

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Arran Whitney	51A Mansfield Road Gospel Oak London NW3 2JE	29/12/2015 17:48:22	OBJ	<p>Arran Whitney</p> <p>51A Mansfield Road, NW3 2JE</p> <p>Change of scope and damage to the appearance of the building</p> <p>The windows facing onto Mansfield Road (excluding A flat upper windows) were not part of the scope on which we were consulted. Previously Camden has confirmed to residents that these windows/doors do not need to be replaced as they are not subject to weathering damage (windows onto 'B' flat yards and 'A' flat walkway are under permanent cover). Generally these windows are in good condition and Camden had previously confirmed to residents that these would be kept.</p> <p>These windows, facing onto Mansfield Road, are a key feature of the architecture of the locally listed block. The bespoke nature of the doors and windows will be lost due to the proposals (such as omitting the barn doors) and this will have a detrimental effect on the reading of the building. As a group, we have written to Camden about our dismay over this last minute change of scope (letter forwarded to Anna Roe from Jack Trench on 24.12.15). As stated within our letter, the flats are generally very warm and the key issues of cold bridging etc, which can only be dealt with by internal treatments, are being ignored by the council. Similarly Camden are refusing to meter the use of gas in the block which is an established method of reducing consumption. As such the use of 'reduced heating bills' as a rational to degrade the appearance of the block is difficult to understand or accept.</p> <p>We are dismayed that the scope has been changed and this will fundamentally affect the building. We previously understood that the re-submission of drawings was being carried out to pick up inaccuracies and errors within the previous applications. We feel Camden is using the re-submission to change the scope, going against the wishes of the people who live in the block and who care for the building.</p> <p>Balustrades around roof lights</p> <p>The DAS starts that the balustrading is to be repaired and where required, replaced, to match existing. Within 'existing and proposed section AA' it states that these are to be replaced with stainless steel posts. This is not in as per the existing and this has been stated both to Camden Housing and Camden Planning Department before. Similarly, Camden has previously stated to residents that replacing the balustrading with SS posts would not form part of the works. We feel as though we are being misled and feel that that this change would have a detrimental impact on the appearance and detail of this locally listed building.</p> <p>Architype drawings</p> <p>These are inaccurate. The type M windows, regardless of the location are keyed to a flat A roof terrace window. The window types change between the A and B flats.</p> <p>Comments on existing/proposed window drawings</p> <p>All comments provided here should be read in conjunction with the points made earlier within this objection however we would also like to record the following additional comments</p> <p>Type A&amp;B</p> <p>Type A/B proposed windows (from kitchen onto red walkway): We understood that it was not Camden's intention to replace these windows as they are in good condition and only require painting. Please confirm that this is still the case. These windows are not open to the elements as they are protected by the walkway.</p> <p>Type M</p> <p>Type M proposed sliding doors. The Existing Type M drawing is inaccurate, showing the proportion of the fixed panel to the openable panel incorrectly. The proposed drawing suggests that the existing</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>openable panel will be replaced with a fixed panel. The openable vent panel that currently exists provides safe and essential ventilation to the bedroom. Without it, there is no means of ventilating the bedroom safely. The proportions of the large sliding doors are also shown slightly differently to the originals, as is the narrow glass panel. Also the proposed doors slide internally rather than externally as at present. This will cause problems with the internal linings of the building. These openable panels and the proportions of these windows are essential to the original design, function and integrity of the building.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The scope of the application has changed and we feel we have not been properly consulted by Camden. The proposed works are not reasonably required in many cases and the proposals will have a detrimental and irreversible impact on the building which is locally listed and internationally recognised as being architectural significant.</p> <p>The application is still inaccurate. We would note that this is the third time which we have been asked to review drawings and they are still incorrect. We would state that as many of the issues previously raised have not been addressed in the drawings, the previous objections should be considered when reviewing this application.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Cordelia Mayfield	27A Mansfield Road London NW3 2JE	29/12/2015 04:55:41	OBJ	<p>Thank you for your hand-delivered letter dated 16 December 2015 regarding an update on the proposed works to Mansfield Road.</p> <p>The current scope of works as listed by you in your letter does not specify which windows are to be replaced.</p> <p>You state that that you have assessed the condition and the heat loss of the windows and the doors on the front elevation of the block by doing a thermographic survey. All windows create heat loss so we do not agree with your findings.</p> <p>We are gravely concerned to note that as per the drawings on the planning application on the Camden website, the windows facing the walkway are proposed to be replaced. These windows are never exposed to the elements and so have survived remarkably well. They do not need to be repaired nor replaced.</p> <p>We have been promised that we would be shown examples of the new roof light, ironmongery and window frames at Lamble Street for some months now. You state in your letter that we will be able to see the ironmongery for the windows in Lamble Street once the works are in progress there. This is cutting things very fine for us to be able to give you clear feedback as you further mention that the window installation will commence by the end of JANUARY 2015 ( we assume you mean 2016?!). We urgently request an early viewing of these items so that we can give you informed feedback as to whether they will serve to maintain the architectural integrity of the building.</p> <p>The historic neglect of cyclical maintenance by Camden has resulted in causing many of the proposed works. Has this been taken into account by Camden when costing the works? We believe that we would be successful in applying to the First Tier Tribunal to show that Camden is being unreasonable in passing on the cost of historic disrepair to leaseholders in that Camden has failed in its' contractual duty as a Freeholder, in this respect.</p> <p>Regarding the scaffolding, we note that you will be erecting this on our part of the block in the week commencing 11 January 2016. Please can you confirm when the work will start on our part of the block and how long it is estimated that it will last?</p> <p>Can you assure us that the scaffolding will only be in place for the duration of the works and that it will be taken down immediately after the works have finished in order to save us all from unnecessary and unreasonable costs?</p> <p>We are disturbed to note that despite us spending a considerable amount of time and effort scrutinising Camden's proposals for the work and so submitting carefully considered comments and objections to Camden, we have never had the courtesy of a detailed response from Camden to our comments and objections. Further more, we have submitted comments and objections twice already. Yet you as Camden's representatives do not seem to be taking many of our comments into account. This is the third round of feedback to Camden. We fear that we are being treated unreasonably by Camden and so, we reluctantly suppose that we will have to have recourse to the First Tier Tribunal in the near future.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Elaine Spraggan	23a Mansfield Road London NW32JE	30/12/2015 14:56:04	COMMNT	I do not think it is necessary to replace the windows in the kitchens of the A. flats at the front that lead on to the red walkway.
2015/3709/P	Julie Chan & Jack Trench	45A Mansfield Road London NW3 2JE	28/12/2015 14:55:11	OBJ	<p>We would like to comment on the recent documents uploaded on to the Camden website for the Planning Application for 17- 79 Mansfield Road - application number 2015/3709/P.</p> <p>We note the following with specific reference to flat no.45A</p> <p>TYPE M PROPOSED SLIDING DOORS:</p> <p>The Existing Type M drawing is inaccurate, showing the proportion of the fixed panel to the openable panel incorrectly. The proposed drawing suggests that the existing openable panel will be replaced with a fixed panel. The openable vent panel that currently exists provides safe and essential ventilation to the bedroom. Without it, there is no means of ventilating the bedroom safely.</p> <p>The proportions of the large sliding doors are also shown slightly differently to the originals, as is the narrow glass panel, which is proposed to be significantly wider than the existing.</p> <p>Also the proposed doors slide internally rather than externally as at present. This will cause problems with the internal linings of the building and will change the aesthetic of the doors significantly from the outside. The openable panels and the proportions of the windows are essential to the original design, function and integrity of the building. We note that the proposed design for the Type "O" sliding doors to the flat B properties slide to the externally so we would assume that there would be no issue for the Type "M" sliding doors to also slide externally.</p> <p>TYPE A/B PROPOSED WINDOWS:</p> <p>On the front elevation onto walkway - we understood that it was not Camden's intention to replace these windows as they are in good condition and only require painting - these windows are not open to the elements as they are protected by the walkway.</p> <p>We note that the proposed drawings suggest replacing the existing solid hinged panel with a fixed panel. The existing small solid hinged panel provides valuable speedy ventilation to the kitchen as it is at an accessible height from inside. We object to this window being replaced with a fixed panel as it provides essential ventilation from the cooking area of the kitchen.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Leigh Johnson	75a Mansfield Road	30/12/2015 21:15:19	COMMNT	<p>Leigh Johnson 75a Mansfield Road, NW3 2JE</p> <p>Change of scope and damage to the appearance of the building The windows facing onto Mansfield Road (excluding A flat upper windows) were not part of the scope on which we were consulted. Previously Camden has confirmed to residents that these windows/doors do not need to be replaced as they are not subject to weathering damage (windows onto 'B' flat yards and 'A' flat walkway are under permanent cover). Generally these windows are in good condition and Camden had previously confirmed to residents that these would be kept. These windows, facing onto Mansfield Road, are a key feature of the architecture of the locally listed block. The bespoke nature of the doors and windows will be lost due to the proposals (such as omitting the barn doors) and this will have a detrimental effect on the reading of the building. As a group, we have written to Camden about our dismay over this last minute change of scope (letter forwarded to Anna Roe from Jack Trench on 24.12.15). As stated within our letter, the flats are generally very warm and the key issues of cold bridging etc, which can only be dealt with by internal treatments, are being ignored by the council. Similarly Camden are refusing to meter the use of gas in the block which is an established method of reducing consumption. As such the use of 'reduced heating bills' as a rational to degrade the appearance of the block is difficult to understand or accept. I am dismayed that the scope has been changed and this will fundamentally affect the building. We previously understood that the re-submission of drawings was being carried out to pick up inaccuracies and errors within the previous applications. We feel Camden is using the re-submission to change the scope, going against the wishes of the people who live in the block and who care for the building. I would also like to state that all of my windows (75a) are original and in perfect working order. Others in the block ar</p>
2015/3709/P	Catriona Hill	79B Mansfield Road NW3 2JE	30/12/2015 18:53:31	OBJ	<p>My neighbours, Matt Thornley 51A and Elizabeth Pearson 71A, have commented extensively on the inaccuracy of the application and I agree with their comments. I object to the elements of the application which they have discussed in detail.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Catriona Hill	79B Mansfield Road NW3 2JE	28/12/2015 18:07:24	OBJ	<p>Catriona Hill 79b Mansfield Road, NW3 2JE</p> <p>My neighbours, Matt Thornley and Juliet Aston have compiled a list of observations, all of which I agree with and reiterate below.</p> <p>Change of scope and damage to the appearance of the building: The windows facing onto Mansfield Road (excluding A flat upper windows) were not part of the scope on which we were consulted. Previously Camden has confirmed to residents that these windows/doors do not need to be replaced as they are not subject to weathering damage (windows onto 'B' flat yards and 'A' flat walkway are under permanent cover). Generally these windows are in good condition and Camden had previously confirmed to residents that these would be kept. These windows, facing onto Mansfield Road, are a key feature of the architecture of the locally listed block. The bespoke nature of the doors and windows will be lost due to the proposals (such as omitting the barn doors) and this will have a detrimental effect on the reading of the building. As a group, we have written to Camden about our dismay over this last minute change of scope (letter forwarded to Anna Roe from Jack Trench on 24.12.15). As stated within our letter, the flats are generally very warm and the key issues of cold bridging etc, which can only be dealt with by internal treatments, are being ignored by the council. Similarly Camden are refusing to meter the use of gas in the block which is an established method of reducing consumption. As such the use of 'reduced heating bills' as a rational to degrade the appearance of the block is difficult to understand or accept. We are dismayed that the scope has been changed and this will fundamentally affect the building. We previously understood that the re-submission of drawings was being carried out to pick up inaccuracies and errors within the previous applications. We feel Camden is using the re-submission to change the scope, going against the wishes of the people who live in the block and who care for</p>
2015/3709/P	Julia Wilson	55a Mansfield Road	29/12/2015 14:04:43	OBJ	<p>My objections to the proposed works are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) inaccurate window drawings which do not reflect current measurements</li> <li>b) intention to replace windows facing Mansfield Road. This was not included in the original proposal and is not necessary. These north-facing and sheltered windows have not been subject to weathering damage. Reference to reduced heating bills seems odd, given Camden's refusal to install gas meters in the flats</li> <li>c) intention to remove vents on sliding doors and in kitchen - these provide important ventilation access</li> <li>d) sliding doors - the current plan has the internal element being the sliding part. This will have a significant impact on internal furnishings and flooring, as damp and dirt from outside will come into the flats</li> <li>e) ballustrade around rooflights - there is currently no ballustrade, therefore there is no reason to replace or repair. Camden has previously stated that a ballustrade would not form part of the works. A ballustrade would have a negative impact on the appearance of the architecturally renowned building</li> </ul> <p>Julia Wilson, Leaseholder 55a</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Julie Chan & Jack Trench	45A Mansfield Road London NW3 2JE	28/12/2015 17:47:26	OBJ	<p>Further to our previous comments submitted earlier today 28th December 2015, we would like to make the following comments / objections:</p> <p><b>BALUSTRADES ROOF LIGHTS</b></p> <p>The DAS starts that the balustrading is to be repaired and where required, replaced, to match existing. Within 'existing and proposed section AA' it states that these are to be replaced with stainless steel posts. This is not in as per the existing and this has been stated both to Camden Housing and Camden Planning Department before. Similarly, Camden has previously stated to residents that replacing the balustrading with SS posts would not form part of the works. We feel as though we are being misled and feel that that this change would have a detrimental impact on the appearance and detail of this locally listed building.</p> <p><b>DESIGN &amp; ACCESS STATEMENT</b></p> <p>There are a number of statements within the design and access statement that are inaccurate. The design and access statement notes the current practices such as 'secure by design' etc mean windows cannot be matched like for like (para 2.2.2). This is an inaccurate statement. A more true statement is the contractor's preferred sub-contractor cannot manufacture such doors. As such the design and access statement is misleading.</p> <p><b>INTEGRATION WITH EXISTING BUILDING</b></p> <p>The frame sizes shown differ from the true existing condition. The existing frames tie into internal linings which is key to the design ethos of the block. As such, the proposals will have a detrimental impact to this and to the quality of the internal spaces. We feel that this is not acceptable. Camden has stated before that the windows will work with the existing linings. The windows that form this application do not. Again we feel misled and that the changes will create irreversible damage to our homes.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Sumaya Partner	53b Mansfield Road	28/12/2015 21:25:51	OBJ	Change of scope: Windows

The replacement of 'A' Flat and 'B' Flat windows that face Mansfield Road (types A, B, G, J, F and H) was not part of the original scope. In consultations it was always stated by Camden that because the 'A' flat kitchen windows and the doors and windows facing the 'B' flat yards are protected from the elements they would not be replaced. As someone who lives in a 'B' Flat, I know that replacing these windows and doors is entirely unnecessary – my flat is incredibly warm.

I was also upset to see that in the newly submitted plans the large door (J) on to the Flat B yard is not shown as a stable door. At present both doors (J and F) on to the front yard are handsome, practical stable doors – key features of the original design that are an important part of the appeal of this unique building.

Since the previous scope the plans for Type H windows continue to show the wrong dimensions.

Type B kitchen windows. The plans do not include the wooden opening vent, which is an important part of the window design.

I remain concerned about the plans for the rear Basement Level type P door and window. The size of these openings needs to align with the differing interior layouts of the 'B' Flats.

I am distressed by the manner in which Camden has suddenly, at the last minute, added front window replacement to the scope of works. This is a major change and it will alter the scale of the works and the look of the block, and I believe this will be to the permanent detriment of the architecture. It will not improve the quality of life within the building. If the need to conserve energy is the reason why Camden has announced it wishes to replace all the front windows then surely a far more effective method of energy saving would be to put all the flats on individual meters. This is a simpler and more cost effective method and it could be done without any damage to the architectural integrity of the building.

I strongly object to the replacement of the types A, B, G, J, F and H windows on the front elevation.



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Paul and Marcella Anstatt	53A Mansfield Road London NW3 2JE	26/12/2015 00:06:22	OBJ	<p>Regarding Drawings submitted:</p> <p>PL24: The drawing of existing 'Type M' A Flat terrace window configuration is not applicable to all variations. Most do not have a split side vent. The original side panels are full height operable - not split.</p> <p>PL25: Proposed window 'Type M'. There are a number of issues with the proposed type M window replacement. During consultation it was stated that the replacement window would 'match' the existing. This drawing indicates that the replacement will match the 'B Flat window, not the 'A Flat window. The side panels are different sizes than existing.</p> <p>We object to the solid panel side vent (that is proposed for M windows) to become fixed! This operable side vent panel serves to ventilate the bedroom! If it is solid then the bedroom can not have natural ventilation. It was specifically designed as a narrow vent panel so that it can be open while still being safe as it is too narrow to allow access for an intruder.</p> <p>The sliding door is, in the partial plans, shown as being internal to the fixed panel and external to the fixed panel. They are currently external and should remain so as this is a better waterproofing detail. It is concerning that the drawings are not coordinated to present a clear picture of the proposal. Previous planning drawings indicated a replacement which matched the existing and this should be returned to. This configuration is ok on B Flats where the windows are protected from weather by large overhang, A Flat windows are more exposed.</p> <p>PL03: There are conflicting notes concerning the edge protection around the mono-pitched roof glazing screen (for A flats). One note says that the existing guardrail is to be replaced but another note on the same drawing says for the existing guardrail to be "retained and refurbished". It had been agreed in the consultation meeting with Camden (Sept 10th) that these rails would NOT be replaced and only refurbished/repared as needed.</p>
2015/3709/P	Kevin Fellingham and Winnie Sze	17A Mansfield Road London NW3 2JE	29/12/2015 07:14:54	OBJ	<p>We object to the effective change of scope which was agreed at previous consultation. We object to the carrying out of unnecessary work which goes against the principal of conservation of historically significant structures which is to retain as much of the original fabric as possible, replacing only as necessary. We note that despite this being the 3rd submission of drawings, fundamental errors of documentation still exist, which if carried out would result in high rectification costs. This would greatly delay the programme and result in a botched job. We hope, for the sake of efficiency and cost management, that this is the last time we need to bring up the matter and that Camden will ensure its contractors do the job properly once and for all.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Leigh Johnson	75a Mansfield Road	30/12/2015 21:02:32	OBJ	<p>Leigh Johnson 75a Mansfield Road, NW3 2JE</p> <p>Change of scope and damage to the appearance of the building The windows facing onto Mansfield Road (excluding A flat upper windows) were not part of the scope on which we were consulted. Previously Camden has confirmed to residents that these windows/doors do not need to be replaced as they are not subject to weathering damage (windows onto 'B' flat yards and 'A' flat walkway are under permanent cover). Generally these windows are in good condition and Camden had previously confirmed to residents that these would be kept. These windows, facing onto Mansfield Road, are a key feature of the architecture of the locally listed block. The bespoke nature of the doors and windows will be lost due to the proposals (such as omitting the barn doors) and this will have a detrimental effect on the reading of the building. As a group, we have written to Camden about our dismay over this last minute change of scope (letter forwarded to Anna Roe from Jack Trench on 24.12.15). As stated within our letter, the flats are generally very warm and the key issues of cold bridging etc, which can only be dealt with by internal treatments, are being ignored by the council. Similarly Camden are refusing to meter the use of gas in the block which is an established method of reducing consumption. As such the use of 'reduced heating bills' as a rational to degrade the appearance of the block is difficult to understand or accept. I am dismayed that the scope has been changed and this will fundamentally affect the building. We previously understood that the re-submission of drawings was being carried out to pick up inaccuracies and errors within the previous applications. We feel Camden is using the re-submission to change the scope, going against the wishes of the people who live in the block and who care for the building. I would also like to state that all of my windows (75a) are original and in perfect working order. Others in the block ar</p>
2015/3709/P	Leigh Johnson	75a Mansfield Road	30/12/2015 21:03:38	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Matt Thornley and Juliet Aston	51b Mansfield Road London NW3 2JE	28/12/2015 17:11:00	OBJ	<p>Matt Thornley and Juliet Aston 51b Mansfield Road, NW3 2JE</p> <p>Change of scope and damage to the appearance of the building The windows facing onto Mansfield Road (excluding A flat upper windows) were not part of the scope on which we were consulted. Previously Camden has confirmed to residents that these windows/doors do not need to be replaced as they are not subject to weathering damage (windows onto 'B' flat yards and 'A' flat walkway are under permanent cover). Generally these windows are in good condition and Camden had previously confirmed to residents that these would be kept. These windows, facing onto Mansfield Road, are a key feature of the architecture of the locally listed block. The bespoke nature of the doors and windows will be lost due to the proposals (such as omitting the barn doors) and this will have a detrimental effect on the reading of the building. As a group, we have written to Camden about our dismay over this last minute change of scope (letter forwarded to Anna Roe from Jack Trench on 24.12.15). As stated within our letter, the flats are generally very warm and the key issues of cold bridging etc, which can only be dealt with by internal treatments, are being ignored by the council. Similarly Camden are refusing to meter the use of gas in the block which is an established method of reducing consumption. As such the use of 'reduced heating bills' as a rational to degrade the appearance of the block is difficult to understand or accept. We are dismayed that the scope has been changed and this will fundamentally affect the building. We previously understood that the re-submission of drawings was being carried out to pick up inaccuracies and errors within the previous applications. We feel Camden is using the re-submission to change the scope, going against the wishes of the people who live in the block and who care for the building. We would also like to state that all of our windows (51b) are original and in perfect working order. Others in the block are in the same position as ourselves. As such, we need no reason why these should be replaced wholesale. We have opened our house up as part of 'Open House' and had over 200 visitors. The estate is locally and internationally recognised and the works being proposed will have a serious and irreversible impact to the block. Design and access statement There are a number of statements within the design and access statement that are inaccurate. The design and access statement notes the current practices such as 'secure by design' etc mean windows cannot be matched like for like (para 2.2.2). This is an inaccurate statement. A more true statement is the contractor's preferred sub-contractor cannot manufacture such doors. As such the design and access statement is misleading. A similar example of this is that frames to roof lights need to be wider to meet current building regulations (para 2.6.1). Again this is inaccurate. There are systems available that could more closely match the existing condition. We believe that changing the rooflights is unnecessary and will detrimentally affect the architecture of this locally listed building. Balustrades around roof lights The DAS states that the balustrading is to be repaired and where required, replaced, to match existing. Within 'existing and proposed section AA' it states that these are to be replaced with stainless steel posts. This is not in as per the existing and this has been stated both to Camden Housing and Camden Planning Department before. Similarly, Camden has previously stated to residents that replacing the balustrading with SS posts would not form part of the works. We feel as though we are being misled</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>and feel that that this change would have a detrimental impact on the appearance and detail of this locally listed building.</p> <p>Architype drawings</p> <p>These are inaccurate. The type M windows, regardless of the location are keyed to a flat A roof terrace window. The window types change between the A and B flats.</p> <p>Architype A drawing show incorrect window fenestration to all of the B flat windows facing onto the yard.</p> <p>Window type E is shown incorrectly – can be seen on the adjacent photograph.</p> <p>Comments on existing/proposed window drawings drawings</p> <p>All comments provided here should be read in conjunction with the points made earlier within this objection however we would also like to record the following additional comments</p> <p>Window frame width</p> <p>The existing frames are not dimensioned. As such it is not possible to assess how the detail of the existing and proposed changes.</p> <p>Type A&amp;B</p> <p>The proposals remove the solid opening vent to the kitchen which is a key feature to the architecture. The proposed dimensions for the structural opening do not match those on the existing. As such, they would require 60mm of filler between frames and tiling which would have a major and detrimental impact on the appearance of the block.</p> <p>Type F&amp;G</p> <p>This is not as per the existing condition in terms of design, size or layout. The existing and proposed drawings show different opening sizes. The bottom panel shown as fixed is also opening in the true existing condition. We would note that type F&amp;G as existing is not as per our window (51b) and this is an original existing window. The proposed does not match the true existing condition and the proposals omit the split window design which is a key characteristic. The existing drawings bear no resemblance to the existing condition and the proposed changes will impact both the design and the use of the rooms beyond. We would note that there are a variety of types for b float windows, as noted before, and the current scheme appears not to relate to any of these.</p> <p>Type J</p> <p>The existing condition is incorrectly shown in terms of design and size. The proposals fundamentally change the design of the window, omitting the barn door and introducing external ironmongery that does not exist. We do not find this unacceptable and it will have an irreversible impact to the quality of the block. By introducing the external locking, the doors will also be less secure than the existing condition. As such, the ‘secure by design’ requirement within the DAS is again inaccurate and misleading.</p> <p>Type P</p> <p>Again the existing condition is shown incorrectly. The lower unit to the right is fixed and the top section above is top hung. The ‘existing timber panel’ is actually a vent. The location of the central mullion on the existing and proposed is slightly in the wrong place. This is critical as this acts as a door stop to a sliding partition internally.</p> <p>Type M</p> <p>These windows currently have an operable vent which is being shown on existing and proposed as fixed/part fixed. The opening panels are key to the original designs and are functional. The proportions</p>

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

**Comment:**   **Response:**

of the fixed glazed panel is also shown differently on the proposed compared to existing. The proposed doors slide internally. The existing condition is that they slide externally. Sliding internally will cause issues with internal linings/built in original furniture etc.

Type O

The existing drawings show a solid panel which is fixed. This is incorrect and is actually an opening vent which is a key feature to the design and provides ventilation to the room. The removal of this opening panel is unacceptable. We would note that this was shown as an opening vent panel on the previously submitted drawings, now superseded by this current set!

The existing drawings are dimensionally incorrect, by a significant amount (nearly 200mm in places). As such the existing is wrong and the proposals are not as per the true existing and as such this is unacceptable.

Type H

The existing drawings are dimensionally incorrect both in height and width! As such the existing is wrong and the proposals are not as per the true existing and as such this is unacceptable.

Structural openings

On all of the above, we would note that the structural openings cannot be changed and as such the inaccuracies are very concerning.

Integration with the existing building

The frame sizes shown differ from the true existing condition. The existing frames tie into internal linings which is key to the design ethos of the block. As such, the proposals will have a detrimental impact to this and to the quality of the internal spaces. We feel that this is not acceptable. Camden has stated before that the windows will work with the existing linings. The windows that form this application do not. Again we feel mislead and that the changes will create irreversible damage to our homes.

Planning application drawings

There does not appear to be a full set of 'existing' and 'proposed' elevations. These are generally standard for a valid planning application and required to understand the impact of the proposals.

Conclusion

The scope of the application has changed and we feel we have not been properly consulted by Camden and in many ways, we have been misled.

The proposed works are not reasonably required in many cases and the proposals will have a detrimental and irreversible impact on the building which is locally listed and internationally recognised as being architectural significant.

The application is still inaccurate. We would note that this is the third time which we have been asked to review drawings and they are still incorrect. We would also note that others in our block simply do not have the time or will to continually review an application that should be straight forward. We would state that as many of the issues previously raised have not been addressed in the drawings, the previous objections should be considered when reviewing this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Leigh Johnson	75a Mansfield Road	30/12/2015 21:02:49	OBJ	<p>Leigh Johnson 75a Mansfield Road, NW3 2JE</p> <p>Change of scope and damage to the appearance of the building The windows facing onto Mansfield Road (excluding A flat upper windows) were not part of the scope on which we were consulted. Previously Camden has confirmed to residents that these windows/doors do not need to be replaced as they are not subject to weathering damage (windows onto 'B' flat yards and 'A' flat walkway are under permanent cover). Generally these windows are in good condition and Camden had previously confirmed to residents that these would be kept. These windows, facing onto Mansfield Road, are a key feature of the architecture of the locally listed block. The bespoke nature of the doors and windows will be lost due to the proposals (such as omitting the barn doors) and this will have a detrimental effect on the reading of the building. As a group, we have written to Camden about our dismay over this last minute change of scope (letter forwarded to Anna Roe from Jack Trench on 24.12.15). As stated within our letter, the flats are generally very warm and the key issues of cold bridging etc, which can only be dealt with by internal treatments, are being ignored by the council. Similarly Camden are refusing to meter the use of gas in the block which is an established method of reducing consumption. As such the use of 'reduced heating bills' as a rational to degrade the appearance of the block is difficult to understand or accept. I am dismayed that the scope has been changed and this will fundamentally affect the building. We previously understood that the re-submission of drawings was being carried out to pick up inaccuracies and errors within the previous applications. We feel Camden is using the re-submission to change the scope, going against the wishes of the people who live in the block and who care for the building. I would also like to state that all of my windows (75a) are original and in perfect working order. Others in the block ar</p>
2015/3709/P	Leigh Johnson	75a Mansfield Road	30/12/2015 21:02:47	OBJ	
2015/3709/P	Elaine Spraggan	23a Mansfield Road London NW32JE	30/12/2015 14:55:42	COMMNT	I do not think it is necessary to replace the windows in the kitchens of the A. flats at the front that lead on to the red walkway.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Elizabeth Pearson	71a Mansfield Road London	30/12/2015 12:56:26	COMNOT	<p>Dear Anna,</p> <p>I would like to make the following comments on the above application.</p> <p>1) The application is titled inaccurately since Camden are now intending to replace all the windows on 17-79 Mansfield Road, going back on statements made at consultation meetings with the residents that they would refurbish some and replace some. Leaseholders also submitted an independent survey report which stated that many of the windows are not in need of replacement, in particular window types A, B, C, G, J, F and P.</p> <p>2) There is a unexplained 'ledge' shown on drawing PL15 Architype A 3D View - going from the railings to the courtyard of Flat B to the railings on the walkway which is not replacing anything already there.</p> <p>3) There are the following differences between the current windows and the ones proposed as part of the capital works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed Window Type A removes the opening panel giving ventilation to the kitchen.</li> <li>Proposed Window Types F and G have a different structural opening to the existing and therefore would not work.</li> <li>Proposed Type J Windows omit the split door in favour of a single door. I oppose this as it changes the design significantly and is an important element of the original design.</li> <li>Proposed Window Types M and O (sliding doors) do not have the existing opening vents and are shown as a fixed panel. The opening panels are key to the original designs and provide an important and secure source of ventilation to the bedrooms (A flats) and living areas (B flats). In addition the whole proportion of the fixed glazed panel is shown differently to the to existing. The proposed doors slide internally rather than externally and changing this will cause issues with internal linings/built in original furniture etc.</li> <li>Existing Type P Windows are top not side hung.</li> </ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3709/P	Catriona Hill	79B Mansfield Road NW3 2JE	28/12/2015 18:07:11	OBJ	<p>Catriona Hill 79b Mansfield Road, NW3 2JE</p> <p>My neighbours, Matt Thornley and Juliet Aston have compiled a list of observations, all of which I agree with and reiterate below.</p> <p>Change of scope and damage to the appearance of the building: The windows facing onto Mansfield Road (excluding A flat upper windows) were not part of the scope on which we were consulted. Previously Camden has confirmed to residents that these windows/doors do not need to be replaced as they are not subject to weathering damage (windows onto 'B' flat yards and 'A' flat walkway are under permanent cover). Generally these windows are in good condition and Camden had previously confirmed to residents that these would be kept.</p> <p>These windows, facing onto Mansfield Road, are a key feature of the architecture of the locally listed block. The bespoke nature of the doors and windows will be lost due to the proposals (such as omitting the barn doors) and this will have a detrimental effect on the reading of the building. As a group, we have written to Camden about our dismay over this last minute change of scope (letter forwarded to Anna Roe from Jack Trench on 24.12.15). As stated within our letter, the flats are generally very warm and the key issues of cold bridging etc, which can only be dealt with by internal treatments, are being ignored by the council. Similarly Camden are refusing to meter the use of gas in the block which is an established method of reducing consumption. As such the use of 'reduced heating bills' as a rational to degrade the appearance of the block is difficult to understand or accept.</p> <p>We are dismayed that the scope has been changed and this will fundamentally affect the building. We previously understood that the re-submission of drawings was being carried out to pick up inaccuracies and errors within the previous applications. We feel Camden is using the re-submission to change the scope, going against the wishes of the people who live in the block and who care for</p>
2015/3709/P	Catriona Hill	79B Mansfield Road NW3 2JE	28/12/2015 18:07:07	OBJ	
2015/3709/P	Catriona Hill	79B Mansfield Road NW3 2JE	28/12/2015 18:06:59	OBJ	