
From: John [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 July 2018 22:16
To: Diver, John
Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: 2015/2170/P: Flat D, 20 East Heath Road.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Diver,

We have had to re-review this application as it is problematic in ways not previously realised.

The rooflights proposed in this application appear in some cases over-sized and in others of questionable need. We see the considerable difficulty in successfully locating the rooflights which may require some re-planning. Also we should be seeking definite conservation rooflights if any at all not just modern flush types.

1. That seemingly hard against the front elevation chimney stack is particularly clumsy and risking defective detailing as well as conflict with the known and seen character of the building. If it is for the loft store which can be artificially lit, it can be omitted. The lower floor plan has this rooflight for the bedroom; if so, its location should be changed as above and its size reduced. It must not be aligned in front of the proposed new front dormer.

2. The large rooflight over the stairhead is also undesirable and unnecessary as to its size and location adjacent to the proposed new pitched roof dormer. The stairhead would be adequately lit by the rear slope smaller rooflight shown.

3. The other twin rooflight to the rear bathroom must be narrower please – not needing to be as wide as shown.

4. The large rooflight to the rear bedroom should be narrower – experience shows a large rooflight is not needed as balancing light output with the room's window.

Clearly the expansion of the flat into the roof space must be most carefully managed as to new elements.

Best regards,

John Malct-Bates

For Hamstead CAAC

[REDACTED]