

Dear Sirs

Re Planning App: 2013/5581/P Garage site to rear of 15 Elsworth Terrace

I am writing to oppose this application for amendment to condition 9 for 2 rooflights, which may seem like minor amendments but have serious consequences for the public, the neighbourhood and specifically for neighbouring properties.

The originally approved consent looked at the key issues of height, sustainability, visual appearance and impact on neighbours which we believe would be abused by this addition, specifically:

Visual Appearance

The additional height and uneven appearance and materials would have a negative effect on views of this building which was specifically consented to have a low AND unobtrusive view behind the wall/gates from the street. If additional height were needed the applicants could have designed this into the scheme at the outset which would not have been granted and not try to spoil this view now. The view from my flat to this building is obtrusive and not in line with the original application.

The proposed trellis cover to only one of the rooflights is unbalanced and unworkable. To intend to cover this with ivy will quickly overgrow much of that part of the roof including the other plain rooflight, would certainly obstruct the sliding rooflight and would snag the opening sliding mechanism. Ivy is a fast growing menace in these kinds of situations and would not be welcome on a building of this type.

The plain form of the green roof (originally consented as it blended into the conservation area) would be disrupted by these mechanical items, as well as the ivy which would make it more unsightly when viewed from neighbouring properties.

Sustainability

I continue to be very concerned with the depth of this building and therefore important that water is soaked up through the green roof which should be maintained. There is the original obligation to sustainability for this building which should not be avoided now.

Neighbour Amenity

There would be 2 areas for concern:

Lightspill - this will occur from these rooflights and affect neighbouring properties as it will be an upward lighting from an otherwise darkened area which will be a greater contrast than a normal window.

Neighbours are happy with normal window lightspill and shouldn't need to install blinds to block this pollution out.

Noise - Whilst the mechanical operation should be unlikely to cause problems the concern will be the noise from people partying/celebrating inside. Noise will travel far louder across the neighbourhood from an open rooflight than it would from a simple window that wouldn't be opened to the same extent.

The festival of Succoth is actually 7 days, not 70 as stated by Boyer in their application letter. This rooflight does not create or complete the walled structure required as it should be a temporary structure and a simple sliding roof is far from religiously correct.

All the proposed additions are deleterious to the appearance of the house from the public and the neighbours' point of view. In particular adjoining properties will be further compromised by the light pollution / potential excess noise / unsightly views onto an unpleasant mix of mechanical items in place of a more attractive plain green roof which was originally approved for good reason that it would blend into the location.

This amendment does not enhance or preserve the conservation area.

I therefore urge officers to absolutely reject this application.

I look forward to hearing from you

Your sincerely

Joyce Green

Joyce Green

