

The Marylebone Association Planning Committee
RESPONSES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS – March 2010

13 MANSFIELD STREET

PT/10/00894/FULL/TP/8378 *Installation of French doors at rear ground floor level.*

OBJECTION: Balcony submitted as separate application

Section BB does not show the buildings in Harley Street (54, 56, 58) that may overlook the new doors and balcony.

Much thought has gone into mimicking the existing sash windows in the detailing of the new French doors to the extent of concealing meeting stiles in the narrow profile of a Georgian glazing bar! This is unnecessary and will weaken the door construction and we would favour a detailing truer to joinery requirements and designed for longevity, perhaps using Georgian glazed external doors as a precedent (for example those on the the rear buildings of Cumberland Place/Chester Gate London NW1).

WH: 12 March 2010

13 MANSFIELD STREET

PT/10/00892/FULL/TP/8378 *Erection of balcony on rear facade at ground floor level.*

OBJECTION: in conjunction with 10/00894/FULL

Further details of balustrade required. What is the mesh infill constructed of? – it's design derives more from Regency than Georgian precedent. What is the purpose of the 'external heating strip'? – this is not sustainable. The white render facing/edging is not detailed for longevity? A cast iron capitel and base is attached to the stainless steel support post which may lead to rusting if water gets into the joint.

If a balcony is to be erected we would favour a far simpler, well detailed construction perhaps using a simple Georgian railing as precedent for the balustrade. It would also look better spanning wall to party wall and avoiding the return.

WH: 12 March 2010

1 NUTFORD PLACE

PT/10/00815/FULL/TP/12294 *Replacement of roof tiles.*

OBJECTION: The proposed replacement tiles are of low quality and inappropriate to this highly visible expanse of roof in the Portman Estate Conservation Area. The existing roman clay tiles should not be used as a precedent and we would recommend replacement with a natural slate tile.

WH: 12 March 2010

65 MARYLEBONE HIGH STREET

PT/10/00922/TCH/TP/13556/PP-00961007 *Use of the public highway for the placing of two tables and eight chairs in an area measuring 1.34m x 3.575m in connection with existing sandwich shop.*

OBJECTION: Both the road and pavement are narrow in this section of Marylebone High street and to reduce the pavement width to 2.4m may force people into the road.

WH: 12 March 2010

5 SPANISH PLACE

PT/09/02439/FULL/TP/11181 *Erection of a metal gate to the front porch.*

No OBJECTION

WH: 12 March 2010

55 BAKER STREET

PT/10/00858/TCH/TP/6367 *Use of the public highway for the placing of 7 tables, 14 chairs and a waiter station in an area measuring 1.6m x 15m in connection with the existing ground floor restaurant.*

No OBJECTION

WH: 12 March 2010

75 BAKER STREET

PT/10/00297/FULL/TP/6519 *On the front facade, the creation of new basement lightwell with entrance door, window and access stairs, and the creation of a basement lightwell with entrance door, window and access stairs at the rear of the property (3A Montagu Row).*

OBJECTION: Further details/specification of railing and stair design required. The design of the new basement shopfront is not acceptable and further details will be required of a revised design.

WH: 12 March 2010

FLAT 1 23 BRYANSTON SQUARE

PT/10/00577/FULL/TP/24470 *Replacement of existing steel framed single glazed windows with tilt/turn replacement aluminium framed double glazed windows at ground and first floor level.*

OBJECTION: This is a piecemeal replacement of the windows to part of the front façade with no guarantee that remaining windows will be replaced to match. However, some windows have already been approved for replacement.

WH: 12 March 2010

FLAT 3 48 MONTAGU SQUARE

PT/09/09460/LBC/TP/6326 *Installation of two rooflights on internal slope of rear roof in connection with Flat 3.*

No OBJECTION:

WH: 12 March 2010

50 MARYLEBONE HIGH STREET

PT/10/00923/FULL/TP/19998/PP-00960143 *Alterations to shopfront and installation of three retractable awnings.*

OBJECTION: No objection to the shopfront but the new awnings extend to over half the width of pavement and are inappropriate above such a narrow pavement.

WH: 12 March 2010

16 THAYER STREET

PT/10/08909/FULL/TP/7073 *Installation of air conditioning unit to basement level at rear yard.*

OBJECTION: The acoustic report accompanying the application recommends an acoustic enclosure to mitigate noise at a window above the new unit. However there is no mention of this enclosure on drawings accompanying the application or on the application form under 'description of proposal'. Acoustic report does not allow for amplification through reverberation in the confined space.

WH: 12 March 2010

157-163 MARYLEBONE ROAD

PT/10/00584/ADV/CA/11947 *Display of an illustrated scaffold screen with a conservation mural depicting a 1.1 image of the building facade with two poster panel internally illuminated signs (either 2x96 sheet poster adverts or 2x48 sheet poster adverts) designed into the shroud at street level.*

No OBJECTION: Screen will be erected for duration of refurbishment works only.

WH: 12 March 2010

22-25 PORTMAN CLOSE

PT/10/00882/FULL/TP/14307 *Use of third floor as 1x2 bed flat (Class C3) and alteration of existing door to window.*

No OBJECTION

WH: 12 March 2010

33 THAYER STREET

PT/09/08839/FULL/TP/13563/PP-00872684 *Use of ground and basement floors for mixed retail / beauty treatment (sui generis), installation of one air conditioning unit at basement level with air intake/extract grill into rear basement lightwell.*

No OBJECTION

WH: 12 March 2010

13-15 SEYMOUR PLACE

PT/10/00794/FULL/TP/8292/19055/PP-00958304 *Alterations to shopfront including the installation of bi-folding windows.*

No OBJECTION

WH: 12 March 2010

59 BAKER STREET

PT/10/00744/TCH/TP/5910 *Use of the public highway for the placing of 8 tables, 16 chairs and 22 removable posts in an area measuring 19.6m x 1.85m in connection with the existing restaurant.*

OBJECTION: The depth of the 'private' forecourt area is nearly half of the pavement width and should be reduced to 1.5m.

WH: 12 March 2010

15-17 BLANDFORD STREET

PT/09/10286/FULL/TP/8796/PP-00923023 *Retention of two air conditioning units at roof level with associated screen, and an air intake unit at rear ground floor level.*

OBJECTION: The acoustic report gives an inadequate assumption of noise levels emitting from the air intake unit, suggesting that the existing open timber trellis (visual) screen will offer some noise reduction. A noise reducing enclosure is required and an acoustic damper on the air intake. The proposed enclosure is unsightly and visible from neighboring residential properties.

WH: 12 March 2010

41 PORTLAND PLACE

PT/10/00804/LBC/TP/23001 *Installation of laminated glass in existing windows at first floor level.*

No OBJECTION

WH: 12 March 2010

7 MANSFIELD STREET

PT/10/00119/FULL/TP/6696 *Internal alterations at basement and ground floor level including installation of air conditioning/comfort cooling condenser units and associated external pipe work runs in lightwell*

No OBJECTION

WH: 12 MARCH 2010

WESLEY MEMORIAL GARDEN

PT/10/00637/FULL/TP/24757 *Reinstatement of north garden wall with associated landscaping and planting.*

No OBJECTION

WH: 12 March 2010

82 PORTLAND PLACE

PT/10/00139/FULL/TP/22507 *Retention and relocation of seven condenser units behind a screen to the rear part of the roof.*

OBJECTION: We note that the plant is intended to operate 24 hours a day and provide comfort cooling to luxury residential accommodation. Although the proposed acoustic screen offers noise absorption and visual screening to the northern aspect no consideration appears to have been given to visual or acoustic screening to the southerly aspect on this high level roof. The existing chimney breast screens only part of the plant. The proposed solution is not an integrated design approach and the new heat rejection units would be better located close to or on existing roof structures. As a principle we do not believe full air conditioning (as distinct from whole house ventilation) should be necessary to residential accommodation in the temperate UK climate.

WH: 12 March 2010

61 LUXBOROUGH TOWERS

PT/09/04503/FULL/TP/23129 *Replacement window and door leading to the balcony on south elevation at eleventh floor level.*

No OBJECTION

WH: 12 March 2010

12-14 ST CHRISTOPHER'S PLACE

PT/09/10103/FULL/TP/13396 *Retention and relocation of air conditioning unit at first floor roof level of No. 12..*

OBJECTION: The acoustic report advises that an acoustic barrier is required to attenuate noise but this is not indicated on the roof plan drawing or in the application form. Please provide details of this screen with the application.

WH: 12 March 2010

FLAT 2 63 MONTAGU SQUARE

PT/10/00554/LBC/TP/24258 *Internal alterations to flat at second floor level. Reposition of boiler flue on the George Street elevation.*

OBJECTION: The proposed location of the new internal secondary glazing will foul and damage the historic shutters on this Grade II listed building. A number of companies now offer double glazed sash windows using slim Georgian/Victorian glazing profiles and 4/4/4mm toughened double glazing.

WH: 12 March 2010

19 WIMPOLE STREET

PT/10/00587/FULL/TP/6899 *External alterations to roof, including replacing slates to roof and new glass rooflights.*

OBJECTION/FURTHER DETAILS REQUIRED: There is inadequate information to review this application for roof works to a listed building. Some form of 3D/axometric view would assist an understanding of the proposal. Section XX, YY should include at least top floors of buildings and neighbouring buildings to understand how proposals impact on the surroundings. A rear elevation should be drawn to show the new RWP. Proposed materials/details also required.

WH: 12 March 2010

25 HARLEY STREET

PT/10/00197/FULL/TP/7266 *Relocation of existing air conditioning unit and retention of two further units in the front basement lightwell.*

OBJECTION: Condensers should be located in vaults or on opposite wall so as not to be visible from pavement. Insulated piping to be channelled below lightwell ground and inside building. A location in the vaults of this grade II listed property in the Harley Street Conservation Area would also mitigate noise from the plant. Note that there is no servicing requirement for condensers to be immediately close to the internal fan coil units.

We question the acoustic reports assumption in appendix B that the hard surfaced walls surrounding the lightwell would lead to a noise reduction of 15dBA. The walls and ground surface are more likely to

reverberate and reflect sound upwards towards the nearest sensitive receptor.
WH: 12 March 2010

MARCOL HOUSE

289-293 REGENT STREET PT/10/00106/LBC/TP/4408 *Retention of CCTV dome camera above fascia a further temporary period.*

OBJECTION/FURTHER DETAILS REQUIRED: The *Description of Proposed Works* suggests that the existing and original stone fascia is to be drilled with 3no 8mm holes. Colour matched grout is proposed for later making good. This is unacceptable. Please provide a site specific detail that fixes through existing mortar/joints and avoids drilling stone.

WH: 12 March 2010

MONTAGU COURT

27-29 MONTAGU SQUARE PT/10/00523/FULL/TP/6564 *Installation of galvanized steel security screen to lower level of external steel fire escape to rear of building and modifications to metal balustrades to rear elevation first floor balcony.*

No OBJECTION:

WH: 12 March 2010

17 HOMER ROW

PT/10/00244/FULL/TP/4671/PP-00932263 *Demolition of building and erection of four storey building comprising basement, ground and three upper floors to provide replacement assembly and leisure (Class D2) facility at basement and part ground levels with courtyard garden. Creation of four residential units: 1x2 bed at ground floor; 3x3 bed at first, second and third floor levels with associated balconies and roof terrace.*

OBJECTION: A previous application for a different design (also 4-storey) was made in March 2008 this was refused in May 2009 on design grounds. The objections of the Marylebone Association at the time related to loss of light to neighbours and inadequate design quality to replace an elegant existing building within the Portman Estate Conservation Area.

The new designs accompanying the current application are improved with a modern façade composition evolved from an analysis of the existing streetscape and faced with local brick. However the new building is one floor higher than the existing building and will lead to increased overshadowing of the shallow rear courtyard and lower floors of Octavia House (on Homer Street) for much of the day. The ground floor sunken well/railing/bridge details are not adequately resolved.

Objections from local residents have been received by the Marylebone Association, including a petition with 20 signees (all of whom reside in Crawford Mansions). The photographic montage prepared by one of the objectors misinterprets the bulk of the proposed building and the visual/light impact on Crawford Mansions is less significant than that on Octavia House.

The proposed design includes a west facing corner balcony and glazing to the north flank wall. This would preclude in the future redeveloping the plot to the north at 7-15 Homer Row with a new building on the historic street façade line.

The proposal also includes a communal roof top landscaped terrace with common access by all the apartments. With no dedicated ownership it is not clear who will be responsible for ongoing upkeep/maintenance of this highly visible terrace. Is the design of this to be formal or uncultivated – the D&A statement refers to areas for biodiversity and a communal composting facility.

In summary we feel that the new development takes away more than it gives back. Has conversion of the existing building been fully explored?

WH: 12 March 2010

ELDON HOUSE 1 DORSET STREET

PT/10/01204/FULL/TP/22849 *Use of the building as private preparatory and pre-preparatory school (Class D1) for children aged 3 to 12 years until 2025.*

No OBJECTION: The Association has considered very carefully this application and has taken a balanced view of the various issues surrounding the change of use.

We support the application in principle, but we wish to ensure that the valid concerns of the neighbours are adequately addressed by the applicant, before permission is granted. The building was designed as an office and clearly requires many changes to make it suitable for School use, so our major concern is that the application is only for a change of use at this time, leaving a considerable number of detailed issues to be addressed in a subsequent application.

1. Access

We support in principle the new gate opening from Paddington Gardens as this will reduce the number of movements through the entrance onto Dorset Street. Details need to be provided of the new gate, paths etc.

2. Transport

We have major concerns about the proposed drop-off in Paddington Street and believe that an alternative should be found in a local car park with a minibus shuttle, or possibly on a wider road such as Baker Street. As it stands at present the Travel Plan is inadequate and needs considerably more work.

The Association is of the view that should permission be granted, then regular and detailed monitoring of the terms of the Planning Conditions should be undertaken and the applicant left in no doubt that the Planning authority will enforce the terms. We recommend that once a more robust Travel Plan has been agreed then the school prepare detailed guidelines for parents on the restrictions of access to the school (with sanctions for those breaking the guidelines spelt out). These guidelines should be incorporated into the Planning Conditions.

3. Noise

The applicant accepts that there will be noise nuisance caused by the outdoor play and the Association is clearly concerned about this aspect. However since the application does not contain any specific proposals for ameliorating the impact, it is impossible to comment in detail on whether these will be effective. We believe that the applicant should make specific detailed proposals at this stage, and particularly show a design for the new canopy to the playground.

Noise breakout reduction measures from the interior of the building also need to be detailed prior to granting consent. The assembly hall proposed for the lower ground floor is currently a naturally ventilated space with an inadequate amount of cooling from a small split AC unit (presumably with a chiller mounted on the roof). At times the assembly hall will be very noisy and therefore detailed proposals for acoustically sealing and ventilating / cooling this space needs to be put forward. Similarly the noise from classrooms needs to be considered and the interior layout will affect how this is addressed since at present the building is designed to achieve natural cross ventilation in open plan form.

4. Overlooking

Some of the flats in St Andrews mansions are very close to the existing office building and already suffer serious overlooking. On balance the Association believes that overlooking from a school will not be any more serious than for office use since the occupants of the flats already have to provide their own curtains / blinds to maintain privacy.

5. Hours of operation

The applicant is asking for a 7am start to activities. We believe that this will cause considerable noise early in the morning and that the start time should be restricted to 8.15am.

The hours for outside play need to be closely defined, and restrictions placed on the type of noise that is acceptable (for example a ban on musical instruments or mechanically generated noise outside)

Conclusion

The Association strongly supports the principle of new schools being provided in our area, since it encourages a wider and more diverse demographic spread and encourages young people with families into the area.

This proposal for an International French School meets a specific, but clearly needed, market for French speaking families, and over time more of this type of family will be attracted into the area if the school is established. We therefore support the application subject to sufficient detailed proposals and reassurances being provided before the application is determined.

WH: 12 March 2010