

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5938/P	Mary Horlock	1 Pilgrim's Lane	18/11/2017 10:49:15	COMMEM AIL	<p>I am amazed to see that this application is essentially for the same unsightly and cumbersome structures that were removed under an enforcement order from the Council just some months ago. At the time, and seeing these structures in situ, the Council considered them to be inappropriate architecturally and visually detrimental. Nothing has changed. The applicant even proposes arranging them in the same sequence: a bizarre staggered arrangement so that they are even more arresting visually. The idea that they could blend in anywhere is ridiculous.</p> <p>I feel the applicant misinforms both the Council and residents.</p> <p>He claims that the structure will serve its "originally intended purpose of storing terrace/garden furniture". This is misleading, as the structures were always put in place 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. He advertised 3 Pilgrim"s Lane via a local agent as having a roof terrace, without consulting the Council or considering the implications for neighbours.</p> <p>the existing roof terrace was always for 40B Rosslyn Hill. The staircase that allows access to it from 3 Pilgrim"s Lane was always there as a fire exit only.</p> <p>The applicant has divided the space using these three large barriers, but it was not to store - and indeed the cabinets themselves could not house anything like a barbecue of deckchair, if that is what he is suggesting, because of the nature of their divisions.</p> <p>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 large and 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. But even then, a shed would be pushed to one side, into a corner, not reconfigured along the length a vast WALL!!</p> <p>I would object even more strongly to the division of the roof terrace to 40B into two terraces as we have now had to live with the increased noise and levels of overlooking. The divisions are unsatisfactory for the tenants and offer little privacy or quiet seclusion, because the patent fact remains that this is a SINGLE ROOF TERRACE and was never meant to be divided into two, and also divided in such a bizarre way, at a strange diagonal.</p> <p>i would also like to point out that 3 Pilgrim"s Lane has its own outside space. If the applicant is so determined to extend this space by colonising another area, surely the applications should be referencing both properties?</p> <p>All in all I am confused and perplexed by this repeated attempt at having these structures accepted as appropriate architecturally and conceptually within the given space.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5938/P	Mary Horlock	1 Pilgrim's Lane	18/11/2017 10:47:55	NOOBJE MAIL	<p>I am amazed to see that this application is essentially for the same unsightly and cumbersome structures that were removed under an enforcement order from the Council just some months ago. At the time, and seeing these structures in situ, the Council considered them to be inappropriate architecturally and visually detrimental. Nothing has changed. The applicant even proposes arranging them in the same sequence: a bizarre staggered arrangement so that they are even more arresting visually. The idea that they could blend in anywhere is ridiculous.</p> <p>I feel the applicant misinforms both the Council and residents.</p> <p>He claims that the structure will serve its "originally intended purpose of storing terrace/garden furniture". This is misleading, as the structures were always put in place 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. He advertised 3 Pilgrim"s Lane via a local agent as having a roof terrace, without consulting the Council or considering the implications for neighbours.</p> <p>the existing roof terrace was always for 40B Rosslyn Hill. The staircase that allows access to it from 3 Pilgrim"s Lane was always there as a fire exit only.</p> <p>The applicant has divided the space using these three large barriers, but it was not to store - and indeed the cabinets themselves could not house anything like a barbecue or deckchair, if that is what he is suggesting, because of the nature of their divisions.</p> <p>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 large and 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. But even then, a shed would be pushed to one side, into a corner, not reconfigured along the length a vast WALL!!</p> <p>I would object even more strongly to the division of the roof terrace to 40B into two terraces as we have now had to live with the increased noise and levels of overlooking. The divisions are unsatisfactory for the tenants and offer little privacy or quiet seclusion, because the patent fact remains that this is a SINGLE ROOF TERRACE and was never meant to be divided into two, and also divided in such a bizarre way, at a strange diagonal.</p> <p>i would also like to point out that 3 Pilgrim"s Lane has its own outside space. If the applicant is so determined to extend this space by colonising another area, surely the applications should be referencing both properties?</p> <p>All in all I am confused and perplexed by this repeated attempt at having these structures accepted as appropriate architecturally and conceptually within the given space.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5938/P	Mary Horlock	1 Pilgrim's Lane	18/11/2017 10:47:45	COMMNT	<p>I am amazed to see that this application is essentially for the same unsightly and cumbersome structures that were removed under an enforcement order from the Council just some months ago. At the time, and seeing these structures in situ, the Council considered them to be inappropriate architecturally and visually detrimental. Nothing has changed. The applicant even proposes arranging them in the same sequence: a bizarre staggered arrangement so that they are even more arresting visually. The idea that they could blend in anywhere is ridiculous.</p> <p>I feel the applicant misinforms both the Council and residents.</p> <p>He claims that the structure will serve its "originally intended purpose of storing terrace/garden furniture". This is misleading, as the structures were always put in place 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. He advertised 3 Pilgrim"s Lane via a local agent as having a roof terrace, without consulting the Council or considering the implications for neighbours.</p> <p>the existing roof terrace was always for 40B Rosslyn Hill. The staircase that allows access to it from 3 Pilgrim"s Lane was always there as a fire exit only.</p> <p>The applicant has divided the space using these three large barriers, but it was not to store - and indeed the cabinets themselves could not house anything like a barbecue of deckchair, if that is what he is suggesting, because of the nature of their divisions.</p> <p>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 large and 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. But even then, a shed would be pushed to one side, into a corner, not reconfigured along the length a vast WALL!!</p> <p>I would object even more strongly to the division of the roof terrace to 40B into two terraces as we have now had to live with the increased noise and levels of overlooking. The divisions are unsatisfactory for the tenants and offer little privacy or quiet seclusion, because the patent fact remains that this is a SINGLE ROOF TERRACE and was never meant to be divided into two, and also divided in such a bizarre way, at a strange diagonal.</p> <p>i would also like to point out that 3 Pilgrim"s Lane has its own outside space. If the applicant is so determined to extend this space by colonising another area, surely the applications should be referencing both properties?</p> <p>All in all I am confused and perplexed by this repeated attempt at having these structures accepted as appropriate architecturally and conceptually within the given space.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**
