



For the attention of: Rachel Miller  
Camden Planning Dept

5<sup>th</sup> November 2013

Dear Ms Miller,

**New Planning Application 21 – 23 Cressy Road**  
**Application reference 2013/6125/P**

I have viewed the above planning application and make the following observations:

1. The proposed addition of an extra storey on the building is unacceptable. This extension would raise the height of the building, taking it from a two to a three storey building. This would compromise the right to light for several neighbouring residents, both on Cressy Road as well as those on Constantine Rd, whose homes are at the rear of 21-23 Cressy Road.

The design of the triangle of homes, of which 21-23 Cressy Road is a part, has been carefully considered. The building sits on a small plot at the top of this triangle, with gardens at the rear. These gardens constitute an important green space benefiting all those whose homes share it.

**Crucially, in respect to this application**, the height of the existing roofline of 21-23 Cressy Rd allows essential light to enter this space. Raising the roofline would dramatically impact the light available to neighbouring properties. Some areas of the triangle would lose ALL access to direct sunlight, and all the homes in the triangle would suffer a loss of light. Indeed, this is the reason the building was built to two storeys; to maintain the right to light and pleasant living conditions for all in the triangle it was deemed essential the building be lower than those south of it. The height of this building is not, as the application implies, in any way anomalous or ill-fitting with the surrounding architecture. Therefore, building an additional floor would not, as the new owner states, bring the building into line with those around it, but would in fact compromise both the surrounding dwellings as well as flout the conservation order under which the building is protected.

2. I do not agree with the suggestion that these proposed works are necessary to "bring the building back into use". In points 5.12 and 5.13 of the application's supporting material, the owner suggests the building is "in an uninhabitable state of disrepair, incapable of accommodating any households" and that these works are therefore necessary and beneficial. This is not a true reflection of the state of the building, since the building was occupied full time until approximately a year prior to purchase.

Further, it is misleading to imply that these significantly altered plans are necessary to bring the building up to modern living standards. The internal layout, which was altered over time by the previous owner, could be quite easily returned to a more practical configuration, to make the building a nice place to live, without altering the fabric and structure of the building, as demonstrated by the first set of plans previously submitted.

4. On point 5.38 of the supplementary document the owner surmises that his plans will have a "beneficial impact on the living conditions of number 19". I live opposite number 19 and strongly disagree with this.. Apart from the compromise of their right to light and the other affected neighbours as already discussed, these works would be extremely disruptive for a prolonged period of time.

5 I would draw your attention to the fact that the building is under a conservation order and that, therefore, altering the building as significantly as he proposes is entirely unacceptable and would set a most unfortunate precedent for the street and the Mansfield Conservation Area as a whole.

I hope that you will take these points into consideration.

