

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2420/P	Mark Nash	flat D Guilford Court 51 Guilford Street London WC1N 1ES	13/05/2014 13:13:20	INT	<p>In 2009 LBCamden agreed a proposal to replace the existing sliding windows in Guilford Court with a mix of fixed units and hinged ventilation quarterlights (2009/5343/P). This permission was granted on the understanding that the building as a whole would adopt this approach. The leaseholder (Guilford Court Freehold) held extensive discussion with leaseholders and it was decided to adopt those plans for the building as a whole. Mr Margolis was party to these discussions and agreed with them. It has always been open to him to renovate his apartment windows according to the agreed plan as the majority of other leaseholders have done. There is in our view therefore no necessity for the planning application that has been submitted.</p> <p>It would be very unfortunate if this proposal were to be agreed by the council since it could open up the possibility of other leaseholders deciding to renovate their windows in a differing fashions. There would then be two (or more) differing approved ways of renovating the windows in existence and we could loose control of the exterior appearance of the block. We therefore argue that the proposal should be rejected because it represents a significant variation from the approved design.</p> <p>The ventilation issue that Mr Margolis refers to is better resolved by the hinged quarterlights in the existing approved plans since residents are more likely to leave these open than the sliding windows which have security issues. Condensation was a major issue in those flats which used the sliding window construction.</p> <p>In the course of preparing our application, extensive discussions and negotiations were conducted with Council officers and it was agreed that our proposal could include variations to the then building codes in force. There were several codes in the 2002 regulations which needed variation: the wooden frames would not be able to hold post 2002 code glazing, and not every room had a window through which one could easily make an exit. To enforce these would have necessitated the rebuilding of the whole block!;</p> <p>Our objections therefore are that the change would seriously affect the external appearance of the building, and that there are plans already approved by the council that Mr Margolis can use.</p>
2014/2420/P	Guilford Court Freehold Limited	C/- Defries and Associates Ltd 120 Brent Street London NW4 2DT	12/05/2014 10:18:32	COMMNT	<p>Dear Sirs the grounds for our objections are:</p> <p>In 2009 Flats D and F Guilford Court submitted planning application ref 2009/5343/P . Permission was granted at the end of the year, and the leaseholder (Guilford Court Freehold Limited and Guilford Cour Management Ltd) held extensive discussion with other leaseholders and it was decided to adopt those plans for the building as a whole. The proposed design by Mr Margolis represents a significant variation from the design which all the leaseholders at the time (including Mr Margolis) agreed to.</p>