

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 November 2022 15:17  
**To:** Miriam Baptist  
**Subject:** 2022/3788/P - Flat A 95 Torriano Avenue Camden NW52RX - Lower Ground Floor Flat extension

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Miriam,



The key principles are - Home Improvements Camden Planning Guidance January 2021:

1) Home:

The existing floor plans that accompany the application are not correct. The existing floor plan (19393\_YPUK\_P003 - Existing plans and Elevations) shows a 2 bedroom basement property with no living area which is NOT correct. The property is in fact a one bedroom property with a living room. In effect this one bedroom property is to be turned into a 2 bedroom + 1 study (which is potentially a further bedroom) so therefore potentially a 3 bedroom property. With this addition 4 windows are lost and replaced with 1 patio door and one light shaft - creating a dark long tunnel which does not make for comfortable living due to lack of natural light and ventilation.

The proposed plan show potentially a 3 bedroom property with a very small living/kitchen/dining area. The open plan living/kitchen area in the proposed development has an area of 21.65 square meters - this is far too small for this size property! For an open plan living/kitchen/dining area to work it is often prescribed that a minimum of 35 square meters is required - the proposed development falls short by by an excess of 13 square meters.

It is noted that the proposed plan incorporates a courtyard which is to supply the property with light and ventilation - we assume. This small 1.625 meter x 0.925 meter shaft is to ventilalte and supply light to 2 rooms (1 bedroom + 1 study (potentially bedroom) and 1 bathroom. We would think this hardly sufficient.

It would appear that the aim of this proposed development is to create maximum bedrooms to increase rental income with no regard to living comfort.

2) Sustainability:

This has not been considered in this new project, for example a green roof could be installed to make the project more energy efficient, improve air quality and generally improve health and well being of the inhabitants and local community. Natural light will be minimal as the light shaft which supplies 2 rooms and 1 bathroom is very small. Thus the property will largely rely on artificial light.

3) Neighbours:

This extension exceeds the neighbouring property extension, 97 Torriano Avenue, by 1.5 meters, and by a substantial amount more in the case of the extension of 93 Torriano Avenue.

It should be considered if the extension causes light loss to 93 Torriano Avenue.

With regard 97 Torriano Avenue I would certainly notice a reduction of sunlight into my property as the proposed development is 1.5 longer than my already very long extension (which was build prior to me purchasing the flat) - and would overshadow my patio doors which are the main source of light into the rear part of my lower ground floor property. An equal or shorter length extension would eliminate the problem in my case.

4) Community:

The proposed plans show an extension of 5.612 meters. This is in addition to an already existing extension of 4.409 meters from the original footprint of the building. The extension would therefore dominate the building. I attach an aerial view of the existing building and extension.

Showing also the extension of basement property of 97 Torriano Avenue. The proposed extension is to exceed this by a further 1.5 meter.

The proposes additional extension is outlined in red. If this proposal is approved it will surely set a new precedent that others in the area might try and follow thus loosing valuable green space and habitat for wildlife. In addition it would appear that more than 50% of the existing rear garden will be lost.

One should also note that the garden of 95 is shorter by some meters than the garden of 97 Torriano Avenue and others going further up the street, as can be seen on the Site Location Plan 1393\_YPUK\_P001 attached to the application.

