

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7598/P	John Malet-Bates	Flat 6 4 Ferncroft Avenue NW3 7PH	16/02/2015 10:28:17	OBJ	Hampstead CAAC is likely to object to this application for which I will forward notes later today or tomorrow. It seems to be time to prevent further development of this rooftop area and to limit matters to technical essentials.
2014/7598/P	John Malet-Bates	Flat 6 4 Ferncroft Avenue NW3 7PH	17/02/2015 17:57:01	COMMNT	<p>We object to the proposal and ask to have the scheme revised at least. We understand the top balustraded terrace has consent – probably by &gt; 4 years ‘deemed consent’, otherwise we regret any consent to a terrace on top of these fine roofs. We also query the height of the “existing” ? balustrade which someone must surely one day decide has to be safety-raised.</p> <p>The most serious error appears to be in allowing (previous consent) a conservatory at this level, where the temptation must be for future extension as now proposed and general mucking-about as so often happens. The plan shows a limited area structure but the ‘volume sketches’ indicate a longer one which must be a temptation.</p> <p>A simple opening rooflight at the head of the spiral stair is all that is needed IF this terrace is to be allowed to continue in use. The lift shaft overrun should be queried as the D&amp;A statement appears to be in error in stating the occupant can not mount the spiral stair to the roof (sic). That has to be a requirement not for the lift to be allowed to rise further. If the shaft extension and overrun height as shown are required it should be as a simple and minimal all-but-invisible frameless glass structure. At least there should be submitted technical details of the lift shaft and essential overrun height.</p> <p>We are not convinced the structure as drawn cannot be seen from around and we should not be satisfied with the exclusive ‘street-view’ concentration of so much planning assessment.</p> <p>This kind of scheme presages accretions of similar across Hampstead and it adds light pollution to the local environment.</p> <p>We ask for redesign and resubmission to remove all but the most minimal trace of such structures at this level, and that only on condition that there is a consented roof terrace. This kind of development can not be regarded as 'high quality design' as part of Camden policy. David Sumray, Nancy Mayo, John Malet-Bates.</p>