

Gentet, Matthias

From: darian leader [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 November 2017 16:15
To: Planning
Subject: 2017/5938/P and 2017/5492/L

Dear Planning Officers,

I am emailing regarding the above applications as I have been unable to access the Comment section via your website. I was amazed to see that the application is essentially for a structure that you have recently removed under an enforcement order. I object to the application and would like to point out that the developer misinforms both the Council and residents.

He claims that the structure will serve its "originally intended purpose of storing terrace/garden furniture". This is utterly ridiculous, as the structure was put in place simply to divide the existing roof terrace into two roof terraces, one for his tenants at 40B Rosslyn Hill and one for his tenants at 3 Pilgrim's Lane. The developer is in the embarrassing situation that he advertised 3 Pilgrim's Lane via a local agent as having a roof terrace, when the property does not in fact have one. Hence he has divided the space using the structure. It has never served to store any furniture.

The Council had the structure removed previously as it was clearly not mobile, yet the application now claims it can "easily be relocated". This is also silly, as they are very large and heavy structures which, when removed, took a great deal of time to shift and are patently not relocatable with any ease. The developer also says the structures are a convenient way of avoiding having to install a shed, which is absurd given that we are talking about a roof terrace which has never had a shed and no local roof terraces to my knowledge have a shed.

I would object even more strongly to the division of the roof terrace to 40B into two terraces as the new roof terrace will increase noise and overlooking, as we have already experienced since the developers' tenants have held several parties already in this space, and use the fire escape adjoining this as a thoroughfare, when it is not intended for such use.

As the terrace will in fact serve 3 Pilgrim's Lane and not 40B Rosslyn Hill, shouldn't the developer make the application with reference to that property?

Kind regards
Dr D.H. Leader