

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Bond, Catherine  
**Sent:** 22 May 2015 21:21  
**To:** Curry, Rav  
**Subject:** FW: FAO Catherine Bond: OBJECTION Planning Applications - 2015/1826/L, 2015/1824/L, 2015/1822/L, 2015/1828/L, 2015/1825/L, 2015/1823/L, 2015/1821/L

Another objection to all 7 applications from Elena Besussi.

Thanks  
Catherine

Catherine Bond  
Principal Planner (Conservation and Heritage)

Telephone: 020 7974 2669

---

**From:** Besussi, Elena [\[mailto: \[REDACTED\]\]](#)  
**Sent:** 19 May 2015 09:29  
**To:** Bond, Catherine  
**Subject:** FAO Catherine Bond: OBJECTION Planning Applications - 2015/1826/L, 2015/1824/L, 2015/1822/L, 2015/1828/L, 2015/1825/L, 2015/1823/L, 2015/1821/L

Planning Applications - 2015/1826/L, 2015/1824/L, 2015/1822/L, 2015/1828/L, 2015/1825/L, 2015/1823/L, 2015/1821/L

Applications for Listed Building Consent to renovate and restore the interiors of the dwellings at 89E, 66A, 65A, 33E, 79C, 65C, 51G to their original II\* listed condition including the removal of alterations and additions, renovation of existing listed features and restoration of missing listed features

Dear Catherine,  
please find below my response to the above applications.

### **Objection**

I am commenting on these applications as a resident and leaseholder at 82K Rowley Way, NW8 0SL.

**I am responding to these applications in a single response because they all provide similar information and are all connected in their intention to establish future guidelines for the reinstatement of void properties and for internal alterations to flats in the Alexandra and Ainsworth Estate**

I think it is laudable that Camden is considering to develop standards of quality for the internal works to the flats of the Alexandra and Ainsworth Estate and to complete the Management Guidelines. However, after having read the Design and Access Statements submitted in support of these applications, I am concerned at the information and process used to reach a decision about these standards.

I am objecting to these applications on the grounds of **insufficient consultation**. Camden's Statement of Community Involvement states that the council will advertise applications for internal alterations of a Grade II\* listed building by site notice, letters to occupiers and press notice. However, I have not received a letter and I am aware that no site notices were posted in Ainsworth Way. This lack of appropriate consultation is of exceptional concern because of the significance of these proposals which once agreed "should both

update the existing Management Guidelines and should also address the Decent Homes works, setting a standard to be followed in similar properties" (Design and Access Statements, page 5).

Additionally, the consequences of these proposals and their relevance for the future of the Estate and the Decent Home works have not been made sufficiently clear in the notices posted in Rowley Way.

More simply, I don't think I have been given sufficient information and sufficient time to consider these applications and to submit an appropriate response.

In addition to this objection I am also asking the Council to

- extend the consultation deadline for all the above applications
- to consult the residents and the TRA of the A&A proactively
- if not already agreed, to allow for decisions on these applications to be made by Development Management Committee as a single issue, not seven or more separate issues.

I look forward to hearing from you on my comments.

I would be grateful if you could notify me of the receipt of my comments and of any decisions made on these application.

Kind regards,

Elena Besussi

82K Rowley Way  
NW8 0SL

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Bond, Catherine  
**Sent:** 22 May 2015 21:25  
**To:** Curry, Rav  
**Subject:** FW: FAO Catherine Bond: OBJECTION Planning Application - 2015/1828/L

This objection specifically mentions no 89E, but also refers to all the other current applications.

Thanks  
Catherine

Catherine Bond  
Principal Planner (Conservation and Heritage)

Telephone: 020 7974 2669

---

**From:** Thomas Muirhead [\[mailto:\[REDACTED\]\]](#)  
**Sent:** 18 May 2015 21:47  
**To:** Bond, Catherine  
**Subject:** FAO Catherine Bond: OBJECTION Planning Application - 2015/1828/L

## **OBJECTION**

### **Planning Application - 2015/1828/L**

#### **Re: Listed Building Consent for Residential Minor Alterations to 89E Rowley Way London NW8 0SN**

I live at 4E Rowley Way in a one-bedroom flat identical to 89E Rowley Way. I am therefore familiar with the internal planning, fixtures, fittings, and finishes described in the application.

I am an architect. I have a particular interest in the conservation of 20th century architecture. Until recently I was a member of the Cases Committee of the Twentieth Century Society.

The Grade II\* listed status of the flat implies that the alterations as proposed in the application should return the interiors, including all details, as closely as possible to the original design, whilst taking appropriate account of the changed expectations of domestic life in the 21st century.

Any listed features that have been lost should be reinstated and should accurately conform to the originals. This should include all materials, finishes, details, etc.

Whilst it is admirable that LB Camden intends to carry out these reinstatement works I have a number of concerns about the application.

Rather than itemise my concerns one by one, I would summarise them by saying that they all result from the lack of detailed drawings in the application drawings, and the absence of a comprehensive specification.

I note that this application is the precursor to a number of other similar forthcoming applications to similarly reinstate a significant number of the other dwellings on the Estate.

I would therefore urge the Council to postpone consideration of this particular application and instead, bring together all of the reinstatements as a single application, with the works to be carried out as a single package by a single skilled contractor. The economies of scale that would thereby become possible, and the quality and consistency of the work, hardly need mentioning.

From private conversations I know that many residents of the Alexandra and Ainsworth Estate, some of whom are conservation experts in their own right, welcome this initiative by LB Camden and wish to help to ensure that everything possible is done to ensure that it is successful. We stand ready to assist the Council in this matter.

May I therefore respectfully request that this application be set aside and that instead, all of the proposed works to all the affected dwellings be configured as a single application and a single package of works, to be taken forward in close cooperation with the residents of the Estate.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Muirhead, Monday, 18 May 2015

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Bond, Catherine  
**Sent:** 22 May 2015 21:28  
**To:** Curry, Rav  
**Subject:** FW: planning applications for void flats - 89e etc

Hi Rav

This consultation response from Elizabeth Knowles is not so strongly worded as the others - so would you agree that is a comment rather than an objection? It also refers specifically to no 89E, but mentions all the other applications.

Thanks  
Catherine

Catherine Bond  
Principal Planner (Conservation and Heritage)

Telephone: 020 7974 2669

-----Original Message-----

From: Elizabeth Knowles [\[mailto:\[REDACTED\]\]](mailto:[REDACTED])  
Sent: 18 May 2015 23:57  
To: Bond, Catherine  
Subject: planning applications for void flats - 89e etc

Dear Catherine

I have now had time to get the design and access statement for 89e printed out and looked at.

Please can you withhold your decision until we have improved information from Levitt Bernstein about these proposals?

Firstly can I point out that there are a no of inaccuracies in the statement starting with the fact that the Alexandra Road Estate is not in NW9 but in NW8 ( section 02) such inaccuracies do not fill you with confidence.

Secondly I wonder why there is what seems to be an entirely fictional drawing marked " Original kitchen design"(01 section 2)?

It seems to me that this document has been produced with the belief that no one is actually going to look at it or read it which is not the case.

I request therefore that all the applications are withheld until accurate working drawings and text can be examined properly.

I do believe that this will be of advantage to Camden and yourselves in the long run when the same ( hopefully) corrected revised plans can be used in the future for the Better Homes scheme.

As you know I have been involved with this now for a very long time but I truly believe that the time has come to go forward - at last.

With very Best Wishes

Elizabeth ( Knowles)

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Bond, Catherine  
**Sent:** 22 May 2015 23:09  
**To:** Curry, Rav  
**Subject:** FW: FAO Catherine Bond: OBJECTION Planning Application - 2015/1826/L, 2015/1824/L, 2015/1822/L, 2015/1828/L, 2015/1825/L, 2015/1823/L, 2015/1821/L

Hi Rav

Sorry not to have mentioned before that Sara Bell also represents the Alexandra and Ainsworth Estate TRA.

Catherine

Catherine Bond  
Principal Planner (Conservation and Heritage)

Telephone: 020 7974 2669

---

**From:** Bond, Catherine  
**Sent:** 22 May 2015 21:17  
**To:** Curry, Rav  
**Subject:** FW: FAO Catherine Bond: OBJECTION Planning Application - 2015/1826/L, 2015/1824/L, 2015/1822/L, 2015/1828/L, 2015/1825/L, 2015/1823/L, 2015/1821/L

Hi Rav

Here is another objection from Sara Bell, to all seven current kitchen listed building consent applications for Rowley Way.

Thanks  
Catherine

Catherine Bond  
Principal Planner (Conservation and Heritage)

Telephone: 020 7974 2669

---

**From:** Bell, Sara (SHHS) [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 19 May 2015 13:35  
**To:** Bond, Catherine  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: FAO Catherine Bond: OBJECTION Planning Application - 2015/1826/L, 2015/1824/L, 2015/1822/L, 2015/1828/L, 2015/1825/L, 2015/1823/L, 2015/1821/L

Dear Catherine,

**On behalf of myself as a resident and the whole TRA we objecting to these planning applications and request you postpone the decision on these applications until more appropriate consultation and details are provided for the following applications:**  
**2015/1826/L, 2015/1824/L, 2015/1822/L, 2015/1828/L, 2015/1825/L, 2015/1823/L, 2015/1821/L**

Whilst I/we are extremely happy that Camden is considering to develop standards of quality for the internal works to the flats I/we have grave concerns about how the Council will reach a decision about these standards based on the documents contained in the application itself.

We are objecting to these applications all together as they are all connected in their intention to establish future guidelines for the reinstatement of void properties and for internal alterations to A&A estate. Each flat type all have common features so you cannot treat each type of flat in isolation to the others.

The residents and the TRA need to have a proper chance to get together and submit more detailed responses and we wish these applications to be determined by the Development Management committee, due to its critical relevance for the future of the Estate.

Our objections are based on the below after a preliminary look at the documents available online for 89E

1) Insufficient consultation. Camden's Statement of Community Involvement states that the council will advertise applications for internal alterations of a Grade II\* listed building by site notice, letters to occupiers and press notice. However, no site notices were posted in Ainsworth Way, and no letters were received by occupiers. I and the TRA were hoping that there would be far more consulting with us. This lack of appropriate consultation is source of concern because of the significance of these proposals which once agreed "should both update the existing Management Guidelines and should also address the Decent Homes works, setting a standard to be followed in similar properties". The consequences of these proposals and their relevance for the Decent Home works have not been made sufficiently clear to the occupiers and the TRA.

2) Inaccurate description of the "original features and finishes" of the properties. For instance, the images provided for the kitchen worktop details, show an existing but unusual cream coloured tiles. The majority of the flats had and still have brown quarry tiles. (see attached photo). The drawing of the "original kitchen design" on page 13 of the Design and Access statements bears no relevance with the existing original kitchens and shows alien elements such as a boiler and a radiator. This is very misleading as it quite simply is a drawing of a kitchen from another estate yet it is labelled 'Original kitchen design'. The post code is wrong NW9 we are NW8. In fact the more you read this document the more inaccuracies there are and this has to be looked at very closely and corrected before it goes any further.

3) Insufficient details about the proposed works and materials. In particular it is not clear which criteria will be applied to decide when to restore and when to substitute original features.

These applications are very very important to the seriousness of Camden and worthiness of our estate! If these plans are not done properly and accurately then what is the point. I find it quite extraordinary that Levitt Bernstein can put in a planning application and go to all the trouble of producing a spec for 89E and can't even get the post code or design of the kitchen correct!!! Really doesn't give one much confidence.

Please can you acknowledgement our objections either by email or post (Sara Bell, 63b Rowley Way, Abbey Road, London) and inform us on any decisions made on these applications.

Yours sincerely  
Sara Bell, resident and  
Sara Bell, Secretary A&A TRA

---



## Important Notice

This e-mail file transmitted with it is confidential to the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, disclosure of its contents is prohibited and may be unlawful. You should notify the sender immediately if you have received this e-mail in error and delete it from your system without retaining a copy.

Please do not view or otherwise use or edit this e-mail or the contents of the e-mail without the prior written consent of the Controller. The Controller is not responsible for any loss or damage incurred through the use of this e-mail.

The Controller is a limited company registered in England No. 6400  
Registered Office: 100 Piccadilly, London W1A 3DP