

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Mark Swenarton	8 Brookland Rise London NW11 6DL	11/11/2015 11:38:49	OBJ	<p>I am very concerned to see the inclusion, in the Design and Access Statement and on drawing PL05 revision A, of a highly visible edge protection to the roof. This will have a major impact on the appearance of the building both from Mansfield Road to the north and from the conservation area to the south and destroy its architectural integrity.</p> <p>Mansfield Road was designed by the celebrated architects Gordon Benson and Alan Forsyth (later famed for the Museum of Scotland in Edinburgh) in 1971 when they were working for Camden council and, with nearby nos 1-9 Lambie Street, was the only part of the Gospel Oak redevelopment designed under the auspices of Sydney Cook, the borough architect responsible for a series of housing projects in Camden that attracted attention and applause worldwide.</p> <p>The 17-79 Mansfield Road building was designed at a time when the recently completed Wadham block on the adjacent site had been met with severely adverse reaction. When the design for 17-79 Mansfield Road was unveiled, it was hailed by councilors (including one who is still on the council) and pundits alike for its elegance.</p> <p>In terms of architectural impact, the proposed edge protection system would be a disaster, like placing a sticking plaster on the face of the Mona Lisa, opening Camden to ridicule. I strongly advise that this proposal is dropped and that an alternative safety system which does not have this deleterious impact on the appearance of the building is adopted.</p> <p>Prof Mark Swenarton, organiser of Cook's Camden exhibition 2010</p>

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

2015/3709/P	Jack Trench & Julie Chan	45A Mansfield Road NW3 2JE	11/11/2015 07:48:51	OBJ	
-------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------	-----	--

Dear Anna,

RESPONSE TO APPLICATION 2015/3709/P from FLAT 45A (Jack Trench & Julie Chan)

Please find below our response and objections to the planning application referred to above.

METAL RAILING TO HIGH LEVEL ROOF

Point 2.6.3 of Design & Access Statement: Free standing edge protection at the perimeter of the high level flat roof.

Camden Council have already agreed, after residents consultation, that the edge protection would not form part of the revised planning application or major works schedule, so we are disappointed to see it has been re-submitted as part of this planning application.

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. We object to this application.

BALUSTRADE RAILINGS TO FLAT A PROPERTIES

Point 2.6.1 of Design & Access Statement: Renewal of edge protection around glazed mono pitch roof

The application plans show that proposed railings for terrace around glazed screen to be replaced with Stainless Steel post and tensioned wire rope infill in the style of the original design. In the consultation process it has already been agreed that these balustrade railings would be repaired and refurbished and not renewed / replaced. We object on the basis that Stainless Steel would not be like for like or in keeping with the original design. There is no exposed Stainless Steel in the design of the estate.

WINDOWS

Point 2.6.2 of Design & Access Statement: Timber Window and Door Units

We endorse in principal that the existing windows are being replaced with timber units. However, 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 still incorrect. Some windows have been omitted completely. We can only comment on our own FLAT A property windows:

TYPE M (Rear first floor) - SLIDING DOOR

We object to the proposed application on the following points which altogether significantly alter the look of the window from existing and cannot be said to be 'like for like' as agreed in the consultation.

1 - The door should slide on the outside as existing however the plans show the doors sliding internally

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

Comment: **Response:**

which is incorrect and changes the look of the door and is a poor weathering detail

2 - The solid panel on the right hand side is shown in the drawings as a fixed single panel. This should be a hinged upper and lower section panel opening as per existing to allow for secure ventilation. We strongly object to the proposed drawings as this opening panel provides secure ventilation to the principle bedroom.

3 – The existing fixed glass panel (glass 1) is 125mm wide not 255 mm wide as show in the proposed application drawings. The hinged solid panel should match the width of the fixed glass panel as per existing.

4 – The fenestration of the sliding door is incorrect. The existing rails and styles are all 130 mm including the glass beading. However, the proposed application shows different dimensions.

GENERAL NOTES ON PLANNING APPLICATION DRAWINGS

Please also note the following observations where there are inconsistencies with existing and proposed:

1. PL03 – existing and proposed AA shows an existing guard rail on the roof perimeter (bubble 3) This is incorrect, the guard rail does not exist.

2. PL02 – existing front and rear elevations type E window does not show existing hinged solid panel

3. PL02 type M does not show solid hinged panel and fixed glazed panel is not the correct size and is very unclear appearing to show more window panes than existing

4. PL06 – existing window schedule rev B shows TYPE M sliding on the inside which is not correct and also the Bailey Garner notes indicate that the flexi-wood windows are the same as existing which is incorrect

Yours sincerely,

Julie Chan & Jack Trench

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Mark Swenarton	8 Brookland Rise London NW11 6DL	11/11/2015 11:38:27	OBJ	<p>I am very concerned to see the inclusion, in the Design and Access Statement and on drawing PL05 revision A, of a highly visible edge protection to the roof. This will have a major impact on the appearance of the building both from Mansfield Road to the north and from the conservation area to the south and destroy its architectural integrity.</p> <p>Mansfield Road was designed by the celebrated architects Gordon Benson and Alan Forsyth (later famed for the Museum of Scotland in Edinburgh) in 1971 when they were working for Camden council and, with nearby nos 1-9 Lambie Street, was the only part of the Gospel Oak redevelopment designed under the auspices of Sydney Cook, the borough architect responsible for a series of housing projects in Camden that attracted attention and applause worldwide.</p> <p>The 17-79 Mansfield Road building was designed at a time when the recently completed Wadham block on the adjacent site had been met with severely adverse reaction. When the design for 17-79 Mansfield Road was unveiled, it was hailed by councilors (including one who is still on the council) and pundits alike for its elegance.</p> <p>In terms of architectural impact, the proposed edge protection system would be a disaster, like placing a sticking plaster on the face of the Mona Lisa, opening Camden to ridicule. I strongly advise that this proposal is dropped and that an alternative safety system which does not have this deleterious impact on the appearance of the building is adopted.</p> <p>Prof Mark Swenarton, organiser of Cook's Camden exhibition 2010</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Winnie Sze and Kevin Fellingham (17A)	17A Mansfield Road NW3 2JE London	11/11/2015 08:15:17	OBJ	<p>Thank you for the consultation. We object to the application for 2015/3709/P, the letter titled “Design & Access Statement” dated 30 October 2015 with its accompanying drawings on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 1.2.2 the “3 wire edge protection system ...”, there are 2 issues. First, it is a considerably negative change to the aesthetic of a locally-listed building, by a highly respected firm of architects, which forms part of a housing programme globally-recognised as exemplary of local authority housing provision. Rather the same safety requirements can be achieved unobtrusively with a man-safe system (particularly given that the roof is not publicly accessible). Secondly, if it is indeed a wire system then it cannot be curved on top of the boiler enclosures as shown on the drawings, which means it cannot do the job it says it will do. The drawing shows vertical supports whilst the text refers to an angled support. Finally the drawing actually shows a stainless vertical system without a central rail which means the application is inconsistent in its facts. Point 1.2.3 the “replacement of windows...” and drawings PL06 and PL07. Drawing PL06, the existing window schedule, shows a number of errors suggesting that the contractors have not measured accurately. On PL07, the proposed replacement windows schedule, also contains a number of errors. These include: (a) size, proportion and placement of openings, and (b) thickness of frames. These discrepancies have already been pointed out a number of times and have clearly not been corrected even though the window schedules have been revised. This suggests a lack of intent or ability by the contractors and their architects to actually deliver windows that match the originals as much as possible. The Council cannot, in good faith, allow the work to proceed until competence to achieve the stated intention of the Design and Access Statement has been demonstrated. <p>In sum, we object to the design as well as the inconsistency and errors in the application which in our experience suggests would not be approved by Camden Council.</p>
2015/3709/P	Arran Whitney	51a Mansfield Road Gospel Oak London NW3 2JE	09/11/2015 17:12:55	OBJ	<p>Re 2.6.3</p> <p>Please clarify extent of roof covering. Is this the whole flat roof? I do not want the galvanised freestanding angled posts to the perimeter of high level flat roof area as this will compromise the architectural integrity of the building and be an eyesore from the street.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Sumaya Partner	53b Mansfield Road	10/11/2015 22:13:27	OBJ	<p>17-79 Mansfield Road is a building of considerable architectural importance and it is a locally listed building. Refurbishments and repairs to the building are long overdue, however it is vital that these reflect and respect the building's architectural integrity.</p> <p>The proposed wire guard system on the roof is unsightly and unnecessary. It does not suit the appearance of the existing building.</p> <p>The proposed Type O rear ground floor sliding windows are drawn inaccurately. The side panel of glass is too narrow and there is no wooden vent panel shown. As shown they would reduce the amount of light coming into the room.</p> <p>The Type P rear lower basement level door and window are also inaccurate. The dimensions shown do not reflect what is already there and they won't work with the basement's interior layout. They do not seem to take into account the two rooms, both bedrooms divided by a sliding panel or a wall, that are behind them. Also, there is no sign in the drawing that the top pane of glass in the window opens.</p> <p>With regard to the metalwork, the proposed rear elevation does not show the sheet of metal on the spiral staircase. This is essential to the look of the staircase and it is also important as it provides a screen between adjacent flats and gardens.</p> <p>In the front elevation the doors (J) bear no resemblance to the large wood and glass stable door that is actually there. The glass in the pavement level window (H) is too narrow and would make the bedroom uninhabitable.</p> <p>As well as looking good this building must continue to be an enjoyable place to live in. Neither should be compromised by external alterations.</p> <p>For all the above reasons I object to the application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Catherine Croft,	70 Cowcross Street London EC1M 6EJ	11/11/2015 17:05:38	INT	<p>Re Planning Application - 2015/3709/P</p> <p>Site Address 17-79 Mansfield Road, London, NW3 2JE Mansfield Road</p> <p>This application for refurbishment works to these locally listing buildings has been drawn to our attention. We are pleased to see that the architectural and historic significance of Benson and Forsyth's attractive and very carefully detailed terrace has been taken in to account when specifying the programme of renovations. In particular, the use of timber windows is welcomed. However the propped roof guards (as shown on drawing PL05) would be visually intrusive, and have a negative impact on the clean lines and considered proportions of the elevations, and we recommend that this part of the works is not carried out. These are buildings whose value will be increasingly recognised as time passes (C20 Society has organised visits on several occasions), and good stewardship is extremely important.</p> <p>Catherine Croft, Director Twentieth Century Society 70 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6EJ Tel: 020 7250 3857 Email: catherine@c20society.org.uk www.c20society.org.uk</p> <p>Reg. charity no: 1110244</p>
2015/3709/P	Catherine Croft,	70 Cowcross Street London EC1M 6EJ	11/11/2015 17:05:16	INT	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Marcella Anstatt	53A Mansfield Road	10/11/2015 21:16:53	OBJ	Response to Planning Application number 2015/3709/P

Proposed Roof Plans (PL04) & Proposed Elevations (PL05)

I strongly object to the new Wire Guardrail system proposed for the roof edge shown on the PL04. It is very unsightly and since the building is only 4-5meters above street level it will be very visible from the street and the conservation area opposite the building. It will change the external appearance on all 4 sides of the building completely. It will be a very obvious and strange looking addition to the building even visible from the end of Mansfield Road.

It will also feel highly intrusive when sitting on the roof terraces. When sitting on the terrace we would be surrounded by this Guardrail on 3 sides (only 2 meters above our heads) making it feel like a caged-in space and thus severely affect the use of the terraces which has been a prized feature of the upper apartments.

If safety is the driving factor then there are other options to such man-anchor systems which are not visible from the street.

The choice of material is also not fitting with the design of the building and would be look out of place. I note that the Wire Guardrail system is not shown on the building sections PL03.

WINDOWS (PL06 & PL07)

As I live on an upper flat (A Flats) I can only comment on those windows. The existing window schedule does not seem to show the correct existing window dimensions and glazing sizes for some of the windows.

Window Type M: The sliding door of this unit operates on the external side and not on the inside as shown in the PL06. This means that the replacement unit for Window Type M is also shown incorrect. If the window/door unit is supposed to match the existing system then the new sliding door should slide on the exterior. The proposed fixed glass panel of this unit (on PL07) is wider than the existing fixed glass panel. This affects how a person accesses the stairs to the roof terrace. Currently the stairs are directly opposite the edge of the sliding door so that when stepping out through the door one can easily continue straight across to the steps. With the changed dimensions (PL07), of the fixed glass panel and sliding door the opening has shifted to one side of the steps, off-setting the opening, and thus makes for an awkward movement when navigating out of the door and around the corner post of the railing that surrounds the mono-pitched glazing unit to get to the steps.

Existing and Proposed Section A-A (PL03)

The existing building section is not drawn correctly. Various elements are incorrect but I would like to focus on the Guardrail around the mono-pitched glazing unit. The existing drawings are missing the Guard rail along the lower edge of the mono-pitched unit. This is also missing on the Proposed Section. On one note it says "All existing edge protection to be retained and refurbished. This includes tensioned wire edge protection around roof glazing...." but on another note it says "Proposed railings for terrace around glazed screens to be replaced with Stainless Steel post and tension wire rope infill....as original". The documents are contradicting themselves.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					I strongly object to the renewal of the existing rail as the Stainless Steel posts shown on the application do not fit with the design of the building. It had been discussed with Camden that the existing posts and wires will be refurbished instead of being replaced.
2015/3709/P	Julia Wilson	55a Mansfield Road	10/11/2015 08:10:31	OBJ	I strongly object to the proposed railings on the roof. These will considerably change the appearance of the building and may give the impression that the roof is an area which may be accessed for recreational use. There have been no incidents related to the lack of railings.

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

2015/3709/P	Jack Trench & Julie Chan	45A Mansfield Road NW3 2JE	11/11/2015 10:57:57	OBJ	
-------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------	-----	--

Dear Anna,

RESPONSE TO APPLICATION 2015/3709/P from FLAT 45A (Jack Trench & Julie Chan)

Please find below our response and objections to the planning application referred to above.

METAL RAILING TO HIGH LEVEL ROOF

Point 2.6.3 of Design & Access Statement: Free standing edge protection at the perimeter of the high level flat roof.

Camden Council have already agreed, after residents consultation, that the edge protection would not form part of the revised planning application or major works schedule, so we are disappointed to see it has been re-submitted as part of this planning application.

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. We object to this application.

BALUSTRADE RAILINGS TO FLAT A PROPERTIES

Point 2.6.1 of Design & Access Statement: Renewal of edge protection around glazed mono pitch roof

The application plans show that proposed railings for terrace around glazed screen to be replaced with Stainless Steel post and tensioned wire rope infill in the style of the original design. In the consultation process it has already been agreed that these balustrade railings would be repaired and refurbished and not renewed / replaced. We object on the basis that Stainless Steel would not be like for like or in keeping with the original design. There is no exposed Stainless Steel in the design of the estate.

WINDOWS

Point 2.6.2 of Design & Access Statement: Timber Window and Door Units

We endorse in principal that the existing windows are being replaced with timber units. However, 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 still incorrect. Some windows have been omitted completely. We can only comment on our own FLAT A property windows:

TYPE M (Rear first floor) - SLIDING DOOR

We object to the proposed application on the following points which altogether significantly alter the look of the window from existing and cannot be said to be 'like for like' as agreed in the consultation.

1 - The door should slide on the outside as existing however the plans show the doors sliding internally

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

Comment: **Response:**

which is incorrect and changes the look of the door and is a poor weathering detail

2 - The solid panel on the right hand side is shown in the drawings as a fixed single panel. This should be a hinged upper and lower section panel opening as per existing to allow for secure ventilation. We strongly object to the proposed drawings as this opening panel provides secure ventilation to the principle bedroom.

3 – The existing fixed glass panel (glass 1) is 125mm wide not 255 mm wide as show in the proposed application drawings. The hinged solid panel should match the width of the fixed glass panel as per existing.

4 – The fenestration of the sliding door is incorrect. The existing rails and styles are all 130 mm including the glass beading. However, the proposed application shows different dimensions.

GENERAL NOTES ON PLANNING APPLICATION DRAWINGS

Please also note the following observations where there are inconsistencies with existing and proposed:

1. PL03 – existing and proposed AA shows an existing guard rail on the roof perimeter (bubble 3) This is incorrect, the guard rail does not exist.

2. PL02 – existing front and rear elevations type E window does not show existing hinged solid panel

3. PL02 type M does not show solid hinged panel and fixed glazed panel is not the correct size and is very unclear appearing to show more window panes than existing

4. PL06 – existing window schedule rev B shows TYPE M sliding on the inside which is not correct and also the Bailey Garner notes indicate that the flexi-wood windows are the same as existing which is incorrect

Yours sincerely,

Julie Chan & Jack Trench
