

**From:** Walker, Hannah  
**Sent:** 09 June 2015 09:35  
**To:** Clark, James  
**Subject:** RE: Conservation response

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hi James

The photo that they have sent looks pretty good, but it doesn't seem to bear any resemblance to what their drawing shows. Are they suggesting that the timber glazed door will have a frame which effectively matches the colour/finish of the steel frame? The photo has a flush door which is clearly timber on the interior but I am not sure what the outside is – perhaps its painted timber? I think they need to clarify that this is what they will be doing as at the moment the sound of a hybrid timber/steel fenestration system sounds like we will be looking at a natural timber finish which could be incongruous.

The revised door is much better though and sits comfortably with the overall aesthetic of the extension.

Hope this makes sense. Thanks.

Hannah Walker  
Principal Planner

Telephone: 020 7974 5786

---

**From:** Clark, James  
**Sent:** 08 June 2015 13:34  
**To:** Walker, Hannah  
**Subject:** FW: Conservation response

Hi Hannah,

Attached are the revised plans for 4a Burton Street. The door has been changed but I would be interested to hear your thoughts on the attached photo, presenting evidence of the timber/steel frame proposed.

Thanks

James Clark  
Planning Officer

Telephone: 02079742050

---

**From:** Gabriel Warshafsky [mailto:gabriel@jankattein.com]  
**Sent:** 08 June 2015 12:10  
**To:** Clark, James  
**Cc:** Diogo Real  
**Subject:** Re: Conservation response

Dear James,

Please find attached amended drawings and issue sheet. These show the existing timber door to the rear extension replaced with a glazed timber door in a minimal steel frame to match the other proposed new door.

I also attach a precedent image for our proposed glazing strategy (Alma Lane House, Dublin, by Boyd Cody Architects). Fixed glazing, flush timber vent panels and glazed timber doors are fitted within a slender steel frame to present a minimal external appearance.


Please don't hesitate to contact me if you require any further details.

Kind regards,

Gabriel Warshafsky

[Jan's new book The Architecture Chronicle - Diary of an Architectural Practice is out. Buy it at Ashgate.com or search on Amazon.](#)



Jan Kattein Architects | 277 New North Road | London N1 7AA | +44 (0)20 7704 0604 | [www.jankattein.com](http://www.jankattein.com) 

On 05/06/2015 11:09, Clark, James wrote:

Dear Gabriel,

I have discussed the revised application with the Conservation Officer and the following issues have come up.

#### Doors/fenestration

- The retention of the existing timber door is at odds with the proposed fenestration. A design that matches the proposed door or the general layout/look of the proposed fenestration would be more in keeping.
- The windows appear to be part steel/metal and part timber? This is not something we generally see, is it possible examples of the windows could be submitted/provided? Manufacturer or precedent picture of what is being put forward?

#### Materials

- The materials work a lot better but would be conditioned upon any approval.

Once we agreed on the fenestration format I think we will be almost there.

Regards

James Clark

Planning Officer

Telephone: 02079742050

---

**From:** Gabriel Warshafsky [<mailto:gabriel@jankattein.com>]

**Sent:** 01 June 2015 13:01

**To:** Clark, James

**Cc:** Diogo Real

**Subject:** Re: Conservation response

Dear James,

Please find attached for your comment amended drawings for our proposals for 27a Burton Street. After discussion with our client, we have attempted to address each of the points raised in your feedback below.

### **Fenestration**

We have proposed fixed glazing with minimal steel frames to the rear extension which reflects the proportions of the existing rear elevation with a discreetly contemporary treatment. We have taken the sill height of the existing lower ground floor rear window as a datum to unify proposed glazing, and have replaced the previously subdivided door with a full height glazed door. Ventilation will be provided by flush painted timber vent panels.

### **Materials**

We have omitted the previously proposed glazed brick parapet. The proposed extension is now in painted stock brick to match treatment of existing garden walls to lower ground floor level.

### **Railings**

We have removed the previously proposed railings to the flat roof of the proposed extension.

Please advise if these amendments are sufficient to address your concerns regarding the acceptability of the proposal, and please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further clarification.

Kind regards,

Gabriel Warshafsky

[Jan's new book The Architecture Chronicle - Diary of an Architectural Practice is out. Buy it at Ashgate.com or search on Amazon.](#)



Jan Kattein Architects | 277 New North Road | London N1 7AA | +44 (0)20 7704 0604 | [www.jankattein.com](http://www.jankattein.com)



On 27/05/2015 12:25, Gabriel Warshafsky wrote:

Dear James,

Many thanks for the below feedback. I am confident that we can revise our proposals in line with the below, however, we will need to consult with our clients who are currently on holiday. We hope to

get some revised plans to you later in the week - will that fit in with your timeframes?

With regard to the railings, would a glass balustrade resolve your misgivings regarding the apparent height of the rear extension, or are the issues of overlooking/use as a roof terrace the overriding concern? Our client would likely wish to retain the stair as drawn in order to allow access to maintain pot plants on the flat roof if the roof terrace cannot be approved.

Kind regards,

Gabriel Warshafsky

[Jan's new book The Architecture Chronicle - Diary of an Architectural Practice is out. Buy it at Ashgate.com or search on Amazon.](#)



Jan Kattein Architects | 277 New North Road | London N1 7AA | +44 (0)20 7704 0604 | [www.jankattein.com](http://www.jankattein.com)



On 22/05/2015 16:07, Clark, James wrote:

Dear Gabriel,

Below are notes in relation to the **fenestration and materials**,

Whilst the principle is considered acceptable.... I do think that the design is rather disjointed, particularly in terms of the fenestration. It may be better to go for a more wholly contemporary approach – the subdivided traditional door (is this just being retained or replaced?) in this case is at odds with the design of the adjacent openings. The window to the bathroom might be better if it picked upon the proportions of the original fenestration on the rear façade, albeit in a contemporary manner rather than just utilising the shape and size of the existing unsympathetic modern window.

In addition, I appreciate that the lower portion of the building is painted render but I think that a fully stock brick extension would be more in keeping with the original character of the building and wider terrace. In my view the glazed brick parapet, when combined with the proposed varied fenestration results in a real lack of coherency to the overall design and does

not draw upon any readily appreciable precedent.

### **Listed building Consent**

As far as I can see the internal works relate only to the installation of a bathroom in the front room. This room often has a hallway that aligns with the basement level front door and the partitions in this case are acceptable as they create a similar sense of subdivision

### **Railings**

As stated on the phone the railings provide the impression that the extension is greater in height and further intensifies the rear garden. I appreciate the client wants a roof terrace but I do not consider the railings to be of design value. The roof terrace would result in potential privacy and amenity concerns to neighbouring properties and therefore consider its removal to be in line with policy. I appreciate the flat roof is used as terrace now, but this has not been formalised through a planning application. The conservation officer agrees with my position on the railings.

Kind regards

James Clark  
Planning Officer  
Regeneration and Planning  
Culture and Environment  
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 02079742050  
Web: [camden.gov.uk](http://camden.gov.uk)

2

5 Pancras Square  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright

protected. This e- mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e- mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.