

Tel.: 020 8348 0874

E-mail: [REDACTED]

24th April 2013

**Angela Ryan**

Planning and Development Management

London Borough of Camden

Town Hall

Judd Street

WC1H 8ND

**Subject:** Planning Application 2013/1550/P

Dear Angela Ryan,

I live in and hold the Leasehold for the 1st Floor flat at 2 Millfield Lane, next door to 1 Millfield Place, London N6. Please consider this letter as my comments to the above listed application.

I am glad that the current application for the redevelopment of the house at 1 Millfield Place which is to be retained and partially extended, is for a more modest development than the previous application 2010/2046/P which was subsequently withdrawn. The current application is, in my opinion, far more in keeping with the architectural character and inherent qualities of the existing house. In general, I understand the reasons why the new owners want to extend the house, and have sympathy for their needs. However, there are a few critical comments that I would like to express:

1. Western extension. The house is <sup>to be</sup> extended by 3 m to the west and will therefore be bulkier but not to the extent that I would consider ultimately unacceptable. It is nice to see that the 1st floor west facing windows are to be reinstated in the new, extended position. Less convincing however, in my opinion, is the use of larger glazing units on the ground floor, which introduce a whole different vocabulary. It would be preferable to refer to the original existing finer articulation of the existing ground floor glazing, as used in the rest of the house.
2. Added southern conservatory. The 2m wide conservatory is another substantial addition which changes the volume of the house. Even though I can accept that, similarly as with the proposed ground floor glazing facing the garden on the west, the introduction of the larger glazing elements goes against the spirit

unit  
of the house. Furthermore, the planning permit application if approved should specifically limit the depth of the conservatory to the proposed 2 m.

3. Widening the north extension of the main volume on the first floor by over 1 metre results in the ridge line facing Millfield Place being raised by 70 cm. This is unfortunate as it results in an uncomfortable resolution where the ridge line running along Millfield Place meets the ~~the~~ south facing roof. In my opinion this change should not be realized and the north wing should remain at its current width. In the event that the roof line were to be raised there should be an assurance that this should not be by more than the proposed 70 cm.

I assume from the submitted documentation that the idea of excavating a basement under a part or even the full house has been entirely abandoned and an assurance by the planning authority to that effect should be included in the planning permission in the event that this application is approved.

Yours sincerely,

Jean Eisler

