

Dear Fergus,

Mr. Mert Alas (owner of 73 Parliament Hill, Flat 1), Mr. Toby Salmon (owner of 73 Parliament Hill, Flat 2), Mag. Dorothea Mezler-Andelberg and Prof. Colin Fournier (co-owners of 73 Parliament Hill, Flat 3) and myself (owner of 73 Parliament Hill, Flat 4), have had a discussion regarding the proposed development at 75 Parliament Hill.

We would jointly like to comment as follows:

1. From what can be seen on the submitted plans, the proposed project would entirely change the visual character of the roof to the rear elevation of the building. The state of the roof is presently still fairly close to its original period state as the existing roof terrace is located only on the very top of the roof. This would be entirely destroyed by the proposed project. In fact, the roof on the third floor would be completely eliminated at the rear elevation. Therefore, the proposal must clearly be rejected in a conservation area.

2. Historically, there were no roof terraces or structural changes on the roofs in the area at all. In order to preserve the period character of the conservation area, the dimension and location of roof terraces, and any further alterations to an existing roof, ought to be limited to what presently exists already. Any plans for further roof terraces in the area, enlargements of existing roof terraces or structural alterations of an existing roof must be rejected on the grounds of preserving the period character of the conservation area.

3. The proposed, new location of the roof terrace is likely going to affect privacy of the neighbours.

4. The schematic drawings are incorrect and vague. For example, the drawing of 73 Parliament Hill, in particular its third and fourth floor, is simply incorrect. This could be misleading as one may come to the conclusion that the proposed project is similar to the top floor of 73 Parliament Hill. This is most certainly not the case, at least when judging based on the plans submitted for 75 Parliament Hill. In any case, in order to be able to judge the impact of the project, more accurate drawings will need to be submitted and looked at.

5. The building is located in a conservation area of historic heritage value. Any building project in the area ought to be subject to diligent scrutiny in order to preserve the valued period character of the area. This can only be achieved by requiring to submit and subsequently examining detailed plans and drawings of the final state of a proposed project. Drawings must be provided in colour. Details of proposed materials and colours will need to be submitted. For example, it does make a huge difference whether the colors of the window frames on the roof terrace will harmoniously blend into the roof and brickwork or whether those colours stand out unsightly.

6. The previous point 5 is only highlighted by a recent project in the immediate neighborhood, where a steel and glass structure at the rear extension of a South Hill Park building has been implemented. This structure is clearly visible from our building (73 Parliament Hill). One of the building's flat owners has called it a 'fish tank'. It certainly does not preserve the period character of the building. Special care must be taken not to repeat such mistakes.

Kind regards
Guido Hagemann