

Hazelton, Laura

Subject: FW: 2018/3816/L Boncara 35 Templewood Avenue London NW3 7UY

From: Grace Etherington
Sent: 25 September 2018 12:06
To: Hazelton, Laura <Laura.Hazelton@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 2018/3816/L Boncara 35 Templewood Avenue London NW3 7UY

Hello Laura,

Sorry for the delay in my response about this, I have been particularly busy.

Yes, I did see the Purcell report before submitting my comments, however our objection does not question the information provided by them.

We understand that Purcell have been instructed to provide heritage advice supporting this application. This involves an assessment of the historic significance of various elements of the Grade II listed Schreiber pool, and sets out a plan for the careful dismantling of some of the fittings and structural elements. We are satisfied that the methods suggested for this dismantling will be effective. Our objection lies with the principle of relocation, and the demolition of original fabric that cannot be relocated, rather than the methods proposed.

We are opposed to the demolition and reconstruction of the reinforced concrete walls, as described in the Purcell report. As stated by Purcell, the original tiling, glazing and many of the fittings of the pool have been replaced, meaning the reinforced concrete walls constitute a major proportion of the listed building's original fabric. We recognise that structural issues have resulted in the pool leaking, however the structural investigation does not show that these issues cannot be addressed with the pool remaining in its original position.

The structural advice from Barrett Mahony dated 2 October 2017 states:

That complete reconstruction of the pool concrete structure will be significantly more economical than forensic examination and repair of the existing concrete structure. The level of intervention on the pool external and internal tiled finishes will be the same regardless of the approach taken for the concrete frame repair or reconstruction.

We do not consider the cost of repair of the existing listed concrete structure to justify its demolition. The structural report does not say that further investigation and repair work to the listed concrete structure is impossible, and we therefore do not consider our pre-app recommendation that "it is necessary that the option of repairing the structure in-situ is exhaustively investigated" has been fulfilled. My suggestion, echoing Tess' previous suggestion, recommends that the structural advice of a specialist in historic concrete be sought. We are satisfied with Purcell's contribution in providing specialist information regarding the building's historic significance.

The relocation of the pool will cause significant harm to the listed pool building, and the heritage benefits as proposed can be implemented without moving the pool. This was made clear in Camden's pre-application advice. We are therefore unconvinced that the harmful relocation of the pool is necessary, and recommend that repair work and sensitive enhancements to the listed structure be carried out.

In our experience the relocation of a listed structure will result in it being unlisted, as this process classifies as demolition. The applicant suggests otherwise, and we would like to see evidence to prove that this is the case.

The applicant's response to the objections also states: "reusing the original listed elements and only re-constructing the failing structural shell which is something outside of the public domain anyway". We would like to remind the applicant that lots of listed structures are not accessible to the public, and this in no way diminishes their historic importance nor warrants their demolition.

Please let me know if there is any other information that I can provide to help keep this case moving.

Thanks and best wishes,

Grace

Grace Etherington

Caseworker

The Twentieth Century Society

70 Cowcross Street

London EC1M 6EJ

[REDACTED]



From: Hazelton, Laura [<mailto:Laura.Hazelton@camden.gov.uk>]

Sent: 24 September 2018 17:30

To: Grace Etherington

Subject: FW: 2018/3816/L Boncara 35 Templewood Avenue London NW3 7UY

Hi Grace,

Hope you are well.

Just wondering whether you had had a chance to consider the email below?

Kind regards,

Laura Hazelton

Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1017

From: Martin Dunseath <[REDACTED]>

Sent: 05 September 2018 10:32

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: 2018/3816/L Boncara 35 Templewood Avenue London NW3 7UY

Dear Grace,

I have been forwarded your letter dated 14 August 2018 to Laura Hazleton relating to the above, which I have read and I see therefore that you make reference to the structural engineer in your letter. However, I didn't see any reference to the existing fabric assessment & reinstatement methodology report prepared by Purcell, which slightly makes me wonder whether you have seen this document that formed part of the planning / listed building consent application submission?

For ease of reference I have attached the report to this e-mail.

Regards

Martin

MARTIN DUNSEATH-FRANKLIN
BA DipArch RIBA
Partner

Purcell



This email is securely filed using Gekko, a [Cubic Interactive Ltd](#) product.
[PURCELL: 238926]

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.