				Printed on: 12/01/2021 09:10:08
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	<b>Comment:</b>	Response:
2020/5230/P	Mr Reynolds	11/01/2021 15:07:39	OBJ	I live Just to the east of this block of flats and I am writing to object to this application for the use of the second floor roof as a terrace on the grounds of overlooking and especially of inappropriate scale and design for the area. This is a large three storey block of flats with terraces overlooking an area of small two storey houses. The developers (Mr and Mrs Hauser) have proposed this use on several occasions and it has always been rejected. The developers appear to use various techniques to manipulate the planning process in their favour. This application is typical - applying just before a holiday period when people are distracted. Others include submitting multiple applications then building parts of different approvals and building higher than the approvals then going to appeal when enforcement was threatened.  The Planning Inspectorate decision on that appeal dated 1 May 2020 granted the appeal with regard to the height infringement but very specifically added a condition that the second floor roof should never be used as a terrace.  This application asks that new drawings be substituted for the approved ones. All of the new drawings have the note ¿Amendment to cycle storage¿ but six of them also show changes to the second floor terrace without mentioning it. Simple error or deliberate attempt at confusion?  I have had problems with searches on the Camden website today when looking for the Inspectorate report. I got the message ¿500: Internal server error¿ several times before I eventually found it.