

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/3640/P	Andrew Chesher	207 Foundling Court Brunswick Centre London WC1N 1QG	22/09/2014 22:23:52	COMMNT	This application should be rejected. There are many food outlets already in the Brunswick Centre and no need for any more. The aim should be to diversify the businesses operating there. Architecturally the proposal is seriously lacking the style needed to sympathetically blend with the current beautiful construction. Like almost all residents of the Brunswick Centre I'm opposed to this development.
2014/3640/P	Mark Swenarton	8 Brookland Rise London NW11 6DL	28/08/2014 10:45:26	OBJLETTE R	<p>Planning application for The Brunswick/Renoir Cinema, planning application 2014/3640/P Comment by Professor Mark Swenarton</p> <p>As an historian of social housing, particularly that built by Camden in the 1960s and 1970s, and author of the most detailed historical study to date of the design and construction of the Brunswick*, I have looked with interest at the proposals for remodeling the Renoir cinema in the Brunswick and would make the following comment.</p> <p>As one would expect from the architectural practice that emerged from the original 1960s design team for the Brunswick led by Patrick Hodgkinson, the design is evidently the result of care and thought. Nonetheless, particularly on the side facing Brunswick Square, it does not succeed in resolving the problem of scale, real and apparent, that arises in relating a very small item (the new insertion) to the very large one (the 100 metre façade of the Brunswick) within which it sits.</p> <p>In the condition as existing, the problem is dealt with by treating the cinema as a sign, for which the cinema building provides largely invisible support. The eye is drawn to the letters of the sign, which are of a scale in keeping with the Brunswick façade.</p> <p>In the consented scheme designed by Patrick Hodgkinson, the problem was dealt with by making the new insertion big enough (while still keeping it very slender and light in its relationship to the ground plane) to be in keeping with the scale of the façade.</p> <p>In the proposal as now submitted the problem is not dealt with at all. The new insertion is presented as small box sticking out from a huge façade; as inappropriate and unwelcome, one might say, as a site hut on the front of a palace. The sense that expediency rather than architecture is the driving force is compounded by the lift crudely stuck on at the side.</p> <p>If implemented the scheme would impose severe architectural damage onto the Brunswick. Given this, my view is that the council has no alternative but to withhold consent.</p> <p>* Mark Swenarton, 'Politics, property and planning: building the Brunswick 1958-74', Town Planning Review 84 no 2 (March 2013) pp197-226.</p>
2014/3640/P	Mark Swenarton	8 Brookland Rise London NW11 6DL	28/08/2014 10:45:26	OBJLETTE R	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/3640/P	Mark Swenarton	8 Brookland Rise London NW11 6DL	28/08/2014 10:45:25	OBJLETTE R	<p>Planning application for The Brunswick/Renoir Cinema, planning application 2014/3640/P Comment by Professor Mark Swenarton</p> <p>As an historian of social housing, particularly that built by Camden in the 1960s and 1970s, and author of the most detailed historical study to date of the design and construction of the Brunswick*, I have looked with interest at the proposals for remodeling the Renoir cinema in the Brunswick and would make the following comment.</p> <p>As one would expect from the architectural practice that emerged from the original 1960s design team for the Brunswick led by Patrick Hodgkinson, the design is evidently the result of care and thought. Nonetheless, particularly on the side facing Brunswick Square, it does not succeed in resolving the problem of scale, real and apparent, that arises in relating a very small item (the new insertion) to the very large one (the 100 metre façade of the Brunswick) within which it sits.</p> <p>In the condition as existing, the problem is dealt with by treating the cinema as a sign, for which the cinema building provides largely invisible support. The eye is drawn to the letters of the sign, which are of a scale in keeping with the Brunswick façade.</p> <p>In the consented scheme designed by Patrick Hodgkinson, the problem was dealt with by making the new insertion big enough (while still keeping it very slender and light in its relationship to the ground plane) to be in keeping with the scale of the façade.</p> <p>In the proposal as now submitted the problem is not dealt with at all. The new insertion is presented as small box sticking out from a huge façade; as inappropriate and unwelcome, one might say, as a site hut on the front of a palace. The sense that expediency rather than architecture is the driving force is compounded by the lift crudely stuck on at the side.</p> <p>If implemented the scheme would impose severe architectural damage onto the Brunswick. Given this, my view is that the council has no alternative but to withhold consent.</p> <p>* Mark Swenarton, 'Politics, property and planning: building the Brunswick 1958-74', Town Planning Review 84 no 2 (March 2013) pp197-226.</p>
2014/3640/P	Mark Swenarton	8 Brookland Rise London NW11 6DL	28/08/2014 10:45:04	OBJLETTE R	