

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6589/P	John Malet-Bates	Flat 6 4 Ferncroft Avenue NW3 7PH NW3 7PH	30/12/2016 12:30:57	OBJ	HCAAC objects to the general use of railings on high wall tops and questions their need. No evidence is given in the DAS as to past or recent incidents giving rise to concerns about infiltration of the site. A site of this nature should have permanent concierge cover and total CCTV coverage. No objection to the increase in railings height at the main entrance – indeed this should be increased to align with the main gates proposed new side panels. The elevation of the wall in front of the storage area shows the futility of erecting railings where similar protection is not available for the neighbour. This just pushes the problem downstream for a determined intruder to access the neighbour then choose a vulnerable spot on the joint boundary. While the southern boundary bow railings seem strange even associated with the 3 trees, HCAAC has no objection to them. We also question the point and adequacy of solid resin anchors in old lime-jointed walls. These will have to be carefully done – the section drawing does not explain how the anchors are actually fixed, seeming to require simultaneous mounting of the railings with the anchoring operation, which does not seem feasible. We ask for better study of this scheme if required and improved organisation of differing railings heights between gates and walls.
2016/6589/P	Mrs R Booth	4 Mount Vernon London NW3 6QS	04/01/2017 13:39:55	COMMNT	<p>I'm writing to object to the planning application 2016/6589/P.</p> <p>The fence on the Mount Vernon (road) side is currently 2.7 meters high which is very high indeed. The planned, increased height of the fencing will directly impact on the outlook from our house and the amount of daylight we get. Mount Vernon (road) is already deprived of daylight, not only for the residents, but also for many passers-by who use this as a short-cut, because of high fencing and overgrown trees. This road is perceived dangerous, at dark, by the local residents, with many women refusing to walk through here or requesting someone to accompany them. Please do not allow the situation to get any worse by increasing the height of the fencing.</p> <p>The security staff at Mount Vernon block indicated that they have had four recent burglaries which led to this planning application. On each occasion the burglars apparently gained entry through an open window. Surely the correct response to the situation is to advise the residents in the flats to keep their windows closed when going out? By increasing the height of the fencing, the residents will be lulled into a false sense of security. Mount Vernon block already has security staff working round the clock, a porter, a security gate, CCTV, security lighting and very high fencing. Surely that is sufficient?</p> <p>Situated in a conservation area, Mount Vernon block should remain in proportion to the neighbouring properties. Unfortunately, it is becoming more and more like a fortress, overshadowing everything else.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Mrs R Booth</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6589/P	Stephen Booth	4 Mount Vernon London NW3 6QS	04/01/2017 13:27:25	OBJ	<p>In respect of Planning Application "2016/6589/P", I am writing to object to the proposed erection of railings as well as a timber trellis to the southern boundary fence.</p> <p>With regard to the erection of the proposed metal railings, this would clearly make Mount Vernon (flats) more "fortress like", something that goes against Camden's Development Policies Document CPG1 (Design). It would also not be in keeping with the appearance of other properties, especially in the square, in what is a very important and beautiful conservation area.</p> <p>With regard to increasing the height of the wooden trellis, currently outside No.s 1-7 Mount Vernon (road), the height of the trellis is c.58cm, not the 73cm referred to in the application. Accordingly, the proposal is for a near doubling (to 1.1m), not c.50% increase, to the height of the trellis. Such an increase seems totally unnecessary, especially when the fence itself is already c.2.7m in height, as it would most definitely impact upon the outlook for all of the properties in Mount Vernon (road). With the properties also being north facing and already suffering from a lack of light, partly due to most of the trees on the grounds of Mount Vernon House being overgrown (1 is even impacting upon the fencing, forcing it open), increasing the height of the trellis will further impact upon the light into the properties.</p> <p>I do understand the need for security measures to be adequate. However, if this planning application is partly a response to what the security team mentioned have been 4 break-ins of late, surely it is the existing security team and arrangements (e.g. cameras) that are inadequate. Also, how would erecting high railings prevent burglars when the residents were also at fault for leaving windows open (according to security team). Having security measures in place is no excuse for stupidity on the residents' parts.</p> <p>I think the residents of Mount Vernon (flats) should first look at the existing problems rather than some over-the-top security alteration that would impact greatly the character of the area and look really quite ugly.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6589/P	Ethan & Tracy Sassower	5 Mount Vernon London NW3 6QS	30/12/2016 22:30:00	OBJ	<p>We refer to the timber fencing partly facing the entrances to the Georgian terraced houses (1-6 Mount Vernon), Abernathy House and the pedestrian way leading to Frogmal NW3.</p> <p>My wife and I own, and live with our 3 young children at, 5 Mount Vernon. We object to any alterations / additions to the existing timber fencing on this residential street (called Mount Vernon).</p> <p>We feel caged in already as our habitable rooms look directly out onto the existing fence with trellis, which are already very tall and restrict our natural light. The proposed raising of this composite fencing (fence + trellis) would adversely affect the amount of daylight reaching our north-facing homes and indeed the street would become even more of a canyon.</p> <p>We are unaware of any burglars having gained access to the Mount Vernon residential estate specifically from this non-pedestrianised section of the street so please provide the evidence, if any exists, as soon as possible; we do not see this section as being attractive to such criminality as it is heavily overlooked by no's 1-6 Mount Vernon and Abernathy House. We do not consider a raised trellis on top of the timber fencing to offer the desired deterring result.</p> <p>The proposed radial anti-climb steel frames would be categorically out of place in the remarkably well-preserved Georgian streetscape and should not be authorised. Existing documentation at the Holborn Library Archive Department ranging from 1902 to 1986 shows the consistent continuous simplicity of the timber boundary fencing; this should be scrupulously preserved.</p> <p>The effectiveness of the proposed anti-climb structures is anyway very questionable, mainly because the trees are on the property's side of the timber fencing. Here, the Application by Constantine Architects shows mainly drawn (diagrammatic) information only. Thus the clarity of significant details is lacking; in reality the trees except one are not on the street, but instead on the private land. Relevant photos are available at the Swiss Cottage library's information desk.</p> <p>If the trees are such a security risk then rather they should be regularly cut right back (they anyway block out much light on this narrow street). Alternatively the owners could plant continuous substantial thorny bushes on their side of the fence. We anyway understand that the porters from the Mount Vernon residential estate stated that all recent entries by burglars were via open windows! Each owner / resident has to decide upon the measures to be taken to secure his / her property without affecting, in this case, the streetscape and the existing amenities of the neighbours.</p> <p>In conclusion we categorically object to any alterations / additions to the existing timber fencing. Kindly ensure that the proposals contained in architect's drawing no. 105 (Mount Vernon – southern boundary – fencing) are rejected.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6589/P	Kristen Lippincott	3 Mount Vernon NW3 6QS NW3 6QS	30/12/2016 12:08:03	COMMNT	I strenuously object to the proposed plans to erect new railings over the perimeter and internal walls of this property and to increase the height of the southern boundary of the property with an additional trellis. The neighbourhood on all sides of Mount Vernon House is a listed conservation area. These proposals violate the architectural and urban landscaping integrity of the area, which has an open, residential feel, characterised by low-level wooden fencing, capped brick walls and relatively open vistas. The proposed alterations are totally inappropriate in terms of both the materials and scale bring suggested. The addition of railings to the existing brick walls will drastically and adversely affect the character of the neighbourhood. Moreover, raising the height on the southern perimeter of the property will reduce natural light and increase the noise levels on Mount Vernon (the street) and the much-used path to Frogna.
2016/6589/P	Mrs R Booth	4 Mount Vernon London NW3 6QS	04/01/2017 14:13:59	OBJ	<p>I'm writing to object to the planning application 2016/6589/P.</p> <p>The fence on the Mount Vernon (road) side is currently 2.7 meters high which is very high indeed. The planned, increased height of the fencing will directly impact on the outlook from our house and the amount of daylight we get. Mount Vernon (road) is already deprived of daylight because of high fencing and overgrown trees, not only for the residents but also for many passers-by who use this as a short-cut. This road is perceived to be dangerous by the local residents, with many women refusing to walk through or requesting someone to accompany them. Please do not allow the situation to get any worse by increasing the height of the fencing.</p> <p>The security staff at Mount Vernon block indicated that they have had four recent burglaries which led to this planning application. On each occasion the burglars apparently gained entry through an open window. Surely the correct response to this situation is to advise the residents in the flats to keep their windows closed when going out? By increasing the height of the fencing, the residents will be lulled into a false sense of security. Mount Vernon block already has security staff working round the clock, a porter, a security gate, CCTV, security lighting and very high fencing. Surely that is sufficient?</p> <p>Situated in a conservation area, Mount Vernon block should remain in proportion to the neighbouring properties. Unfortunately, it is becoming more and more like a fortress, overshadowing everything else.</p> <p>Please keep me updated on any progress.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Mrs R Booth</p> <p>P.S. I'm resending my message as it is meant as 'an objection', and not merely as 'a comment' as marked previously.</p>