



Dear Sirs, I refer to your **planning proposal/application 2020/1105/P**

This, marked 'Proposal', refers to an inter-war block of decent-sized family flats adjacent to Lloyds Bank, overlooking the side-street called Greenland. The plan is to destroy much of the existing internal layout, and infill a flat-roof space at 2nd and 3rd floor level, over-looking the side-street, with a new development. This would result in a loss of light and air to a narrow street and, more crucially, the loss of at least two and possibly three flats of family-sized accommodation in order to create seven far smaller units - one of which, 'Flat 01', would appear to be a squeezed-in, awkwardly constructed maisonette on two floors.

Significantly, the drawings available on line have no measurements stated, but, as anyone accustomed to looking at plans will realise, every unit appears to be of no-more-than-minimum-necessary size to fit in the appropriate furniture. None possesses a separate kitchen, there are merely kitchen-counters, or corners, in the only living-spaces, but there is much emphasis on en-suite bathrooms. None of the accommodation conforms to what, for decades, was regarded by local authorities as adequate permanent living space.

In other words, what is planned is not proper homes for families but just-about-sufficient evening accommodation for busy office workers - perhaps indeed as pieds-à-terre for well-to-do businessmen who spend their weekends in their country homes. Quite certainly, the prices/rents

of these proposed flatlets would be out of the financial reach of most long-term Camden residents.

Is this really the sort of exploitative development that Camden Council wishes to encourage?

I realise that these are difficult times for the Planning dept. but it does appear that, though the plans were registered on 23rd April, you have failed to notify the existing tenants in the building or to post a street notice on the matter - though I am told this has now been, very belatedly, remedied, on what is supposed to be the 'last day' for consultation. Please note that, in these unsatisfactory circumstances, the period for receiving comments should be extended.

Yours etc.

Gillian Tindall FRSL