

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2015/3709/P	Catriona Hill	79 B Mansfield Road	08/11/2015 14:42:54	OBJ	I strongly object to the railings proposed for the roof. There has been no need for the railings up to now and there have been no incidents related to the lack of railings. Adding railings considerably changes the appearance of the building. I also note that only some of the windows are due to be changed. Unless they are an exact replica of the existing windows this will give the building an piecemeal appearance.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Stefania Orazi	69B Mansfield Road London	07/11/2015 13:05:52	OBJ	Stefania Orazi 69b Mansfield Road London NW3 2JE

Mobile: 07815 757306

Dear Anna,

RESPONSE TO APPLICATION 2015/3709/P

Please find below my response to the planning application referred to above.

Design and Access Statement and metal railing to high level roof  
Point 2.6.3 free standing edge protection at the perimeter of the high level flat roof  
Please refer to my previous objection with regards to this, in response to the first planning submission. Additionally, Camden Council have agreed, after residents consultation, that the edge protection would not form part of the revised planning application or major works schedule, so I am disappointed to see it has not been omitted.

The proposed edge protection is not in keeping with the appearance of the building. It will have detrimental impact on the appearance of the Locally Listed building major impact on how the building is both viewed from the adjacent streets and the surrounding conservation areas to the north and south. It is not in line with the detailing of the building. The railings are visually intrusive and this will be amplified by the galvanised finish. Alternative and less intrusive solutions should be sought. I object to this application.

Window replacement

I am pleased that the replacement windows will be in timber as per the original windows. As a leaseholder of a 'B' flat I can only comment on the window schedules that refer to my specific property. After a series of revised drawings by Camden, the dimensions and detailing of the windows, which have been agreed to be replaced like for like, are incorrect. Some windows have been omitted completely. It should also be noted that there are several type of 'B' flats with different types/sizes of windows, and therefore a blanket approach is inappropriate. I therefore object to the planning application based on these drawings.

Yours sincerely,

Stefania Orazi

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Jack Trench	45a Mansfield Rd London NW3 2JA	06/11/2015 10:58:01	COMMNT	Hello, great to see the window drawings have been updated. However in relation to Type M windows (Flat A Sliding doors). The Fixed glass panel 'Glass 1' is currently 125mm wide, not 255mm wide as shown in the drawings (the fixed panel and ply panel on the opposite side currently both match). The current door slides on the outside of the frame not the inside as proposed. Lastly the rails and styles on the sliding door are all 130mm (including glass beading). All the above points do make the proposed widows have a different look to the existing ones. I would assume the same issues apply to Type O (Flat B's) but would not know for certain. Ideally I would like to speak briefly about the above on the phone as I am keen to understand how the above can be adjusted without causing delay to the works. My mobile number is below.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Matt Thornley and Juliet Aston	51b Mansfield Road London Nw3 2je	07/11/2015 11:45:27	OBJ	<p>RESPONSE TO APPLICATION 2015/3709/P</p> <p>Please find below our response to the planning application referred to above.</p> <p>Design and Access Statement and metal railing to high level roof:</p> <p>Point 2.6.3 refers to new free standing edger protection at the perimeter of the high level flat roof area. The previous submission indicated edge protection which had a detrimental impact on the appearance of the locally listed building and was detrimental in terms of townscape viewed from the surrounding conservation area. Camden Council confirmed to residents that this was not going to form part of the revised application. We, as residents have also be informed that the existing roof is not to be replaced, rather repaired, which is not as stated within the application.</p> <p>We also understand that Camden do not intend to replace the guarding around roof lights to A flats as shown.</p> <p>The proposed strategy is not in keeping with the appearance of the building. The new high level edge protection is not in line with the detailing of the building, which is recognised as a building of importance through its local listing. The railings are visually intrusive and this will be amplified by the galvanised finish. They will have a major impact on how the building is both viewed from the adjacent streets and the surrounding conservation areas to the north and south. There are methods to provide edge protection for the infrequent access required such as a man safe system or fold down rail which would not have an impact on the appearance of the building</p> <p>Existing elevations PL02 rev B</p> <p>These are still incorrect! Our flat 51b, has the original windows and our comments below relate to these. The existing elevation provided does not match the 'existing window schedule' – drawing PL06, provided as part of the application. The window at low level onto Mansfield Road is shown as a single slot window. This is in fact two separate windows.</p> <p>The windows to the front elevation to the yards on the B flats are shown as a door with adjacent window. This is incorrect. The fenestration should be shown as a single, large split barn door with full height fixed glazed screen adjacent.</p> <p>The sliding doors to the rear elevation are shown incorrectly. They omit the opening solid vent panel and the proportions of the fixed glazed screen are incorrect.</p> <p>The lower door and window to the B flats on the rear elevation are shown incorrectly. The window is shown as a single glazed screen without the opening upper portion.</p> <p>The unauthorised additions to the front elevation are not shown in the existing elevations. It is not clear if this means Camden are to remove these.</p> <p>The existing metalwork is not shown as per the existing condition.</p> <p>On the basis that the proposals are to 'match existing' it is extremely important that the existing drawings are correct, and they are not. It is very straight forward to produce an existing drawing and it is unclear why this is not been addressed by the applicant as it has been raised previously.</p> <p>Existing window schedule PL06</p> <p>This appears to be a proposed window schedule – the notes on the drawing refer to 'style to match existing' which implies what is shown is proposed. The schedule shows windows which we have been led to believe are to be refurbished (windows at upper ground/Lower ground' facing Mansfield Road Type F/G: These are shown incorrectly both in terms of size and fenestration. Window type F is formed as 3 parts, all of which open. The framing is significantly thinner and what is shown would mean a major reduction to light to the bedroom. The window also allows emergency egress from this room and</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>the fixed panel shown prohibits this.</p> <p>Window G is not a single opening window but a top hung window with fixed solid panel. Again the framing shown significantly reduces daylight to the internal room.</p> <p>Type H window is shown incorrectly. This is not a single window but two separate windows. These are fixed yet appear to be shown with an opening frame. As such the glazing shown is incorrect as it is minimal. If the windows were to be replaced to match this, it would involve major structural alterations to the building and would reduce our daylight significantly and as such would be totally unacceptable.</p> <p>Type J: These are shown incorrectly. The fenestration should be shown a single, large split barn door with full height fixed glazed screen adjacent. The doors are dimensionally significantly incorrect. The door element is around 1350mm wide (compared to the 910mm shown) and are full height – not the 2110mm shown</p> <p>Type O windows. Dimensionally, this is shown incorrectly in width by nearly 200mm and is also incorrect in terms of height.</p> <p>Type P: The opening window to the right hand section is not shown. This is incorrect as this opening window provides ventilation to the principle bedroom. The vent at high level is also not shown.</p> <p>Within the application it states that windows will be part replaced and part refurbished. Where the windows cannot be refurbished they will be replaced. If these windows, particularly to B flats facing Mansfield Road, were replaced as per this schedule, they would not be as per existing (and very different in some cases), would omit ventilation to bedrooms and reduce our daylighting and affect the appearance of the building significantly.</p> <p>Proposed elevation PL05</p> <p>See comments above on the proposed window schedule regarding window types F, G, H, J, O, P. Although we understand that some of these windows are due to be refurbished, the application does state that these may be replaced on an individual level and as such the proposed elevation will indicate the potential configuration. These are shown incorrectly and if executed as shown would amount to a major change in the fenestration of the building as viewed from the street and the surrounding conservation area. It would also reduce daylight to all of the internal rooms to a level that would not be acceptable and remove the critical emergency egress routes from the front bedroom. This may be an error in drafting however this issue has been raised previously and is still not resolved.</p> <p>See point above regarding the railings to the high level roof.</p> <p>The balustrades shown as ‘mesh infill to be replaced to closely match existing’ is shown not as per existing and changes the location of the principle balustrade supports which is a primary element of the building.</p> <p>Proposed Window schedule</p> <p>Window type O</p> <p>The window/doors are incorrect both in terms of size and detail. This has been raised with Camden previously and the residents have provided comment on sizes and details. The solid panel is not ‘fixed’ as shown but an opening vent and provides ventilation to the room</p> <p>Window Type P</p> <p>The trickle vent to the bedroom is also removed which would be in breach of current building regulations. The details of these windows need to be reviewed so that they allow for separation for the rooms behind.</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

Summary

The window fenestration is still incorrect although raised previously. It does not show an understanding of the existing building, and if allowed to proceed on the basis shown, would cause considerable damage to both the appearance of the building and the use, enjoyment and safe habitation of the internal spaces by those who live there.

The proposed guarding to upper levels would have a major impact on the appearance on the block and the setting as viewed from conservation areas. Little consideration has been given to this and alternatives would be possible without affecting the appearance of the block.

As such we object to the application.

---