

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0603/P	K. Ellis	22/03/2023 13:25:55	OBJ	<p>COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS ROOF TERRACE, FENCE ETC. 73 HAVERSTOCK HILL LONDON NW3 4SL No. 2023/0603/P</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. THE application applies for Full Planning Permission for a roof terrace that has already been built without Planning Permission. I wish to emphasise this fact. 2. I VIEW the Application as having too much emphasis on additions and accessories, instead of on the principle construction and the fence. 3. A significant omission from the text and plans is the neighbouring property Steele's Mews South. The Application it appears to me hardly includes Steele's Mews South in text and plans, even though the roof terrace already built without Planning Permission has a direct physical impact on a Steele's Mews South wall, on the other side of which begins a patio and garden of a Steele's Mews South property. The occupants of the roof terrace are able at their waist height to look over the wall into Steele's Mews South windows, patio and garden. A couple of workmen were witnessed on separate occasions standing on the Applicant's side at waste height and looking over the wall as they leaned and made phone calls. 4. THE roof terrace is built directly up against the Steele's Mews South property wall, which on the Mews side has little support, in appearance just a blank wall. 5. WHERE the Steele's Mews South / Applicant no. 73 wall ends on one side, going northwards, another Mews house, the immediate neighbour to the one previously referred to, seems to have the roof terrace against the house side, with an unidentified object or slab on top of the Steele's Mews South/ number 73 wall. 6. On the wall of the first-mentioned Steele's Mews South property, the one with the patio and garden, a metal post or such protrudes in sight above the wall. 7. I ask for independent confirmation that the roof terrace already built has access confined to the second floor, and the number of access flats. It appears more than one flat will have access to the roof terrace. Is there access from the restaurant? Are the second floor flats and / or other flats connected to the restaurant as staff accommodation or other connected use? 8. 'Boundary fence'. Applied for is a 600mm extension (nearly two feet higher). It seems an intrusion of the next door on Haverstock Hill to win an argument against a breach of privacy brought by the roof terrace now or as it is applied for retrospectively. 9. 'FLAT roof'. Not literally a flat roof because of the restaurant roof as part of it. 10. 'MINOR alterations'. The roof terrace already built without Planning Permission is not minor alterations. 11. WORKS figure £2 million seems to relate to the building as a whole, and not the cost of the roof terrace. 12. HAVERSTOCK Terrace'. Is this a new name? 13. 'ETCHED glass balustrades'. More descriptively screens. Able to be seen through the screens are the still shapes of the additions and accessories applied for, so I assume these and moving shapes would be a distraction to neighbours. 14. ZINC trough planting'. Insufficient precautions to shield and prevent breach of privacy. Possibility of plants in time being neglected and occupants of terrace standing on troughs to look over the balustrade screens at the windows and gardens of no. 71 building next door, as is already done looking over into Steele's Mews South. 15. 'FIRE suppression'. In my opinion, there is fire danger at the roof terrace lacking a safe exit. 16. 'EXISTING terrace'. 75 Haverstock Hill next door on the other side. To what extent is this a roof terrace comparable to the applicant's?. Besides, general rear in this area is overdeveloped. 'Existing terrace not always properly identified on plans, and is confused with the existing terrace that the Applicant has built without Planning Permission. 17. 'Eton Conservation Area'. The Application for the roof terrace already built at No. 73 without Planning

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Permission and changes are and would be a negative contribution to the area. Overdevelopment and loss of space. Originally the restaurant was a hairdresser's with an open courtyard at the rear. Flats above.
18. A resident of Steele's Mews South approached the Applicant but did not receive a response.
19. 'DWELLING house'. As a whole, a building of flats above with a restaurant beneath.
