

Our Ref: IL/12.316/JN

28 May 2013

Jenna Litherland
Senior Planning Officer - West Team
Camden Council
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

Dear Jenna

Application No. 2013/1924/P – 187-199 West End Lane – Design Amendments

We write further to your e-mail of 13 May 2013 and our subsequent telephone conversations and have pleasure in enclosing the following revised drawings, which we hope will now satisfy the Authority's concerns:

PL01 – Block A Plans (Rev A)
PL02 – Block B Plans (Rev A)
PL03 – Block C Plans (Rev A)
PL04 – Block D Plans (Rev A)
PL05 – Block E Plans (Rev A)

PL10 – Block A Elevations (Rev A)
PL11 – Block B Elevations (Rev A)
PL12 – Block C Elevations (Rev A)
PL13 – Block D Elevations (Rev A)
PL14 – Block E Elevations (Rev A)

In relation to the detailed queries set out within your e-mail of 13 May 2013, we felt that for ease of reference it would be helpful to include the wording of your e-mail and respond to each point in turn. Our comments are therefore included in *italics* below.

I have received comment from Kevin Fisher in relation to the amended design and can now advise you as follows:

The statement in support of the Section 73 Application states that the proposed design affects Buildings A, B, C, D and E. It is noted that block F is not referred to in the D&A however you have provided drawings showing the amendments to Building F.

Blocks F and G do not form part of this Section 73 Application. If any drawings relating to blocks F and G have been forwarded to you in error please disregard and remove these from the drawings package. The drawings enclosed with this letter represent the full extent of the changes we seek approval for within the scope of this application.

The D&A states that the changes represent refinements to the architecture. No breakdown of the proposed changes has been provided.

Your detailed response (e-mail dated 13th May 2013) to the originally submitted amended elevations outlines the proposed changes and we are, as will be seen below, responding to each of these.

Carrwood Court
Carrwood Road
Sheepbridge
Chesterfield
S41 9QB

t: 01246 260 261
e: email@wcec.co.uk
www.wcec.co.uk

Partners:

James Kemp
Ashley Turner
Alex Wall
Danny Slater

Consultant:

Tim Cocker

Senior Associates:

Richard Hague
Dave Savage
Simon Whittam

Associates:

Jason Ainsworth
David Billington
Warren Brown
Andrew Dabbs
Mike Dackiewicz
Jon Godwin
Chris Hand
Darren Jolley
Mark Kraut
Simon Newton
David Skelton
Stephen Spedding

RIBA 

Chartered Practice



Office also in:

London
Livingston

Additional information

In order to assess the application I need to see the amended floor plans for the buildings which reflect the amended window positions. Can you also please confirm whether there would be any change in floor areas? I cannot make a full assessment on the proposal without this information.

The enclosed drawing pack now includes floor plans as amended to reflect the revised fenestration and including revised floor areas. As discussed previously the residential floor plates have been subject to:

- *Layout design development*
- *Construction rationale and tolerances*

Design

Having carefully considered the proposals it is considered that the proposed changes result in a loss of detail and reduction in the architectural character of the proposed buildings.

The South elevations show a thicker vertical (white) banding on blocks A, B, C, D and E. This thicker proportion is considered to lack the finesse of the original proportion.

This has been noted and we have reverted back to the original proportions as demonstrated on the revised elevations.

No jointing is shown, which on the original proposal provides a further degree of refinement to this detail.

This has been noted and we have reverted back to the original jointing as demonstrated on the revised elevations.

The width of the banding on Block E is wider than the other blocks resulting in a lack of consistency and coherence. This banding is placed on the left hand side of the window rather than the right, breaking the unified patterning formed by blocks A, B, C and D.

This has been noted and we have reverted back to the original 'formulae' as demonstrated on the revised elevations.

Block F has no vertical banding on the southern elevation with a consequent lack of visual interest and coherence with blocks A, B, C and D.

As mentioned earlier please disregard any previous reference to Block F. The enclosed drawings represent the amendments we are applying for.

The loss of vertical banding on the eastern elevation of Block A results in the loss of visual relief and contrast on this important elevation facing the square and reduces the consistency and coherence of the role of this architectural motif throughout the development.

This has been noted and we have reverted back to the original vertical banding as demonstrated on the revised elevations.

Similarly the loss of vertical banding on the remaining eastern elevations reduce the coherence of this motif as an expression of the stylistic components of the mansion block.

This has been noted and we have reverted back to the original vertical banding as demonstrated on the revised elevations.

The balconies on the central bank of windows on the eastern elevation of Block C have been omitted. This adds to the lack of visual interest and relief created by removing the vertical banding details.

This has been noted and we have reverted back to the original position of balconies on the eastern elevation of Block C as demonstrated on the revised elevations.

Whilst the northern elevations of each of the blocks have always been given a simpler treatment they are still considered to be important elevations which will be visible from the public realm. The proposed removal of the banding details results in the loss of any visual interest to these facades and also a loss of coherence with the language of the other facades.

This has been noted and we have reverted back to the original vertical banding to the northern elevations as demonstrated on the revised elevations.

The proposals remove the balcony frames from the "contemporary" elevations of the buildings south and west) whilst retaining the balcony frames on the "contextual" elevations of the buildings. This is considered to be problematic in that this element provides particular coherence to the concept of the two expressions, contextual and contemporary being unified and locked together as a single piece.

This has been noted and we have reverted back to the original proposition of balcony frames as demonstrated on the revised elevations.

At various meetings comments have been made of changing the originally proposed re constituted stone to a white brick. No details have been provided in this submission. This is considered to result in a move away from the original intention to work within the stylistic language of the mansion blocks characteristic of the area which are predominantly characterised by red brick and stone. The jointing of the stone indicated by the original drawings also provides a degree of visual interest to the detailing.

Your comments are clear and are noted, however details of materials do not form part of this Section 73 application. We propose to deal with materials through the discharge of conditions 14 and 15 as attached to the existing planning permission.

Block E indicates that an additional storey has been added. No explanation has been given for this.

This is not the case although we appreciate that you may have arrived at this conclusion based on the perspective drawings where the façade treatment of light material (details of which to be confirmed under the terms of conditions 14 and 15) has been extended down by 1 level. As you can now see with the amended block E elevations no extra storey exists.

No details of any changes being made to Block G have been provided therefore I assume that the details of this block will remain the same.

You are correct that there are no changes proposed to Block G.

Our Ref: IL/12.316/JN
3 June 2013

The original approval was granted on the basis that the proposed buildings were considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the area. It is considered that many of the proposed changes result in a reduction in the visual interest and architectural character of the proposed buildings and as such would fail to provide a positive contribution to the area originally conceived.

As you can appreciate from our responses above and the drawings enclosed we have accepted your position on this and reverted the elevations in the areas you have highlighted back towards the original approval.

Given the concerns raised above it is likely that the application will be refused. It may be more appropriate to withdraw the current application and re-submit following some pre-application advice.

As discussed, we have amended the application proposals in line with your concerns and as agreed, on this basis you are happy for the application to continue to be determined.

Kevin and I would be happy to meet with you to discuss any amendments to the scheme.
Regards, Jenna

We are more than happy to meet as you have suggested but hope that this may not be necessary given your detailed guidance and our response to your concerns outlined above and in the amended drawings enclosed.

Yours sincerely



I Lowson
WCEC Architects
ian.lowson@wcec.co.uk

Enc