

THE REGENT'S CANAL CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
31 OVAL ROAD, CAMDEN TOWN, LONDON NW1 7EA

Secretary: Anthony Richardson

Please reply to: Anthony Richardson email: anthonyrichardson@arparchitects.co.uk Tel: 020 7485 0991

Josleen Chug
Planning Case Officer
LB Camden,
Regeneration and Planning
2nd Floor,
5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

21 Feb 2016

BY E-MAIL

Dear Ms Chug

KXC Camley Bridge, Applications Nos. 2016/0288/P and 2016/0289/C

Generally this is a commendable design, elegant in concept and detail and well thought through. However, the Regent's Canal Conservation Area Advisory Committee OBJECTS that the proposals where the bridge meets the wall of the Wharf Road Viaduct are incomplete and must be subject to condition, that the proposed pattress plates are unsightly and that the wall beneath the arch of the viaduct should not be demolished for temporary works. These features are indicated on the drawings KX_MOX_A_BR3_1003_C, 2005_E, 3000_E and 3001_F.

1) Whereas the bridge breaks cleanly through the top of the existing wall face to bear on an independent abutment behind, an opening is proposed in the wall beneath the bridge deck to allow inspection of the bearings. Details are not given in the presented drawings, but it is proposed to close it with a door faced with reclaimed bricks. While the hinges to carry the weight of these doors may be a design issue, we agree that this approach to maintaining the expanse of brickwork should be much preferable to making the doors in timber, which the Canal and River Trust has suggested in their letter. An undisguised, timber or metal door at this point would severely upset the rhythm of exposed arches in the Wharf Road Viaduct. Skills in reinstating brickwork are available and they should be deployed here. Careful detailing will be needed to minimise and disguise the amount of stainless steel exposed in the door framing and the extent and sizes of clearance gaps. Also the drawings are ambiguous as to whether this opening would be centred on the viaduct arch immediately beneath or the centreline of the bridge deck immediately above.

The bridge will be seen and admired particularly at close quarters from the towpath, so the detailing here must be meticulous.

2) We OBJECT to the crude pattress plates applied to the face of the brick arch, which will look like clumsy remedial works. As an engineer I deduce they are to stabilise the abutment, by tying it back to the vault behind. The proposal is a direct way of doing that, but it is highly unsightly in this position. Ingenuity should be applied to connect the tie bars to the vault away from the face of the wall – the extra cost is unlikely to be disproportionate.

3) We OBJECT to consent for taking down the facing wall of the vault to facilitate construction of the abutment (see note on drawings _2005_E and _3001_F). No case is presented for this and, for example, the shuttering used for casting the pier could be left in place instead of demolishing the wall to remove it.

This section of the canalside boundary wall with its arches over former stables is particularly distinctive and also archaeologically very valuable, since the other canalside boundary walls have mostly been demolished for the development. So the utmost should be done to safeguard its character and minimise further rebuilding.

Yours sincerely

Malcolm T Tucker

Acting Chairman,
for RCCAAC