

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Arran Whitney	51a Mansfield Road Gospel Oak London NW3 2JE	27/07/2015 13:02:55	OBJ	<p>Referring to the Design and Access Statement I have the following comments:</p> <p>1.2.1 There is no drawing of the aluminium double glazed replacements so I cannot comment on its visual appearance, impact to the residents etc. If a drawing of the proposal was provided we could comment.</p> <p>1.2.3 The visual appearance of a freestanding roof top handrail will be hugely detrimental to the visual character of the building and thus street scene. The building has hard distinctive structural lines, which are fundamental to its 1960's design and appearance. We accept the need for safety at roof level and would prefer to have harness positions fixed to the roof structure. This can be carried out at no extra cost and will not damage the visual appearance of the building from the street and also from the rear balconies.</p> <p>1.2.4 There are no drawings illustrating the design of the new windows and door units. The existing windows include side panels that open, typical of the building's design. This is a design feature and we want to know what their exact design is proposed to be. If Camden were to advise they were to replace the windows exactly, then we can be reasonably informed so as to comment as part of the consultation process. If the changes are not to match existing exactly then it is not unreasonable to request design drawings for each type of proposed window design is to be provided for the consultation process. There are not many design types so it will not take long to provide this information.</p> <p>2.6 This details the design and appearance of the various alterations, except the windows and doors. This is surprising as arguably the window and door replacements will have the highest impact. We need a detailed description and indicative drawings illustrating design types for the window and doors.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Kevin Fellingham and Winnie Sze	17A Mansfield Road London NW3 2JE	27/07/2015 09:31:50	COMMNT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The balustrade railings that are shown on the drawing PL03 for illustrative purposes/i.e. in photo are not in the existing style or in the same form. They are generic substitutes and are not acceptable.</li> <li>2. As a suggestion, the use of proprietary stainless balustrade to replace the existing edge protection to the skylights is an extremely high cost alternative to straight-forward maintenance. Does this suggest the contractor is trying to pad the accounts? For example we sandpapered ours, used a rust stripper, a coat of paint and they look nearly as good as new.</li> <li>3. The skylights are a key architectural feature and they will need to make a mock-up because the wording on the drawing is vague and the example shown is also entirely out of keeping with the existing skylights. Before any approval is granted, given the number of these, the supplier needs to demonstrate in mock-up in situ in real materials the nature what they are proposing and its ability to provide natural cross-ventilation – key to the building – and the ability to repair the surrounding plastering, waterproofing consistent with the original detail (or in case of residents who had changed these details to reinstate them on a case-by-case basis).</li> <li>4. The roof edge protection should take the form of a cable harness points fixed to the roof structure. At the very least the : railing should be set back so as not be visible from the parapet in the manner understood by any reasonable conservation architect. The balustrade posts shown in the illustration are not vertical which means it is out of keeping with the existing building in which everything is resolutely vertical and horizontal.</li> <li>5. The photograph is misleading because the parapet of the building is very much lower than shown in the photo. The cross-section is inaccurate because the parapet whilst lower than example shown in photo is higher than shown in the cross section suggesting the building has not actually been measured.</li> <li>6. The roof edge protection is a generic proprietary industrial system which is not in keeping with the character of the building. It is also running over the top of the curved boiler rooms and there is no evidence that the product is able to be formed to a smooth curve at such a tight radius. More details required.</li> <li>7. With respect to the existing mesh infill on the walkway on the street-facing facades please provide samples. Because “closely matched” to existing is a vague definition.</li> <li>8. The edge protection balustrade is extremely dominant in the elevations and appears to be a generic industrial product out of keeping with the character of the building and sure to offend the neighbours across the street with its unfinished appearance.</li> <li>9. No Details have been provided regarding the windows and doors, which are a distinctive aspect of the buildings character, and occur on several listed buildings within Camden’s housing stock. TheExisting windows to the south elevation incorporate an opening timber vent which is not shown on the elevations- it this an error of omission or is it intended not to match the existing design.</li> <li>10. The large sliding doors to the roof terraces are not shown. These include opening side vents vital to the ventilation strategy of the building, and to the design intent.</li> <li>11. The large sliding doors as shown on the proposed south elevation are shown as single pane, of necessity fixed panels. This fundamental error has been repeated 32 times on the drawings, suggesting lack of care and incompetent work by the architect unchecked by the contractors .</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	T Robinson	41B Mansfield Road	27/07/2015 10:48:40	OBJ	<p>Design and Access Statement 1.2.3: Edge protection by way of freestanding handrail system to height of 1100mm.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The block is of architectural significance. Preserving the integrity of the original design should weigh heavily in considering any changes to the exterior that will impact on its appearance.</li> <li>2. The proposed feature will be extensively visible from the street and radically alter the appearance of the block.</li> <li>3. The proposed feature will not be of materials used elsewhere in the block (see 1.2.5 where wire mesh fencing used elsewhere is being repaired or replaced like-for-like).</li> <li>2. The proposed feature played no part in the recent consultations with residents over the proposed works.</li> <li>4. The area protected is not accessible to residents; the only purpose of this feature is to provide protection during maintenance. Access is required infrequently maintenance workers have their own safety equipment for such work (that they use on other similar buildings with no such feature. Erecting unsightly (redundant) protection for infrequent access will disproportionately compromise the appearance of the block.</li> </ol>

---