

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1784/L	Andrew Farkas	Flat 2 34 Museum Street London WC1A	26/04/2017 16:31:34	OBJEMPER	<p>The alterations started in May 2016 and concluded in February 2017. There is no way these could be described as 'minor'. The flat has been gutted and reconstructed.</p> <p>Seymour Three Ltd is a company of which Mr Alex Sargeson is/was a Director. Mr Sargeson is an architect. There is no way that an architect could not have known that planning consent and listed building consent was required. This project appears to have been undertaken with forethought and the intention of avoiding consent prospectively.</p> <p>An internal load bearing stud partition wall between the kitchen and the lounge has been removed (details and drawings supplied by Mrs Yeo in her comments). I am concerned that this has compromised the structure and integrity of the building. It is suggested that structural engineers have confirmed that no structural repairs have been undertaken. There is no supporting documentation to this effect.</p> <p>The new window in Bedroom 2 is out of keeping with the style of the house. The original sash window has been replaced by full length doors. It is unsympathetic with the design of the building and potentially unsafe.</p> <p>I have not been provided with any evidence of acoustic baffling in respect of the flooring. The noise level from movement in Flat 3 raises questions as to whether sound insulation compliant with building regulations has been used.</p> <p>In summary, the development is not minor. It is not consistent with the heritage of a Grade 2 listed building. No prospective independent supporting evidence has been provided to indicate the structural integrity of the building has not been compromised. I would request an INDEPENDENT structural survey and confirmation of the flooring insulation.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1784/L	Andrew Farkas	Flat 34 Museum Street London WC1A 1LH S10 3PQ	26/04/2017 16:16:59	COMMNT	<p>The alterations started in May 2016 and concluded in February 2017. There is no way these could be described as 'minor'. The flat has been gutted and reconstructed.</p> <p>Seymour Three Ltd is a company of which Mr Alex Sargeson is/was a Director. Mr Sargeson is an architect. There is no way that an architect could not have known that planning consent and listed building consent was required. This project appears to have been undertaken with forethought and the intention of avoiding consent prospectively.</p> <p>An internal load bearing stud partition wall between the kitchen and the lounge has been removed (details and drawings supplied by Mrs Yeo in her comments). I am concerned that this has compromised the structure and integrity of the building. It is suggested that structural engineers have confirmed that no structural repairs have been undertaken. There is no supporting documentation to this effect.</p> <p>The new window in Bedroom 2 is out of keeping with the style of the house. The original sash window has been replaced by full length doors. It is unsympathetic with the design of the building and potentially unsafe.</p> <p>I have not been provided with any evidence of acoustic baffling in respect of the flooring. The noise level from movement in Flat 3 raises questions as to whether sound insulation compliant with building regulations has been used.</p> <p>In summary, the development is not minor. It is not consistent with the heritage of a Grade 2 listed building. No prospective independent supporting evidence has been provided to indicate the structural integrity of the building has not been compromised. I would request an INDEPENDENT structural survey and confirmation of the flooring insulation.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1784/L	Andrew Farkas	Flat 2 34 Museum Street London WC1A	26/04/2017 16:31:18	OBJEMPER	<p>The alterations started in May 2016 and concluded in February 2017. There is no way these could be described as 'minor'. The flat has been gutted and reconstructed.</p> <p>Seymour Three Ltd is a company of which Mr Alex Sargeson is/was a Director. Mr Sargeson is an architect. There is no way that an architect could not have known that planning consent and listed building consent was required. This project appears to have been undertaken with forethought and the intention of avoiding consent prospectively.</p> <p>An internal load bearing stud partition wall between the kitchen and the lounge has been removed (details and drawings supplied by Mrs Yeo in her comments). I am concerned that this has compromised the structure and integrity of the building. It is suggested that structural engineers have confirmed that no structural repairs have been undertaken. There is no supporting documentation to this effect.</p> <p>The new window in Bedroom 2 is out of keeping with the style of the house. The original sash window has been replaced by full length doors. It is unsympathetic with the design of the building and potentially unsafe.</p> <p>I have not been provided with any evidence of acoustic baffling in respect of the flooring. The noise level from movement in Flat 3 raises questions as to whether sound insulation compliant with building regulations has been used.</p> <p>In summary, the development is not minor. It is not consistent with the heritage of a Grade 2 listed building. No prospective independent supporting evidence has been provided to indicate the structural integrity of the building has not been compromised. I would request an INDEPENDENT structural survey and confirmation of the flooring insulation.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1784/L	Maggie Yeo	Flat 1, 34 Museum Street London WC1A 1LH	26/04/2017 20:09:07	COMMNT	<p>im writing to confirm our objection to the retrospective listed and planning consent. There are two mains areas of concern, firstly the fenestrations (marked C) and referred to under 1.6 in the Heritage statement by Montagu Evans. Essentially, the original sash casement window has been replace with a pair of patio style french doors at the highest, third floor level of the building. These new doors look out onto an area where all of the buildings of a similar age retain their original look sash windows and are in keeping. Referring to document 9 of the application showing the pre-existing window and replacement doors, i would comment that these new, high level doors open out into the courtyard, this is not made clear from the plan detail, and ref. to a "glass balustrade" is shown to the outside of the external elevation detail. This is misleading. It is clear from these drawings that this balustrade stops well below the pre-existing windowsill height without a handrail or intermediate bars and leaves a sizeable gap at low level to access the door shoot bolts.</p> <p>The new opening ntroduces a significant risk of falling from height and compromises the privacy of neighbouring dwellings.</p> <p>Strictly, reference to the condition of the pre-existing window and framework is not relevant, however all other windows and frames installed at the same time as the pre existing-window casement remain in good, serviceable condition, save for problems caused by these recent works when all windows to the rear elevation were "painted shut" the broken window pane at the 3rd floor level in the common stairwell was damaged after the existing owners had taken occupation. No exposed hinges are shown on the drawing details, (photo to be sent separately) the installed doors have been fixed with ( internal) brass hinges fitted so that the knuckles and pins are visible externally. The photograph will also show the poor quality of installation, with unfinished render, poor painted timber and local downpipes wich have been over-painted in white masonry paint, at odds with all other downpipes and rainwater goods which are in black. All of these works were carried out via ladder access with scant regard for Health &amp; Safety, workmanship or preservation of originality.</p> <p>In respect of the annotation"transoms made to reflect spacing of pre-existing window", the pair of new French doors introduce six elongated panes of glass compared to the original two, almost square,sash panes. The door transoms are at completely different centres to those of the original window casement and replcement door set introduces a wide centre mullion.</p> <p>There is no smilarity whatsoever between the existing windows to the building and the installed door set. Which is not in keeping or can it be considered a minor alteration.</p> <p>Fenestration is a key element to the aesthetic of any building, the consistent design, uniformity and originality of opeings to our building, all of the surrounding buildings and indeed with the Bloomsbury local is of particular note, If allowed, the replacement of windows and inappropriate doors which are not in keeping sets an unacceptable precedent, especially given the buildings listed status. The original sash windows were incorporated when the building underwent a major refurb. in October 1993. Planning Permission was granted in accordance with the detailed plans submitted by the architect Andrew Harris Assoc. and in consultation with English Heritage. These plans and accompanying drawings took references from 33 Museum Street and 48 Great Russell Street in order to help preserve the historical significance of this building, despite previous internal updating. In 1993 it was considered the buildings importance warranted this much attention to original design details as quoted by</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Montagu Evans "the architect William Finch Hill"</p> <p>My second concern is the removal of the internal wall between the kitchen and the lounge, numbered point 5 in the Montagu Evans Planning Heritage Design and Access Statement. A previous planning application to remove this partition and create an open plan space identical to that which has now been created was submitted to London Borough of Camden in 1990. Planning permission was denied.</p> <p>This is a LOAD BEARING stud partition wall that was incorporated in its current form in the subsequent planning application approved in October 1993. We have provided you with a copy of the drawing ref:-9327/01 prepared by David Salter Consulting Engineers which clearly demonstrates this. I am very concerned that the structural integrity of this Grade 2 listed Heritage Asset may have been compromised by the removal of this partition; no supporting documents or structural calculations have been provided to demonstrate that the roof remains adequately supported or to ensure the facade, facing Great Russell Street, is not at risk of localised failure.</p> <p>Finally, regarding the raised floor that was removed and we are advised that a new laminate floor with acoustic baffle has been fitted, we do not have a proper independent report detailing this and its suitability.</p> <p>Clearly, time and effort has been invested in producing these Retrospective Applications, however the Montagu Evans Planning Heritage Design and Access Statement and many of the documents referred to therein do not support their contention that the alterations which have been made to the fenestration are in keeping or that they are minor.</p> <p>The same is true in respect of the internal changes, in particular the structural partition which has been removed. The Application includes historical plans showing an open-plan layout(ref.Montagu EvansPlanning &amp; Heritage Statement &amp; Design &amp; Access Statement Fig. 4,5,&amp; 6 respectively) which formed part of the aforementioned 1990 Planning Application. Each of these drawings has been annotated by Montagu Evans, referring to the as "1990 Plan". This is misleading, as the last of these chronologically (fig. 6) is clearly stamped PLANS NOT APPROVED ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL 17 JULY 1990, and the third floor has never previously existed in the current open-plan layout. There is insufficient evidence to confirm that the alterations conform with current Building Regulations or that they are safe. I am also concerned that the owners and their contractors have failed to comply with the requirements of The Construction (Design &amp; Management) Regulations 2015.</p> <p>The current owners purchased Flat 3, 34 Museum Street, in February 2016, commencing their extensive renovation programme shortly afterwards. Upon completion of the work almost exactly one year later, the property was re-marketed for sale at a significantly higher purchase price and it is now clear that the property was purchased solely as an investment opportunity. Generally speaking, while other residents may suffer disruption during such works (we certainly have), usually all parties benefit in the longer term from maintenance and improvements if they have been carried out correctly, with appropriate consent. As this clearly has not happened i am very concerned about the potential future consequences if the flat is to be sold without addressing these important issues and effecting appropriate rectification.</p>