

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5348/P	John Pennink	04/12/2019 11:32:34	OBJ	Dear Sir/Madam:

I live on Frognal and I walk past this site everyday. The proposed development does not seem to be in keeping with the rest of the street in either size or character.

I also worry about the disruption in terms of the number of trucks and lorries required to effect the rebuild over a long period and the lack of sufficient off street parking at 18A.

Than you for your consideration.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5348/P	Julia McNeal	08/12/2019 09:59:12	OBJ	<p>I am writing on behalf of myself and my sister, Cressida Wasserman (joint owners of 18 Frogna Gardens) to object to the design for the redevelopment of 18a Frogna Gardens as set out in the drawings posted on your website.</p> <p>We have several serious concerns relating to this planning application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Design issues/departure from covenants. The design for the new house, in terms of height, size and materials, is totally unsuitable for one half of a pair of semi-detached houses, without surrounding land. In this regard, I would draw the attention of the Council's Planning Committee to restrictions that were placed when the land was sold for the construction of 18a and 18b in 1965. The strict conditions imposed were documented in the Schedule of that year. (copy can be supplied) and relate to Covenants applying to the entire site that is now occupied by 18, 18a and 18b.</p> <p>The most relevant of the 1965 restrictions are as follows: There was to be a pair of semi-detached homes They were to be similar in architectural style, and faced with brick, preferably red brick, The maximum height was specified (48') The above conditions were specifically designed to ensure that the homes that were built matched each other and fitted into the character of the surrounding area.</p> <p>The additional height proposed would also practically mean loss of light and less privacy for neighbours.</p> <p>Boundary issues</p> <p>The drawings for the proposed new design suggest that the East wall of the new building - unlike the existing one - will be right on the boundary with the driveway of No.18.</p> <p>First, it is impossible to see how such a wall could be constructed and maintained, except by encroaching on the driveway of 18. Since 18a does not have a right to vehicle access, it is important to know what assumptions were made by the architects of 18a in terms of planning for the demolition and rebuild, as well as for ongoing maintenance of the East wall of the new house.</p> <p>Second, the towering 4-story wall with 'chimney' right up against the boundary on the East side of the proposed new dwelling would drastically change the layout and appearance of the current boundary which is a mixture of fencing, brick and plants.</p> <p>Health and Safety issues</p> <p>It is impossible to see how the proposed demolition and rebuild can be carried out without exposing residents of neighboring homes to hazardous dust, pollution and noise over a long period. Therefore, we are deeply concerned about health and safety issues that may arise as a result of the proposed demolition and reconstruction of 18a.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

2019/5348/P	Mikhal Taylor	05/12/2019 10:52:57	OBJ	This application is an overdevelopment of the site. The proposed construction appears very bulky and disproportionate to the size of the plot. The height and scale of the building appears unduly prominent and unsightly. The basement is taking the whole length of the house - a very unwelcome precedent.
-------------	---------------	---------------------	-----	--
