17 Rudall Crescent

London NW3 1RR

25th August 2015

For the attention of James Clark

Development Control & Planning Dept.

London Borough of Camden

Town Hall Argyle Street

London WC1H 8ND

Dear Mr Clark

**Planning App 2015/4151/P – 13 Rudall Crescent, NW3 1RR**

I am writing to make comments on the above application, and to provide a possible objection to several aspects of the application. As mentioned to you some time ago the plans submitted are incomplete and lack important details. Most significantly there is no proposed side elevation drawing showing the proposed widened doorway onto the first floor roof terrace. Nor is there any information about the height and design of the proposed glazed screening around the first floor roof terrace which should have been shown on a side and a front elevation drawing –neither of which have yet been provided. The plan for the first floor is also incorrectly labelled as being a ground floor plan, and none of the interior rooms are labelled.

We have complained to you that that only the two immediately adjoining neighbours (13A and 11) were initially consulted whereas there are a number of properties in Old Brewery Mews which back onto the site and are extremely close to the rear of Penn House. Furthermore numbers 15 and 17 Rudall Crescent are very close by and overlook - and are overlooked by - the first floor terrace, second floor window and proposed first floor enlarged doorway at the side of Penn House. Penn House also overlooks Penn Studio which is a Grade II Listed Building – another important fact omitted from the planning application. Indeed Penn Studio is within the curtiledge of Penn House and the two properties share a front entrance. You said that all these additional properties have now been advised about the application but we at No 17 have not received any such official notification.

In the absence of the additional information required of the architect by you we must object to the lack of important detail. We object to the proposal to increase the size of the doorway at first floor level. This is entirely unnecessary and will remove the symmetry of the current door with the second floor window above. It will also increase overlooking to both numbers 15 and 17 Rudall Crescent, as well affect the privacy of No 13 since the windows of both numbers 15 and 17 look directly onto the first floor roof terrace. Any new glazed screening cannot prevent this unless it is unacceptably high. The proposed new glazed screening will also be very visible from the Rudall Crescent streetscape in this Conservation Area. Therefore it is doubly important that drawings and measurements are provided which show exactly what is proposed for the side and the front elevations.

Therefore in the absence of vital information we must sadly object to these aspects of the proposal.

Yours faithfully

David and Jenny Stevens