

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/2895/P	Dom Green	01/08/2019 17:00:29	COMMENT	<p>To the Planning Committee,</p> <p>I am writing as a student [REDACTED] to strongly object to the proposed planning application 2019/2895/P.</p> <p>Having only moved into the flat some months ago, it would be distressing to have to revisit the process of finding a place to live - especially during university time when I am not only busy studying but also working a job - should the proposed building works become unbearable and disruptive enough that I was forced to relocate, a situation both one of my flatmates and my landlord have stated is foreseeable given the unfortunate circumstances.</p> <p>The last set of building works at the address has been described to me as not only noisy, which I would find incredibly distracting trying to complete my studies, but also terribly long (some five years), which completely eradicates any leeway I could allow for the idea of putting up with some noise should it have been for a short and temporary time. The proposed works would not just be an aggravating period of my time living in the flat, but the entirety of my stay. This is not to mention the people who consider the address their permanent accommodation, of whom I'm sure none are satisfied with the prospects of prolonged building works to their home.</p> <p>Concerns have also been raised about the effect to the National Rail services in the area, and decreased stability of the building structure itself. I share this worry, what with the flat already having undergone refurbishment since I moved in. The actual building is not at its healthiest in its current state, let alone what the pressures of more building works right on top of it would do to its soundness and character.</p> <p>I would be most grateful to see the voices of the residents at the address to be listened to.</p> <p>Thank you, Dom Green [REDACTED]</p>

Printed on: 05/08/2019 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/2895/P	T Baroti	02/08/2019 20:29:05	OBJ	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am a resident on the top floor of the Frogmal Court and I've been living there since 2014. I have witnessed the construction work that was taking place in the building in front of us, which is, what I believe, exactly what is intended to be done to our building.</p> <p>I strongly object to such extension. First of all, I have been made aware of numerous complaints our neighbours from the opposing building expressed due to the extension they had to experience - some of the residents were even forced to move out due to various technical faults in the construction work (i.e. leaks). Secondly, the residents had to pay additional costs for constructions that are not being utilised, thus, do not benefit them (i.e. the lifts) - no refunds have been made. Finally, I personally witnessed criminals occupying one of the mansard roof flats. It ended up in an arrest only due to my flatmate's concern and subsequent report to the police - neither the building manager, nor the project manager were taking the security of their residents seriously. If such extension works were to take place on top of my flat, I would be in constant fear for my safety. By the way, none of the newly built flat have been sold - begs to question whether such project is truly financially viable.</p> <p>I do hope you will take this into consideration and withdraw the planned development.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/2895/P	Dr Michael Anson	02/08/2019 10:19:28	OBJCOMPA P	PLANNING Application 2019/2895/P - Objection

I am Dr Michael Anson the longleasehold owner and resident for over thirty years of [REDACTED] which will be directly adversely affected particularly in terms of light, air and access. Currently there is a similar development taking place over my roof - under planning approval 2016/1709/P - which has yet to be completed.

There seem to be some important relevant facts which should be brought to the Officers and Committees attention.

The High Court (Chancery Division) see Long Acre Securities Ltd v Karet ([2004] EWHC 442 (Ch), [2005] Ch 61) has determined that The whole of Froggnal Estate NW3 (consisting of Flats 1 - 12 Froggnal Court NW3 5HL; Flats 14 - 29 & 30 - 45 Froggnal Court NW3 5HG; 1 - 6 Warwick House NW3 5HN, 1 - 4 Midland Court NW3 5HP together with shops 1 - 16 Froggnal Parade NW3 5HH) is a single building.

As 8 flats are currently being constructed - see 2016/1709/P over 14 - 29 (Block B) and 30 - 45 (Block A) Froggnal Court - this application would bring the total new build to 16 flats at the single entity Froggnal Estate and so trigger the necessity to provide 2.5 units of social housing.

There are two separate mainline railway tunnels running close to the surface and emerging on the surface on the west side of the Finchley Road: the Belsize Tunnel (Midland Mainline to St Pancras) running under Midland Court and the Belsize New Tunnel (Thameslink Mainline to St Pancras) which runs under 1 - 12 Froggnal Court. Network Rail, the Freeholder of the Froggnal Estate, should be consulted and grant their approval before any permissions to build are granted.

The postcode(s) quoted in the Application, is wrong: they should be as stated in paragraph 3 above.

Some more minor errors are: the main entrance to Warwick House with an internal staircase is situated on the Finchley Road as are all the entrances to front block flats. The rear metal staircases to all flats are for emergency use only and are not intended for routine access to the existing flats.

Froggnal Court and Midland Court blocks were constructed between 1934 and 1936 although Warwick House was possibly constructed a decade or so earlier, the Froggnal Estate does not date from the 19th century as stated in the Officer's report.

The Car Park/ courtyard between the blocks of flats is for the parking of Residents' and their Visitors' cars and for the storage of dustbins only as stated in the Deed of Variation to the Head Lease issued by British Rail in 1972 and upheld in the County Court Judgment of 2007.

Currently the Froggnal Estate is managed under a Management Order dated March 2016, granted by the First Tier Property Tribunal under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1987. The Tribunal Appointed Manager is Mr Martin Kingsley (Martin Kingsley, K&M First/Property The Studio, 63 Darlands Drive, Barnet Herts EN5 2DE, Office: 020 8440 1034)

www.kmoropertygroup.co.uk; E-mail: martin@groupkm.co.uk

I understand that Mr Kingsley was not informed directly of this Application. However, he must be consulted on all the Development plans, construction management proposals and health and safety provisions etc for minimizing disruption to, disturbance and safety of existing residents. This is clearly not the case for the existing developments over Blocks A and B, where residents, their safety and quality of life are totally disregarded by the Construction company.

So called Landlords such as RFYC Ltd, F and M Investment Holdings (Virgin Islands), Ralph Kline Ltd and Mr Norman Freed are no longer responsible for management, licensing and operations at Froggnal Estate being superseded by the Management Order.

The removal of lift access to the proposed Development is contrary to LB Camden's requirement for lifetime sustainability as access will be via four story internal staircases (60 or more steps). A challenging everyday

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

climb even for young people let alone the elderly, infirm and old-age pensioners.
No satisfactory CMP has been presented as happened with the current development over the rear blocks 14 - 29 & 30 - 45 Frogna Court. This resulted in the expensive insulated Kemper Roofs, installed in 2014, being ripped off allowing water ingress to the flats below over a period of greater than a year, without any sanction. Such a scenario should not be allowed during the proposed Development, LB Camden has duty of care to ensure that approved constructions do not subject existing residents to damp, mould excessive noise and general inconvenience as a result of the disregard and/or incompetence of the constructors and Developers. I object to this development proposal strongly as my rights to peaceful enjoyment of my property, use of the Car Park and general amenities such as walkways, communal areas etc, will be commandeered as is happened under the present Development. I will also be overlooked and my views over West London destroyed, unlike my present position and outlook living in a third floor flat.
I urge the Officers to take note of the errors detailed here and update their records accordingly and recommend the Committee to reject this development proposal.

Dr Michael Anson

August 2nd 2019



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/2895/P	Dr Michael Anson	02/08/2019 10:19:43	OBJCOMPA P	PLANNING Application 2019/2895/P - Objection

I am Dr Michael Anson the longleasehold owner and resident for over thirty years of [REDACTED] which will be directly adversely affected particularly in terms of light, air and access. Currently there is a similar development taking place over my roof - under planning approval 2016/1709/P - which has yet to be completed.

There seem to be some important relevant facts which should be brought to the Officers and Committees attention.

The High Court (Chancery Division) see Long Acre Securities Ltd v Karet ([2004] EWHC 442 (Ch), [2005] Ch 61) has determined that The whole of Froggnal Estate NW3 (consisting of Flats 1 - 12 Froggnal Court NW3 5HL; Flats 14 - 29 & 30 - 45 Froggnal Court NW3 5HG; 1 - 6 Warwick House NW3 5HN, 1 - 4 Midland Court NW3 5HP together with shops 1 - 16 Froggnal Parade NW3 5HH) is a single building.

As 8 flats are currently being constructed - see 2016/1709/P over 14 - 29 (Block B) and 30 - 45 (Block A) Froggnal Court - this application would bring the total new build to 16 flats at the single entity Froggnal Estate and so trigger the necessity to provide 2.5 units of social housing.

There are two separate mainline railway tunnels running close to the surface and emerging on the surface on the west side of the Finchley Road: the Belsize Tunnel (Midland Mainline to St Pancras) running under Midland Court and the Belsize New Tunnel (Thameslink Mainline to St Pancras) which runs under 1 - 12 Froggnal Court. Network Rail, the Freeholder of the Froggnal Estate, should be consulted and grant their approval before any permissions to build are granted.

The postcode(s) quoted in the Application, is wrong: they should be as stated in paragraph 3 above.

Some more minor errors are: the main entrance to Warwick House with an internal staircase is situated on the Finchley Road as are all the entrances to front block flats. The rear metal staircases to all flats are for emergency use only and are not intended for routine access to the existing flats.

Froggnal Court and Midland Court blocks were constructed between 1934 and 1936 although Warwick House was possibly constructed a decade or so earlier, the Froggnal Estate does not date from the 19th century as stated in the Officer's report.

The Car Park/ courtyard between the blocks of flats is for the parking of Residents' and their Visitors' cars and for the storage of dustbins only as stated in the Deed of Variation to the Head Lease issued by British Rail in 1972 and upheld in the County Court Judgment of 2007.

Currently the Froggnal Estate is managed under a Management Order dated March 2016, granted by the First Tier Property Tribunal under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1987. The Tribunal Appointed Manager is Mr Martin Kingsley (Martin Kingsley, K&M First/Property The Studio, 63 Darlands Drive, Barnet Herts EN5 2DE, Office: 020 8440 1034) www.kmoropertygroup.co.uk; E-mail: martin@groupkm.co.uk

I understand that Mr Kingsley was not informed directly of this Application. However, he must be consulted on all the Development plans, construction management proposals and health and safety provisions etc for minimizing disruption to, disturbance and safety of existing residents. This is clearly not the case for the existing developments over Blocks A and B, where residents, their safety and quality of life are totally disregarded by the Construction company.

So called Landlords such as RFYC Ltd, F and M Investment Holdings (Virgin Islands), Ralph Kline Ltd and Mr Norman Freed are no longer responsible for management, licensing and operations at Froggnal Estate being superseded by the Management Order.

The removal of lift access to the proposed Development is contrary to LB Camden's requirement for lifetime sustainability as access will be via four story internal staircases (60 or more steps). A challenging everyday

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

climb even for young people let alone the elderly, infirm and old-age pensioners.
No satisfactory CM/P has been presented as happened with the current development over the rear blocks 14 - 29 & 30 - 45 Frogna Court. This resulted in the expensive insulated Kemper Roofs, installed in 2014, being ripped off allowing water ingress to the flats below over a period of greater than a year, without any sanction. Such a scenario should not be allowed during the proposed Development, LB Camden has duty of care to ensure that approved constructions do not subject existing residents to damp, mould excessive noise and general inconvenience as a result of the disregard and/or incompetence of the constructors and Developers. I object to this development proposal strongly as my rights to peaceful enjoyment of my property, use of the Car Park and general amenities such as walkways, communal areas etc, will be commandeered as is happened under the present Development. I will also be overlooked and my views over West London destroyed, unlike my present position and outlook living in a third floor flat.
I urge the Officers to take note of the errors detailed here and update their records accordingly and recommend the Committee to reject this development proposal.

Dr Michael Anson

August 2nd 2019

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/2895/P	Iain Syme	01/08/2019 20:30:45	OBJ	<p>2019/2895/P - Froggnal Court, Warwick House and Midland Court Finchley Road London NW3 5HG</p> <p>I am writing to object to the above planning application on the following grounds.</p> <p>No real details have been given as to how they plan to do the construction on Froggnal Court, Warwick House and Midland Court. The site is built on a slope, with business underneath, no direct roof access and no lifts. The rear fire escape is already not fit for purpose - with residents advised not to use it unless in case of an emergency. None of this has been acknowledged in the planning application, simply glossed over and said that it will be decided later. As a current occupant of Froggnal Court, I would like to know before work begins as to what the impact will be upon us. The extension added to the rear of Froggnal Estate caused much disruption and misery to the occupants for years. Severe water damage occurred, causing some residents to have to leave - and loss of income to the owner. Builders climbing on fire escapes railings 4 storeys in the air into cherry pickers. The work site being left unlocked, unsafe and not clean. Is the committee aware of these gross incompetencies that occurred previously? Can we have assurance that these will not happen again?</p> <p>The flats completed at the rear of Froggnal Court have been sitting empty since they have been completed. No effort has been made to sell them on the public market. Instead, they have been attracting unwanted crime and police activity to the area. Not 2 months ago, police dogs, vans and helicopters were called to Froggnal Court to remove burglars that had occupied the top floor. Those responsible for managing the flats had left them unlocked and continue to do so.</p> <p>Whilst the application seems to pride itself on adding more bike parking and a disabled parking space to the car park of Froggnal Court they fail to mention that in doing so they will be removing parking spaces that are already there. The car park is already full. Removing spaces in it will simply inconvenience the lives of those living there more. Froggnal Court was not designed for the proposed capacity, and the already inadequate parking highlights this. Adding more tenants will cause more disruption.</p> <p>Whilst a disabled car parking space is much welcome, I doubt it will be being used by anyone in the new top floor extension of Froggnal Court, Warwick House and Midland Court as it would involve climbing 4 flights of stairs. The lack of any sort of accessibility access to a 4th floor flat, built in 2020 is shocking and discriminatory. Does Camden Council encourage this? It will greatly limit the scope of people that can occupy these new flats. Will the access be through the current stairs that exist on the rear of the buildings? Will they be refurbished if so? If not, where do they plan on placing the stairs to access these new flats? Climbing 4 flights of stairs, outdoors, in any sort of extreme weather is an incredibly dangerous idea.</p> <p>The architects hideous extension on the rear flats have simply been copied and pasted onto the flats at the front of Froggnal Court, with no consideration on the visual impact on the buildings and the surrounding conservation area. Raising the buildings will once again cause an eyesore on the neighbourhood, blocking views of trees and sky to pedestrians on the street and those viewing the Court from approaching trains and roads.</p> <p>The extension on top of the building will also cause great distress to our neighbours on the opposite side of the court, with loss of both valuable light and privacy. The sunsets especially of those on the lower floors would be hindered. These new flats would also be overlooking directly into people's kitchens, living rooms, bedrooms and bathrooms - as experienced with the previous extension. This has already provided great</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

distress to residents on one side of Frogna Court.

Finally, the matter of the buildings structural integrity must be raised. The site is build over an underground railway tunnel and the foundations are very weak. When a train passes underneath the building shakes - all the way to the top floor. In recent history - the tunnel has collapsed due to work happening above it. At no point has this been flagged in the application or risk assed.

I strongly object to the the proposed application and I.d be very grateful if the above would be taken into consideration during your decision making.

Yours,
Iain Syme

