

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1581/L	Patrick	Flat 9 Skipwith Buildings Bourne Estate Portpool Lane London	25/05/2025 23:58:10	OBJ	<p>Comments on planning application 2025/1581/L about the door furniture and glazed panel proposed for the new front doors for Bourne Estate. This concerns the discharge of Conditions 4a and 4b of Listed Building Consent 2022/5600/L and the basis on which the design of the door was granted consent.</p> <p>Please refer to my comments submitted on 23rd February and 17th March in response to the previous application for discharge of these Conditions. (This was Planning Application 2025/0261/L, which was withdrawn by the applicant following objections made by residents to the wholly inappropriate proposals).</p> <p>It is good to see that real textured reeded glass is now being proposed and not the poorly adhered film with an image of reeded glass that was included in the previous application for discharge of Conditions.</p> <p>The proposals for the door furniture are unchanged from the previous application for discharge of Conditions. This is disappointing. As set out in my comments on 23rd February about the previous application, these are not suitable:</p> <p>“The samples of door handle, knocker, letter box and door numbers are also not suitable. The Design and Access Statement that is included in the application 2022/5600/L, for which conditional Listed Building Consent was granted states: "The intention of the works is to retain original features or, if this is not possible, to use materials which closely resemble the appearance and design of the original. The new doors will match the originals installed at the point when the building was constructed as closely as possible." The samples look nothing like those found on the original doors that remain on the estate. This can be seen in the Appendix A - Photographic Schedule that is also one of the documents that forms part of application 2022/5600/L, for which conditional Listed Building Consent was granted. The design of the samples would be more appropriate for a new building. As can be seen on the doors identified as original in the photographic schedule, all of them have brass door furniture. The new door handle, knocker, letter box and door numbers should be solid brass and not have a black finish.</p> <p>It is not made clear which of the two very different styles of numeral is being proposed. Clearly, the back of the letterbox should match the front and the rest of the door furniture.</p> <p>There has been no consultation about these samples with residents. We have not been notified that these samples have been submitted for the discharge of the Conditions of the Listed Building Consent. The period allowed for comment is almost over. Because Camden have not made residents aware that this application for the approval of Conditions has been made, there will, of course, be few comments. Few people are likely to stumble across this application. The absence of comments should in no way be taken as implying support for the proposed samples.”</p> <p>In the “Bourne Estate Design and Access Statement including Heritage Statement” that is included in the application for discharge of Conditions, there are photographs of front doors from 1909 on page 18 and 19. The enlarged pictures of front doors in Figure 3 and Figure 4 clearly show the door furniture reflecting the sunlight. This can also be seen on the other doors in the</p>

Application N Consultees Name Recipient Address Received

Comment Response

main image in Figure 4. The door furniture is clearly brass and did not have a black finish.

The comments made in my email sent to Nick Baxter, Senior Conservation Officer, on 17th March have not been acted upon and so all still apply. These are:

I previously sent comments about the samples of front door furniture and the sample of flat glazing with an image of reeded glass stuck on the surface, which have been submitted for discharge of Conditions 4a and 4b of 2022/5600/L. The residents of Bourne Estate were not notified that these samples had been submitted and that there was a limited period during which comments could be made online. (Nor were we notified when application 2022/5600/L itself was submitted). I came across the application just before the end of this comment period. No opportunity was given to view a sample of the proposed door before the end of the online comment period.

I have now been able to view a sample of the door and it is clear that the size of the glazed opening is too small.

The "Design and Access Statement - Incorporating Heritage Statement", which is one of the documents included in the application for Listed Building Consent (application no. 2022/5600/L), states that: "The intention of the works is to retain original features or, if this is not possible, to use materials which closely resemble the appearance and design of the original. The new doors will match the originals installed at the point when the building was constructed as closely as possible. "

The decision notice (dated 22/02/2023) granting Listed Building Consent subject to conditions for the front doors states: "The applicant has produced an approximate replica of this door. A more faithful reproduction was sought, but could not be achieved owing to constraints imposed by performance requirements, especially regarding glazing sizes and locking. Unfortunately, the historic six-pane arrangement could not be successfully incorporated in the mean apertures imposed by the width of the stiles."

The "stiles" on the proposed doors are far too wide adjacent to the glazed opening. The stiles on the original doors all run the full height of the doors and the width of them does not change. That is, the width of the stile adjacent to the vertical boarding below the lock rail is the same as the width of the stile adjacent to the glazed opening. Think about how the doors were constructed: the stile is a continuous board. This is shown clearly in the images below of two doors that are identified as being original in the document "Appendix A – Photographic Schedule", which is one of the documents included in application 2022/5600/L.

[I will send these comments as an email, as it is not possible to include photos using your online system].

The proposed door looks very inauthentic because the "stiles" are too wide adjacent to the glazing, making the glazing too small.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>Such wide stiles are not necessary. They are not needed for the three-point locking hardware. The glazed opening can be larger and satisfy the fire safety requirements. The reason for the size of the glazed panel is that the manufacturer happens to already have had a door with a glazed panel of this size tested and that it has been certified to meet the fire safety requirements. This is a large contract for approximately 500 doors and it is completely reasonable to expect the contractor to have a new test carried out for a door with a glazed opening of the appropriate size. It seems that you have been mislead about the constraints.</p> <p>The proposed reduction in the size of the glazed opening in the front doors would also have a significant impact on the amount of light entering the flats. This would be unreasonable.</p> <p>Please require that the size of the glazed opening matches that of one of the original door types, in order to avoid the inauthentic and crude wide “stiles” seen on the sample door and so as not to reduce the amount of daylight entering the flats. Please get in touch with me to discuss this.”</p>
