

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4542/L	Marie Poole	12/11/2020 17:31:16	OBJNOT	<p>I have already listed my objections to this planning application but here we go again. No submission to listed building until job started and had to stop because pipework ran across kitchen windows stopping the same from opening. There has been untold opportunity for Camden and Cadent to properly consult with residents on this issue. Did they? makes me not willing to trust that the judgement of both to uphold the acclaimed Architecture that Camden are fond of illuminating. Pipework that closes a window for the next 30 years is a prime example of bad planning and workmanship. let alone aesthetics. Each year week have untold numbers of students visit this estate from home and abroad. N.Browns Riba gold award would be worthless if this proposed plan were to go ahead without proper input and approval. After all isn't Camdens planning dept.reputation on the line as well.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4542/L	David Snower	08/11/2020 19:33:36	OBJ	<p>As a resident of a first floor property on the Dunboyne Road Estate on whom these plans would have a direct impact I object to this revised application on the grounds that the original application was not carried out properly, that it fails to satisfy Camden's own observations at the pre-planning stage, that it fails to satisfy the applicant's own mitigating principles and that the description of the design does not give an accurate representation of the impact of the plans, which are evidently conspicuous, incongruous with the architectural spirit of the Grade II listed estate, and impractical.</p> <p>In paragraph 1.2 of the revised Heritage Assessment, it is highlighted that 'Listed building consent for the installation of external gas pipework to the six blocks within the estate has been granted previously by Camden Council under application reference 2019/3981/L'. I would like to point out that residents were not notified of the initial application, as they ought to have been under the Town and Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. In paragraph 1.3, the applicant acknowledges that the initial plans failed to notice that installing the pipework in front of the kitchen window would impede its opening. Had the applicant properly consulted with residents, they would easily have identified this problem. The secrecy of the initial application is only made more suspicious by its obvious and abject mistakes. Given the lack of meaningful opportunity for residents to comment on the initial application, I argue that the initial decision should have no bearing on the revised application.</p> <p>In paragraph 1.7, the applicant quoted the observations of Camden Council as part of the original pre-planning enquiry. Camden stated that the pipe routes should '...be as logical as possible and to respect architectural features, for example pipes should not cut across windows...' Given this, it is all the more baffling that the plans are now having to be revised because the original pipe route impeded the opening of the kitchen window. I would point out that even the revised plans propose routing the pipes in front of the windows – albeit allowing more room for opening. The pipes will still be clearly visible from inside the windows, will block out light and cover the view, already restricted by the protruding balconies. The application obviously fails to consider the impact of the plans on the residents within the properties. As a relevant leaseholder, I strongly object to any plan to route the pipes in front of my kitchen window. I would also argue that there are far more logical routes, which I shall detail below, meaning that Camden Council's stipulation that the routes 'be as logical as possible' has also been disregarded.</p> <p>In paragraph 6.1, the applicant lists sensible principles for mitigating the impacts of the proposed work. However, the most basic of these principles, 'be discreetly located', is clearly not met. This would be self-evident had the applicant included pictures of the pipework it had already installed. Indeed, it should raise eyebrows that the revised Heritage Assessment used photos of the first-floor elevations of block 1 before the installation of new pipework, when photos of block one after installation of the new pipework would obviously have been more instructive. I have taken my own photos which I shall include in a written version of this objection that I shall send to Camden Planning. Here, I shall simply describe the main features which I and other residents find objectionable.</p> <p>Although it is not clear from any of the drawings, the installation of the pipes entails the suspension of the pipes from the underside of the balconies, not the running of the pipes flush to the surface. It is once again curious that while the application provides granular details about the measurements of the pipes and their routes, it fails to give an accurate measurement of the distance between the pipe and the underside of the balcony – stating only that 'The pipework is to be fixed close to the underside of the balcony as permissible to minimise any gap between the underside of the balcony and the pipework.' Surely the size of this gap is</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

integral to the merits of the application and its omission is further evidence of its misleading nature.

I assume that the existing gap is a requirement of safety standards. Be that as it may, the effect is anything but discreet (see my photos). From a distance the white pipes suspended at eye level in front of the black window frames could not look any more conspicuous. Painting the pipes black would not remedy the situation as this would accentuate their presence against the white underside of the balcony when viewed from up close. And viewed from the front door or kitchen window, the pipe will obscure the view of the garden terrace and sky regardless of its colour. Given the amount of time the residents are likely to spend looking out of their kitchen windows, it is disappointing that their perspective has been ignored by this application. There is simply no way that pipes suspended in front of windows and front doors could be discreet.

The suspension of pipework from the underside of buildings is neither common nor to be found anywhere else on the estate. I would argue that that such a novel and unusual design would itself attract attention as a feature, thus distracting from the architectural significance of the Grade II listed buildings and disrespecting the original intentions of Neave Brown, the celebrated Camden architect.

I do not object to the installation of safe gas pipework per se. Indeed, I would welcome it if a discreet and sympathetic design can be found. A number of residents offered to discuss alternative routes for the pipes with the applicant but these offers were ignored. It is not incumbent on residents to devise viable routes for the pipes, but I would suggest two possible alternatives:

A. The pipes to the first-floor properties could be routed up the front ground floor elevations of blocks 1, 3 and 6 alongside the existing black waste pipes (which can be seen in plates 2 and 4 on pages 29 and 30 of the Heritage Assessment). The pipes could be painted black while they run alongside the waste pipes and white once they turn 90 degrees to enter the first-floor kitchens.

B. Alternatively, if there is a safety consideration that would preclude running the gas pipes alongside the waste pipes, they could be routed up the front ground floor elevations through the gaps between ground floor property windows to reach the first-floor properties.

I will include my own pictures illustrating these proposals in the hard copy of this objection. While both these proposals would still have a visual impact on the appearance of the estate, I believe that they would be preferable in the following ways:

- they would not obscure the views or function of any residents' windows;
- they would be more in keeping with existing pipework, which all runs along elevations rather than being suspended from overhanging balconies;
- they would require less visible pipework in total as the 'trunk' of the pipes could run concealed under the ground floor paving (as it will have to do to service the ground floor properties in any case); and
- the route would be simpler and more logical without so many turns in the pipes.

I hope that these alternatives merit consideration, but regardless of their viability, I implore Camden Council to stick to its original observations in the pre-planning enquiry that the pipe routes be as logical as possible, which is obviously not the case, and that pipes should not cut across windows, whether or not they impede their opening. On this basis, listed building consent for these proposals should be withheld.

I am copying the hard copy of this objection letter to Lorraine Revah, Counsellor for Gospel Oak Ward who is

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4542/L	Carolina Ambida	12/11/2020 23:07:02	OBJ	<p>already aware of residents' concerns with this application, and Sophie Jones from Wardell Armstrong who submitted the application on behalf of Cadent Gas Ltd.</p> <hr/> <p>I strongly object to the "Installation of gas pipe apparatus on the front elevations of properties".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Currently the line of the bottom of the top balconies is clean and minimal, the gas pipe will interrupt this and be a main feature.-It looks like a cheap, and easy option to hang a pipe at the most convenient location and completely disregards the architecture. It's contemptuous towards the estate and the people who live here and will have to look at it everyday and to simply paint the pipes white is laughable and will only highlight the obvious attempt to disguise it.- It is and will be highly visible from the only windows we have from our kitchen- The gas pipes will be an obstruction to our view-I think that from a health and safety point of view it seems a dangerous proposition to hang, in mid-air, a long gas pipe at the front of windows and doors and lighting. The Dunboyne estate is a low rise building and clearance under the top balcony is in proportion to these elevations. The pipes will 'shorten' this clearance and this has to be considered. Also, the gas pipes will be very exposed to the elements and in the summer months and extreme heat. <p>I strongly object the this planning application</p> <hr/>