contert for existing residents of horigonal Estate In start, built be bicycles. The car park is a bane or content for existing re					
grounds: 1. Hazards causing risk to the business customer 2. Deliver and other site vehicles 3. Coverage of store façade 4. Loss of light 5. Parking 6. Traffic 7. Noise, dust and vibration 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Heatti and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tacking all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infinge rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The '4th flore roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' buil it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents to a for the private parking area is in theory, for all Froganal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as a specified by the application a score of to be or be for forganal Estate.					
 i. Hazards causing risk to the business customer 2. Deliver and other site vehicles 3. Coverage of store façade 4. Loss of light 5. Parking 6. Traffic 7. Noise, dust and vibration 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly. BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carified out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the rights loght for existing building windows. This report has been carified out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light the report is not to be soft the methods used in BR 209 and tall on to be assend to light. If there is a concern over right to light to light the hock? 					
 2. Deliver and other is tevehicles 3. Coverage of store façade 4. Loss of light 5. Parking 6. Traffic 7. Noise, dust and vibration 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BOP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light cares is concern over right to light the suited in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light the foll to reak is canced out with a different way to the methods used in BR 209 ard cansot be used the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing sitch has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyrad available to the residents at 1-4 Middiand court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warkick House, with an additional disable park, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The carry and kisplay parking area is in theory, for all Frognal Estate existing residents of Frognal Estate. 					
 3. Coverage of store façade 4.Loss of light 5. Parking 6. Traffic 7. Noise, dust and vibration 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing reductions. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this reports that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light to light to block. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1.4 Midland court, 1.12 Forgonal court and Wawick House, with an additional disabled parking areas, in the routing all state, set the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a car park: 					
 4.Loss of light 5. Parking 6. Traffic 7. Noise, dust and vibration 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in fights to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. The res is a concern over right to light tom The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frogenal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing residens of to blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing resident for existing residents, will not blige anybody to use block'.					
 5. Parking 6. Traffic 7. Noise, dust and vibration 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report shows will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full widt hacross the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that "The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyrad available to the residents at 1.4 Midland court, 1.12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the application above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application or oblige anyboy to use bicycles. The car park is already be one of content					
 7. Noise, dust and vibration 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light their or ropsed development way to the substore light. If there is a concern over right to light their set on the across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The explication is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The explication is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The explication is contradictory. On one hand it says that and disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal courts of rogenal Estate. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal courts of rogenal Estate. 					-
 8. Restriction for use (that is discrimination against disabled users and other groups of people) 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of flight causes is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light thor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building wilding, extended full width across the block'. 					6. Traffic
 9. Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the from blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate. 					
 10. Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented 11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Wankick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full witth across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warkick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicate. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application subgests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate. 					
11. Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the frot blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
Loss of light Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court,1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					·
Brooks Development Practice Ltd's submission is not tackling all issues which cause loss of light. Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to be used to be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light cases is carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'.The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a been of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
Interestingly, BDP suggests that there could be many other options for consideration: This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the forb blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
This report is not to be used to determine any right to light for existing building windows. This report has been carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
 carried out using guidelines set out in BR 209 and cannot be used to replace or satisfy the legal requirements surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate. 					
surrounding the right to light. The assessment of loss of light in rights to light cases is carried out in a different way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
 way to the methods used in BR 209 and this report. It should not be assumed that if the guidelines in BR 209 are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate. 					
over right to light then The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court,1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
The '4th floor roof extension to Warwick House will sit within the footprint of the existing building, extended full width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court, 1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					are satisfied within this report that a proposed development will not infringe rights to light. If there is a concern
width across the block'. The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court,1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
The application is contradictory. On one hand it says that 'The proposed development has been designed to be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court,1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
be car-free' but it also acknowledges that there is already a car park: The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court,1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					width across the block'.
The existing site has a private 'pay and display' parking area in the courtyard available to the residents at 1-4 Midland court,1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
Midland court,1-12 Frognal court and Warwick House, with an additional disabled parking area. In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
In fact, the private parking area is, in theory, for all Frognal Estate residents, not only for the front blocks as specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
specified by the applicant above. Providing spaces for 16 bicycles, as the application suggests, will not oblige anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
anybody to use bicycles. The car park is already a bone of content for existing residents of Frognal Estate.					
Adding a further to hats to the mix (o new hats in the back blocks, not yet fully completed for use, and eight					Adding a further 16 flats to the mix (8 new flats in the back blocks, not yet fully completed for use, and eight

proposed new flats in the front blocks) will have 70 flats competing for the space which until now served, unsatisfactorily, 54 flats. The use of bicycles (instead of cars) would be welcome but they could not deliver furniture, pianos, cookers etc. to the 16 new flats. The potential increase of downloading (even if not necessarily of long term parking) is significant.

The application suggests that

Bin storage is proposed at lower ground level by the south entrance.

Page 15 of 28

Comment: Response:

This suggestion is unclear as currently the disabled parking area is located at lower ground level by the south entrance.

Bottom line: it is unrealistic to accept that possible car usage by sixteen new flats can be accommodated in the car park built for fifty-four flats and that bin storage, so far serving fifty-four flats, can be further extended (in the space built for fifty-four flats) to serve seventy flats.

Traffic (within Frognal Estate)

The Frognal Estate cause considerable traffic (whether by foot or by car) in the car park and elsewhere. Most flats are multi-let, with several people residing in each. Multiple residents in 16 additional flats (8 in the back blocks still to be completed for usage and 8 in the front blocks) will substantially increase the traffic in our car park, in our staircases and in our fire escapes. Residents in the new flats will not only use the new staircases and new fire escapes: they could gain access to them only through our existing staircases and fire escapes on the lower floors. Our existing staircases and fire escapes were built to provide use for 54 flats, not for 70 flats. The proposed extra load is unwelcome as it may prove to be dangerous.

Noise

Certain amount of noise is inevitable in blocks of flats, even with mature, considerate residents. The more residents there are, the more noise is created. Increasing the number of flats by about 30% (two flats added to each block of six flats, with three flats added to one of the blocks) will increase inevitable noise by at about 30%. Furthermore, the proposed flats are likely to be restricted to young people, who are able to negotiate four stairs without a lift. The new flats, therefore, are unlikely to be occupied by families with children, by older people and so on: inevitably, the new flats will be susceptible to noisy parties.

Impact of the construction work rendering existing homes uninhabitable

The application avoids showing the impact of the construction work. They say that

The document provides an overview of the proposed construction methodology and overview of the measures which will be put in place to minimise any impacts on neighbouring residents

during construction.

However, the application does not admit that the proposed extension of existing internal staircases is one meter (or less) from eight current top floor flats. They state only that

These [the new extensions] will be accessed via the stair core of the existing building.

They avoid mentioning that the current eight top floor flats will, in practice, become building sites. They do not specify how exactly the internal staircases will go upwards, going through the current roof, without hugely impacting the eight current top floor flats. They do not explain how access will be maintained to those current top floor flats which do not have any other means of access (like backdoors with keyholes and keys) to their flats. For instance, on advise of police crime prevention officers, I do NOT have backdoor access: how will I access/exit to and from my top floor home while the roof and walls on the current top floor, within about a meter from my flat, are demolished?

The application states that

All existing plant will be relocated onto the new flat roof, accessed from pull down ladders at 1-12 Frognal Court and Midland Court...

All existing plant and services will be extended and relocated to the new flat roof as required. New man safe systems will be installed to provide safe access for servicing.

Presumably they mean water tanks, chimneys (and TV antennas). Some flats gain their water from the main, fewer flats gain their water from the water tank. I get my water from the water tank: will I be left without water (for hours/days/weeks) while the developers move the water tank to the new roof?

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The roof extension to the back blocks (by the current applicant!!) caused significant damages to flats in the back blocks. Five years on, the development has not yet been completed.

It is more than likely that the proposed roof extension to the front blocks will take years of inconvenience, excessive dirt and significant damages to our existing staircases and walls.

Guidelines on affordable homes not implemented

The application states that

For the purposes of this application, a total of 16% affordable housing should be delivered, equivalent to 1.2 units. The applicant proposes to provide this on-site as part of the proposed development. Given the guideline split set out within Policy H4 (Part A), the unit is proposed to be as an affordable-rented level.

This statement is wishful thinking at its best or, otherwise, a disingenuous promise. The developer (that is the applicant) will sell the proposed new flats for the highest prices he can get and the flats will be let, by then possibly but not necessarily out of the hands of the developer / applicant (who owns some flats in the Estate), most probably at the highest market rate. At any event, what does affordable mean? Affordable for whom? For what specific rental charge? On what guarantee? Under whose supervision?

It is unlikely (and it is not even promised) that the proposed new flats will include social housing within the development. It is disingenuous to indicate 'affordable-rented level'.

Health and Safety (as well as life) endangered

a) The proposal compromises the structural safety of the building

Our blocks are built over a train tunnel. Every time a train passes through the tunnel, our block shakes. It certainly shakes considerably in my store on the ground floor. The building stands directly above the mouths of two railway tunnels dating from the 19th century, which at this point are very shallow and immediately below ground level. The lines in these tunnels are very intensively used. They take all Thameslink trains and East Midlands trains, as well as heavy goods trains.

The existing building stands on shallow foundations that pass directly over the tunnels.

Currently, each train passing through the tunnels induces vibration in these foundations.

This vibration is transmitted to the building above, in a pattern that magnifies them through the fabric and is particularly noticeable at the top floor, where I live.

Over many decades it is likely that this vibration has compromised the long-term stability of the building. The application proposes to add one more floor: an additional and very significant structural load that will bear on the existing foundations.

This matter may not be a planning issue but it may be the difference between life and death.

b) Although most flats in our block(s) are let to healthy young people, there are also a number of longstanding elderly owner-occupiers (with various disabilities) living here. The proposed extensive building works will make life for these people (several of whom live on the current top floors in the front blocks) unbearable, possibly leading to tragic outcomes.

This matter may not be a planning issue but it may be the difference between life and death.

According to my best knowledge, Policy A1 of a relevant Camden Council document advises that the Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission that does not cause harm to amenity – including visual privacy and overlooking, outlook, sunlight and daylight, noise and vibration levels and dust (during construction, for example Conclusion