

Flat O College House

NW3 5ES

Ms Knights

I wish to submit an objection for App- 2024/3454/P 9-12 New College Parade Finchley Road London NW3 5EX, following the withdrawal of App-2022/5568/P.

A conveniently timed withdrawal which benefits the Council targets and the need for a submitted report. With the developer happily leaving behind past objections.

The previous application was withdrawn and submitted again because of:

Height:

As a result, the overall height of the building has been reduced by 800mm

Depth:

The rear elevation has been set back on all levels except for the new secondary core which is required under Building 8 Regulations.

The overall floor area has been reduced by 178 sqm.

However, his miniscule reduction in height will have little to no effect on the residence, privacy and light. Only a solid reduction of floor levels will.

The property's height must be restricted further.

The depth of the property is still far too deep. If current regulation does not permit it to be reduced, clearly this development does not fit the location. Stop developing a building in a space better suited for a modest scheme.

In addition, the floor space reduction is only the equivalent space of my flat doubled. But sees the hotel offering increased by 25% to 59 rooms and the residential proposal halved from 6 units to just 3.

Confirming this is a development for pure profit/investment and not a scheme to benefit the residence.

I too would like to comment that the window- W2/201 – in the daylight/sunlight report is not just a 'bedroom', but an office, which we use during the working week as we are self-employed-working from home.

It too is the main window for the room as W3/201 is already severely overlooked by College Crescent and with blinds.

If the development goes ahead with its current depth, it will see the whole room go into darkness, with a further concern when App-2022/3553/P is decided. A development which the current light report for App- 2024/3454/P does not even reference.

Our previous objections also highlighted the growth of a large, established tree.

But the new proposed action towards the tree is disappointing and must not be allowed to happen. A 'modest' scheme would see the tree left untouched.

To conclude, I object for the following:

- Height (loss of privacy)
- Depth (loss of daylight and sunlight)
- The limited residential offering (only 3 residential units)
- Destruction to habitat and tree.