

**Ground Floor Flat,
27 College Crescent,
London, NW3 5LH.**

Carlos Martin,
Planning Application Consultation,
London Borough of Camden,
Judd Street,
London, WC1H 8ND.

5th January, 2015

Dear Sir,

Re: PLANNING APPLICATION : REF: 2014/7680/P
GARDEN FLAT, 27 COLLEGE CRESCENT, LONDON, NW3 5LH

I am the owner and occupier of the raised ground floor flat which is situate immediately above the Garden Flat at 27 College Crescent (the planning applicant property).

I write further to your letter of 18th December 2014 in respect of the planning application and related consultation as per the extensive proposed works to the Garden Flat.

Prior to addressing particulars arising out of this application I would comment as follows:

At no point in any of the planning drawings or other paperwork submitted as per this application is there any information pertaining to the dimensions for the proposed rear extension which will run across the entire back of the building and then out to the rear over and above the existing footprint of the building. Specifically I therefore have no way of knowing how many meters the extension will extend beyond the existing building line.

It is noted that the present UPVC conservatory encompasses half the width of the rear of the garden floor. The proposed extension including its continuation out to the side would appear to give us a width which is circa three times greater than the current width of the UPVC conservatory which it replaces. It is not possible to be specific on this given the absence of any measurements whatsoever in this planning application. It would however appear that permission is sought for a rear extension which in terms of width will run circa three hundred percent (300%) greater than the width of the conservatory that it replaces and in depth (i.e., length) is unspecified.

Notwithstanding the vagueness of the plans it does also appear that the depth (length) of the proposed rear extension is also greater than that currently present as per the UPVC conservatory and again in approximation Camden is being asked to grant approval for a new structure which appears to be no less than four hundred per cent (400%) bigger than the current UPVC conservatory which it replaces.

Now turning to the particulars of my objection to this application, these comprise inter alia the following:

1. Bulk -- The proposed extension will add disproportionate bulk to 27 College Crescent and is not consistent with current rules pertaining to works within the Belsize Conservation Area. Again given the somewhat inexplicable absence of any indicative measurements it is challenging to comment further but looking at the plans it would appear reasonable to surmise that the proposed extension will add no less than one third to the existing internal floor area of the Garden Flat. This is both entirely disproportionate to the Garden Flat and to the configuration of the building as a whole.

2. Security – Both of the two bedrooms in my flat are at the back and as per these works it is now proposed that there will be extensive flat roofs situate immediately beneath and extending out from the bedrooms thereby giving direct and easy access to both bedrooms and the substantial windows which face out. These windows include the bay which for reasons unknown the applicant has noted will be retained notwithstanding of course that the bay is demised in my property and not that of the applicant. To be clear and in a Victorian building such as this, the windows (including the bay) are much larger than usually found in modern properties and a grown adult would have no problem whatsoever climbing through a window. Furthermore I always sleep with a window open for air flow and cannot comfortably sleep otherwise. If this rear extension and the extensive flat roof as proposed comes into existence I will therefore be faced with a choice of either continuing to sleep with the window open and so assume a material consistent security risk or be very uncomfortable in my own property with sleeping and potentially health implications ensuing.
3. Privacy – The ease of access which the proposed rear extension will provide to the bedrooms and first floor side extension (this being my kitchen) is in addition to security concern one pertaining to privacy.
4. Loss of outlook – The sheer size and bulk will not only seriously overwhelm the rear aspect of the building but will also destroy a currently tranquil and pleasing urban outlook from the two bedrooms into the rear garden. This is a pleasant view and largely contributes to a feeling of wellbeing and is an amenity of my flat.
5. Loss of light - Self evidently given that most of the proposed rear extension will be situate in an area which presently has no building and is of (undefined) bulk, there will be some loss of light. It is not possible to comment further on this as no measurements or estimate pertaining to light have been included by the applicant as per this planning application.
6. Effect on Conservation Area – The building is an attractive late Victorian build and consistent with a style which predominates within the Belsize Park Conservation area. The proposed rear extension would appear to fail completely to account for the nature of the building and related aesthetics. Whilst I am not across in detail planning applications within the Belsize Park Conservation Area, looking at the surrounding properties and recent works including by way of example the recent development by Galliard Homes – ‘The Belsize Park Collection’ (42-45 Belsize Park) it is noticeable that:
 - i) The building line of the garden level extends only so far as the existing bay on the raised ground floor and is constructed in materials and shape wholly consistent with the aesthetics and construct of the existing bay.
 - ii) There is no further extension of the building line across the remaining width of each property in this development other than to align with the existing bay. To be clear the garden level stays within the existing building lines of the raised ground floor.

Please see the further information and drawings on the Galliard Homes website:

<http://www.galliardhomes.com/The-Belsize-Park-Collection>

...../cont. over

Conclusion:

I feel strongly that this planning application should be rejected by Camden on multiple grounds. Said grounds include as per this letter, bulk, scale and appearance, effect on the conservation area, loss of privacy, loss of outlook, loss of light and from my perspective the greatest concern being a prejudicial impact on security and ease of access the rear extension would facilitate a trespasser to my property. Most worryingly this will include the time that I am asleep.

I request to be kept informed of this matter and the adjudication.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of Paul March.

Paul March.

Owner : Raised Ground Floor, 27 College Crescent London, NW3 5LH.