

From: ALAN MASON

Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2024 12:13 PM

To: Planning

Subject: Fwd: 75 Greencroft Gardens 2024/1546/P

Dear Sirs

We note the revised scheme, reducing the number of rooflights on the front elevation from five to three. However, as noted below, there is no necessity for rooflights at the front of the building as there is a viable alternative with rear rooflights and skylights. This would accord with the Council's stated preference for avoiding front rooflights if there is an alternative.

CRASH maintains its objection, and urges the Council to refuse consent of the current scheme.

Yours faithfully

CRASH

----- Original Message -----

From: alan mason

To: planning

Sent: Thursday, July 4th 2024, 17:56

Subject: 75 Greencroft Gardens 2024/1546/P

For the attention of Planning Officer Ewan Campbell

Dear Sirs

This OBJECTION is submitted on behalf of CRASH (Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead).

A committee member has visited the subject site and finds it to be badly in need of good maintenance and housekeeping. CRASH agrees that upgrading of the current accommodation is necessary and welcomes the applicant's approach. However, it has one major objection. The drawings submitted with the application show the heightened loft space to be open-plan "amenity space". CRASH can see no reason why such an open space requires TEN windows. Five rooflights on the rear elevation and two skylights on the roof are more than adequate in terms of light and ventilation for a single open-plan room. There is no necessity to disfigure one of the few original roofscapes on Greencroft Gardens by the introduction of any - let alone five - modern Velux windows on the front elevation. Planning guidance indicates that rooflights should be at the rear, unless there is no alternative. At this property there is a viable alternative.

Camden is asked to reject the application as currently submitted.

Yours faithfully

CRASH

Combined Residents' Assoc of South Hampstead