

**27 College Crescent,
London, NW3 5LH.**

Shane O'Donnell,
Planning Application Consultation,
London Borough of Camden,
Judd Street,
London, WC1H 8ND.

16th June 2015

Dear Mr O'Donnell,

Re: Planning Application: REF: 2015/2807/P
Garden Flat, 27 College Crescent, London NW3 5LH
Proposed Work: Erection of a single storey outbuilding ("the Outbuilding Application")

I am the owner and occupier of the raised ground floor flat at 27 College Crescent. My flat is across the entire raised ground floor of this building immediately above the applicant's property, their home being situate at the garden level of our shared building ("the Garden Flat").

The owners of the Garden Flat are currently undertaking extensive renovation, building and extension works to their property pursuant to their prior planning application (REF: 2014/7680/P) ("the Prior Application").

Whilst I have considered on its merit the Outbuilding Application and will proceed in this letter to comment and set out my objections to this, it is material to note as context the building works that are already taking place in respect of the Garden Flat as per the Prior Application and utilisation of prior green space in respect of the same.

As a result of the positive adjudication of the Prior Application by Carlos Martin of the Regeneration and Planning Development Management, we have been bequeathed an extension across the back of 27 College Crescent with corresponding loss of green space and amenity, coupled with a lack of aesthetics.

It is an extension of significant scale and bulk and without apparent precedence vis-à-vis similar properties in the vicinity of our building.

In terms of its depth and appropriation of rear garden space, the addition to our building extends approximately 5 metres out and cross the entire back of the building. It replaces a conservatory that previously extended approximately half the depth (circa 2.5metres) across one half the back of the building. In so doing it has thereby replaced one structure (the conservatory) with a structure approximately 400% larger in its area and enhanced bulk.

Apparently this addition to the building of the Garden Flat and consequent loss of green space from the rear garden is insufficient and hence this further Outbuilding Application for the erection of a single storey outbuilding ("the Outbuilding") and my letter in respect thereto.

Whilst I do not have exact measurements of the rear garden at 27 College Crescent - though the applicants will have this and I assume such information has been provided and/or is accessible to you, my understanding is that the garden (including for these purposes the area which has now been appropriated for new extension) runs to depth of approximately 14 metres and a width of 11 metres ("the Garden").

27 College Crescent is situate within the Belsize Park Conservation Area.

We already have an extension to our building that runs into the Garden over an area of circa 5 metres x 9 metres. It follows that the applicants have to date appropriated 45sqm of their approximate 155sqm rear garden for building – with consequent loss of valuable green space, outlook and related amenity for those of us who live above and look on.

Their proposed Outbuilding is another appropriation measuring 3 metres x 6 metres (18sqm). Taken in aggregate with the new extension (ignoring the 'in-fill on entrance to their apartment) and notwithstanding the widely acknowledged importance of preserving valuable green space within an inner London Borough

such as our own, Camden, the applicants therefore wish to build upon circa 63sqm of the rear garden - approximately 40% of their rear Garden. That is excessive.

Furthermore, the merit and equity of the Outbuilding Application should also be considered in respect of the property to which it relates. The Garden Flat (including extension) now measures no less than 170sqm and is already an average 75% larger than every other apartment within 27 College Crescent. To build further and take, in aggregate with the proposed Outbuilding, the garden apartment to circa 190sqm, as they have requested by the Outbuilding Application, is to then be wholly out of proportion to the demise for 27 College Crescent.

At 27 College Crescent we are fortunate to have a building where no floor is subdivided. There are 5 levels to the building, beginning with the applicants at the garden level and going to raise ground (me), 1st, 2nd and 3rd. My apartment is 97sqm and my neighbours on the 1st and 2nd floor 90sqm with the top floor flat circa 60 sqm.

In seeking a reasonable degree of preservation vis-à-vis the diminishing green space at the rear of 27 College Crescent, which is both conducive to the outlook and amenity of the other residents within the building and of at least equal importance, the wider environment, the applicants already enjoy a fantastic and substantial property. Is it really therefore necessary for us to lose more of an diminished green space, beyond that which is allowed as per permitted development rules, so that their property can then utilise, in lieu of such valued green space, a further 18sqm of garden?

Finally, if notwithstanding the foregoing, Camden is minded to permit an outbuilding of scope and scale which goes beyond that the applicants could otherwise have, as per permitted development rules and once more (in regards to outbuilding) has no ostensible precedence with our near neighbours, I would urge that the dimension, length, breadth and then height of the outbuilding be materially scaled down - again so as to preserve as far as possible, outlook, important green space, the wider environment in this Borough and proportionality to this building and those in its vicinity in our corner of the Belsize Conservation Area.

Thank you for considering this letter and the objections therein.

Yours sincerely,

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Paul March.

Paul March