**Flat 1,**
**26 College Crescent,**
**London, NW3 5LH.**

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

9th January, 2015

Dear Carlos.

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

I am the owner and occupier of the property immediately adjacent to the Garden Flat at 27 College Crescent (the planning applicant property). My home is on the garden level of 26 College Crescent.

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 so that I may inform you of my objections to this planning application.

I note that surprisingly there were no measurements on the plans which render providing accurate comments more difficult. It was therefore most helpful when we spoke this week and you provided to me proposed measurements for the requested works, notwithstanding that the applicant should surely have put this information in their submitted plans. Thank you nonetheless.

To summarise, my understanding is that the proposed extension will run across the entire current back of the Garden Flat and into open space where currently there is no part of the building which forms 27 College Crescent. It appears to run to virtually the (width) of the garden through to the boundary line with both my home at 26 College Crescent and the neighbouring property at 28 College Crescent. Furthermore in proposing a depth of 4.7 metres it extends comfortably beyond where the current conservatory finishes which is presently parallel to the finish line (depth) of my own conservatory.

By my estimation this extension will run for circa 13 metres across and in depth 4.7metres. On this basis it seems to me the proposed works will, if granted, not only build into area next to my home which currently not built upon, but in terms of bulk will mean that the Garden Flat is at least 40% and perhaps nearer to 50% bigger than it currently is. That is massive increase in bulk.

The proposed extension is in my opinion overwhelming and therefore too big to say nothing of dubious aesthetics. It makes no attempt by example to align with the Bay window above. The proposed lengthy flat roof is ugly and I think in terms of neighbouring aesthetics overpowering. I was amazed that the application did not provide even for a sloping roof.

Of course I have usual concerns about length of work, disruption, noise, building materials etc. To be candid, I do not make an issue of this because they are invariable results of works. Rather, it is the sheer bulk of the construction, its length and depth, the perfunctory nature of the proposed build and related overwhelming aesthetics which I object to. I would expect a valid scheme to be of significantly more modest size and further away from the building line with my home. Frankly I would also hope to see something of greater architectural merit and so blending in with the existing building and its adjoining neighbour.

I appreciate your time on the phone and you taking due account of my comments here.

Best wishes

Leonor Troni