
From: English, Rachel
Sent: 25 February 2020 16:14
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 1 Hillfield Road - Objections
Attachments: 2nd floor plan missing line suggesting 1 level.pdf; roof plan missing staircase and turn to landing hazard.pdf; section missing landing.pdf; front elevation not showing the landing to basement flat.pdf

Please log with 2019/3109/P

Rachel English
Senior Planner

Telephone: 020 7974 2726



Sent: 25 February 2020 11:09
To: English, Rachel <Rachel.English@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: 1 Hillfield Road - Objections

Dear Rachel

I have seen the updated drawings and I find it miss leading at best.

I am not sure why an experienced architectural company keep making these mistakes with inconsistency unless they are deliberate. Surely the focus should be on finding a good solution. As you know I am not apposed at all for creating a good basement flat.

Please see attached drawings where I have indicated the inconsistency and mistakes.

1. 2nd floor plan and roof plan have the landing as open and one as closed from the main entrance staircase towards the basement, see attach.
2. Front elevation does not show the landing, see attach.
3. Cross section does not show the landing level and stairs going down, see attached.
4. The cross section front bay lower brickwork does not corelate with the front elevation. The brick work dimension below the basement window should be similar as the basement bay windows to ground floor bay windows or from ground floor bay windows to first floor bay windows or in fact looking closer at the cross section it should be even smaller unless the cross section is wrong. See attached.
5. 2nd floor plan and roof plan do not show the stairs going down to the basement level
6. 2nd floor plan and roof plan seems to imply that there is some sort of railing or wall but the cross section clearly shows no railing or wall just open stair case.
7. If railing is in place or a wall then the opening to the landing is c60cm surely inadequate.

Is this landing at all complies? Part K states landing should be the width of the staircase not the width of a going of a step. It also states the following "In dwellings 1.37 In exceptional circumstances where severely sloping plots are involved, a stepped change of level within the entrance storey may be unavoidable. In those instances, if a flight compromises three or more risers, provide a suitable continues handrail in accordance with both of the following. a. On each side of the flight. b. On each side of any intermediate landings."

On another note the roof plan does not show the dormer set back from the ridge.

There are far too many mistakes and inconsistencies with these drawings and previous drawings which making me inclined to think that this are deliberate in an attempt confuse things and mislead.

Please remove my personal details if posted on Camden web site

Kind regards

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the sender's name and signature.