

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0769/P	Boylan	06/09/2024 17:18:02	COMMNT	<p>I object to this proposal on the grounds that a foldable system is highly likely to be left deployed.</p> <p>This is the worst of all worlds: an expensive complex system, requires maintenance, ugly, and will be visible from the road and from neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>Once more, I suggest the Applicant should employ the same unobtrusive wired man-safe system used on the flat roof of the neighbouring building Carlow House.</p>
2024/0769/P	L Chandler	06/09/2024 22:42:00	OBJ	<p>The objection I made for the previous non-folding application still stands as it will not be enforceable to require that the handrail is folded away each time it is used and the block doesn't have a concierge / caretaker on site to ensure that the guardrail is used correctly.</p> <p>This guardrail is completely unnecessary in contravention to the description. A fall arrest system could be installed instead, which would have no visual impact at all and would provide more secure fall protection for workers on the roof, enabling free access to the parapet in addition (unlike the proposed folding railings). The current railings are ugly and very prominent on the roof which detracts from the pleasing modern design of Metro House itself. The railings negatively impact the wider conservation area including in long views down both Mornington Street and Arlington Road. The guardrails also detract from the setting of the Listed houses immediately adjacent to Metro House (38 and 40).</p>
2024/0769/P	Jude Bickerton	06/09/2024 23:24:19	OBJ	<p>The proposed folding railings will most likely not be folded down as this is the kind of job that most contractors will forget or deem to be not worth their time. Further to this, contractors wishing to raise and lower the railing will need to be centrally tethered, on a travel restrictor, in order to do so, as they will need to be protected as they approach the parapet to carry out the operation. This renders the original free-standing, non-folding railings that were initially proposed, that were specifically selected to avoid "puncturing the roof surface or injuring the fabric of the building", now completely unnecessary, as the travel restrictor will have to be installed anyway.</p> <p>If the intention of the installation of the railings is indeed to abide by working at heights protection requirements for the odd contractor who is engaged to work on the roof, then the travel restrictor alone would be sufficient, and significantly less costly to install. If the intention, though obviously not revealed, is to enable residents access to the roof as a form of roof terrace, then they will wish to retain the railings (at greater cost) despite the need for secondary protection as outlined above.</p> <p>Either Metro House management has failed to pick up on the need for said secondary protection and has failed to account for it in their revised application, and upon realising will simply opt for that alone instead to save a great and unnecessary expense, or they intend to use the rooftop for unpermitted resident access.</p>