

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: Dr Philippe Rogueda

Address: 342 Crescent House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: See file sent by email and below for a truncated version:

Philippe Rogueda
342 Crescent House
London EC1y 0SN

17 July 2023

Objection to Planning application 23/00466/FULL

I am objecting to this application although I fully agree that the windows of Crescent House are in dire need of repairs because of the wonton neglect inflicted on them by the City of London for decades. This constitutes nothing less than a dereliction of duties of the landlords and a wilful breach of our leases.

My objections are the following:

- A year ago, we stood in front of this very committee to discuss the necessity of a pilot project on the windows of flat 347 Crescent House. We were assured that this pilot project was needed on scientific grounds to inform the larger project. The pilot project is at least 18 months away from being completed, nothing of much value has been learnt and yet the larger project is now put

forward for proposal. This makes no sense. Let alone the fact your committee was clearly misled and lied to by the major work team, without valuable knowledge, the current proposal will lead to a fiasco.

- The proposal talks about minor works yet recommends that the residents be removed from their properties. What is it then? A major work that requires the residents to move out? Or a minor undertaking? Studio Partington is clearly intending to mislead this committee and us the residents by deliberately engineering confusion.

- The proposal wishes to introduce a number of betterments to the properties regardless of the rights of the lease holders. I mention in particular: a new ventilation system, vacuum glazing and electrical heating, and shelves insulation. Studio Partington is planning to destroy perfectly well-ventilated windows (this is true for the 3rd floor flats) with a totally inadequate ventilation system. Studio Partington (SP) is recommending to install electric heating and removing gas boilers, this will come at a huge cost not accounted for in this proposal,

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objections to Planning application 23/00466/FULL
Date: 16 July 2023 17:59:38

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Following the submission online of my comments objecting to planning application 23/00466/FULL, please see below the full text of my objections:

Philippe Rogueda
342 Crescent House
London EC1y 0SN

17 July 2023

Objection to Planning application 23/00466/FULL

I am objecting to this application although I fully agree that the windows of Crescent House are in dire need of repairs because of the wonton neglect inflicted on them by the City of London for decades. This constitutes nothing less than a dereliction of duties of the landlords and a wilful breach of our leases.

My objections are the following:

- A year ago, we stood in front of this very committee to discuss the necessity of a pilot project on the windows of flat 347 Crescent House. We were assured that this pilot project was needed on scientific grounds to inform the larger project. The pilot project is at least 18 months away from being completed, nothing of much value has been learnt and yet the larger project is now put forward for proposal. This makes no sense. Let alone the fact your committee was clearly misled and lied to by the major work team, without valuable knowledge, the current proposal will lead to a fiasco.
- The proposal talks about minor works yet recommends that the residents be removed from their properties. What is it then? A major work that requires the residents to move out? Or a minor undertaking? Studio Partington is clearly intending to mislead this committee and us the residents by deliberately engineering confusion.
- The proposal wishes to introduce a number of betterments to the properties regardless of the rights of the lease holders. I mention in particular: a new ventilation system, vacuum glazing and electrical heating, and shelves insulation. Studio Partington is planning to destroy perfectly well-ventilated windows (this is true for the 3rd floor flats) with a totally inadequate ventilation system. Studio Partington (SP) is recommending to install electric heating and removing gas boilers, this will come at a huge cost not accounted for in this proposal, both in terms of a new heating system but litigation due to a de facto derogation of grant of the leases of the leaseholders. The same logic applies to the shelves insulation. This is inside the flats and is not ordinarily accessible to the landlord.
- I am surprised that the C20 society has not been consulted on the matter and this leads to an incomplete and misleading application.
- The application mentions the CoL has held a number of consultation events with the residents and had organised a liaison group. This is true, but the reality is that the consultation was manipulated by the MWT and their appointed communication agency

YouShout. The residents have on many occasions complained to the MWT of the inaccuracy of the minutes of the meetings held and how these minutes were not representative of the discussion. This committee is therefore misled as to truthfulness of these consultations.

- The application details do not take into consideration the differences between the 150+ properties at Crescent House. No pilot work has been carried out on the 1st and 2nd floor properties to check what ventilation system would work best for them. The CoL and MWT has a now a long- and well-established tradition of messing up every ventilation project it undertakes (twice failed in the last 3 years, it takes some skills!). The lack of details in the application regarding the ventilation is preparing a 3rd fiasco.
- The application treats the properties at Crescent House as if they all belonged to the City. They do not. The application should be clear about the difference in treatment of the flats owned by the city and those leased out and no longer under the same legal framework.
- The application intends to destroy historical and original features of the fabric of the building: the louvres windows and other ventilation traps of the 3rd floor flats.
- The application claims the work does not affect the whole building, that is clearly a lie or a mistake. All the flats are affected as well as the roof and soffit. That must be at least 90% of the building, discounting the shop units.

This application needs to be withdrawn and redrafted with unique proposals for each flat and once the full knowledge from the pilot flat project has been gathered.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: Mr Howard Sullivan

Address: 345 Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate, London EC1Y 0SN

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:As a resident of Crescent House, I would like to object to this application.

I believe, as originally agreed, we should await the results of the full pilot project, including the installation of the glass, before moving forward with any form of repairs. At present, no significant information has been gained from the pilot project.

The application also fails to take into consideration the differences between the various flat types. This application, if put into action, will destroy historic features of the glazing and windows/ventilation, particularly on the third floor. The application also refers to the replacement of glazing but does not refer to the replacement of frames, which is particularly necessary in some windows, particularly the projecting bays on the building's facade.

I do not believe we should go ahead with these works until we've seen full implemented solutions for the glazing, which makes for such a major part of these works. Until that time, when the pilot project is complete, I do not believe we should be entering into any works.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: Jacqueline Swanson

Address: 13 Basterfield House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:OBJECTION

I am a member of the Resident Liaison Group for the Crescent House windows project and supported the pilot project with its original intent to test out various options and consult with residents.

I am disquieted by the way this current application is being pushed through, the curtailment of the pilot project, and the repairs only approach.

The application refers to replacement of glazing only and appears to purposefully avoid acknowledging the need to replace some window frames, particularly in bay windows and where corners are damaged beyond repair by wet rot. These bay windows are in such dire condition because of an underlying design flaw and the pilot project should be used to develop an appropriate technical solution whilst respecting the listed status. This application should not be consented until it is supported by the appropriate level of detailed design as part of the application.

A new survey has been undertaken and until the results are available, the pilot project should not be curtailed - it's purpose after all is to de-risk the main project.

The vacuum glazing is still yet to be installed (delivery not expected for another two months). As this is the first part of an estate wide windows project, I am concerned about the precedent set in granting listed building consent when a key material (glazing) is not yet available for viewing.

The application is described thus: 'Repairs and minor alterations....' And yet residents are being prepped for full scale decanting for periods of up to three weeks. This is a major undertaking and residents must be confident that the work required is fully understood. No such confidence currently exists.

I therefore object to this application.

To the Planning Department, City of London Corporation

Crescent House Golden Lane Estate
Application ref 23/00650/LBC/ & 23/00466/FULL

I am a long leaseholder at 209 Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate, which flat is my principal private residence.

I wish to register an **objection** to this application.

1. The application form that there is no stripping out of the interiors of the flats. However, the ceilings to third floor oriels appear to be marked for removal and this should be “yes”.
2. According to the asbestos register held at the Golden Lane Estate Office it is understood that asbestos is present in some floor finishes and possibly cladding panels. Proposed heating changes to the heating systems in the flats are likely to disturb the former and refenestration the latter. The response on the presence of contamination should therefore be a “yes”.
3. I am at a loss to know how this application sits alongside the ‘pilot project’ at Flat 347 Crescent House which was said at the time of that application to be essential to test two, possibly three, approaches to the repairs needed at Crescent House. This is in common with accepted good practice at listed buildings: trial patches, limited test repairs, and so on, to decide optimal techniques and materials for the project. I understand from second-hand information that has trickled down from the Project Management Team for this this project (there has been not direct contact to residents) that the pilot project is a long way from being complete; certainly the access promised to stakeholders including residents at various stages of the stripping out and repair have not been granted. Therefor the present application **should be withdrawn** until proper consideration of the pilot project is to hand.
4. The Applicant is on public record as stating that the soffit to the first floor flats, comprising the ceiling to the public walkways and arcades on the ground floor will be insulated as part of this project, but this does not appear to be included in the application. These first floor flats are the coldest in the building and do not benefit from solar gain at any time of year so this is an important element of the project. This is a surprising omission from the planning application /LBC given the stated objectives of the project is to adopt a ‘whole house approach’ and this element of the works are included in the statutory consultation with resident. From a listed

building point of view the detailing of this intervention requires careful consideration.

5. The application is premised on the removal (or at least decommissioning and removal of flues) of all gas fired boiler heating systems in the building – about 30% of flats. No alternative heating strategy is shown or proposed; nor is it clear how an alternative will affect the listed building, for example pipe runs, new boilers and plumbing installations etc. As Crescent House was designed with (and originally run for three decades) underfloor heating alterations that deviate from the original designs, an alternative system will be required. These should be fully drawn and included in the application, which is currently silent on this matter, as far as I can see with sole exception of para 5.4.3 in the Design and Access statement which refers to those flats where flue exhaust via bathroom windows; this is understood to be a tiny minority of flats mostly on the third floor. Presumably the Corporation of London is not going to render the flats statutorily unfit; so without a solution to this matter the scheme presented for this application is not buildable and should be rejected for that reason alone.
6. A statement in Design and Access statement (5.4.4) that softwood windows to internal courtyards had aluminium beadings does not appear to accord with the facts on site. Most do in fact have wooden beadings.
7. The Design and Access statement states that the resident lifts and pedestrian routes will be used and will be cleared for access by contractors, for example during the transport of new glazing glass to the windows. This is impossible to achieve in an occupied building as it will mean blocking means of escape routes and for disabled and infirm residents (of which there are many) obliging them to use secondary stairs, which they will be unable to do. The buildability of the scheme needs substantial further work and there is no method statement to show that the proposals are capable of being realised in a fully occupied building.
8. It is unclear, because the application material contradicts itself, what the finish to the sapele type hardwood windows is to be following removal of paint and repair of windows. A regime of maintenance and repair of the Barbican windows, works well with rolling repairs undertaken. At the Golden Lane Estate the City of London Corporation operates a wholly different and inferior standard of maintenance; one regime for the wealthy and a totally inferior standard of management for its social housing. It has been at least 20 years since the windows were maintained and the result is a widespread disrepair. This has been acceleration since the ill-advised application of matt brown paint to the windows which has trapped water under the surface saucing rot. Such a paint finish is again common best practice for such windows which are normally treated with varnishes or augmented oil finishes. It is difficult to know why there was such a radical departure from the regime at the Barbican, and that for Crescent House until the repairs carried out about 20 years ago. The impervious brown paint finish should not be replicated and the finish should not be stated to be 'as existing' as the existing finish was specified in error by

non-specialist consultants, is deleterious to the fabric of this GII* listed building, and visually very dowdy in appearance.

9. The shambolic appearance resulting from protracted and only partially successful concrete repairs in 2018-2021 is apparently not addressed in the works. DOF concrete cleaning should have been undertaken prior to fill repairs to ensure the fill was not contaminated with soot deposits etc. during that sequence of repairs. This was omitted due to incompetent project management and inadequate technical supervision of the works. I consider it essential that this omission is now made good to restore at least a presentable appearance to the G II* building.

10. Crescent House is a key gateway to the City of London, standing above the Col Griffon boundary marker. The Corporation's logos are writ large on the building at both ends of the building, which sits on a main traffic and bus route. The history of negligent maintenance and repair to Crescent House make for a dilapidated appearance. The state of Crescent House is a conspicuous testimony to the standards to the shockingly poor standards to which the City maintains its social housing in stark and direct contrast to the standards on its Barbican Estate. Whilst it is to be expected that the level of service and the costs of maintaining the more extensive amenities and lavish open spaces provided at Barbican would be higher than those provided on Golden Lane Estate since 1951, the professional housing management standards and building maintenance standards should not be any different. In fact, the City of London operates one management standard for the wealthy and wholly inferior standard for social housing occupants on Golden Lane Estate.

For the above reasons, I **Object** to the present applications.

Roland Jeffery
16th July 2023

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: David Henderson

Address: 324 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I wish to object to this application on the following basis:

There is insufficient detail contained within the application to be able to determine the impact and appropriateness of the proposals on the listed fabric of the building.

Describing proposals as simply "repairs" is misleading in the extreme. Significant parts of the existing windows, particularly those projecting over Goswell Road, have become rotten due to inherent flaws in the original design and its failure to shed water away from the building adequately. Simply replicating the original profile will lead to repeating the same failure in due course. To avoid this occurring, an improved detail will be required for the roof of the projecting bay windows but of course this will require great care in the design in order to not damage the external appearance of the listed building.

The above level of intervention should be contained within any application for this building, not merely subject to a planning condition as experience with works carried out on Great Arthur House highlighted the complexity of getting the building details visually correct as well as achieving adequate building performance.

The application is based around the use of vacuum glass as a replacement for the existing single glazing. This will present a different appearance both internally and externally. This very major

change is as yet unproven as an adequate alternative to more conventional clear glazing and it is uncertain what contingencies have been made should the vacuum glass be deemed unsuitable.

A pilot project has previously been commenced to trial and establish proof of concept for the interventions proposed on Crescent House. This would provide the best basis for ensuring that ALL details and materials are agreed prior to embarking on the main project. Will this be the case?

I believe the points have not been adequately explained in the application and so wish to object.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: Mr Luke Johnson

Address: 307 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I object to this planning application as a resident of Crescent House. It is essential to await the conclusive results of the full pilot project, including the glass installation, before proceeding with any repairs. The lack of significant information from the pilot project and the failure to address differences among flat types are concerning. This application risks damaging historic glazing and windows/ventilation features. It is necessary to consider complete and effective glazing solutions before engaging in any construction activities.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: Sarah O'Connor

Address: 321 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I strongly object to this application, as the vacuum double glazing has not been installed in 347, how can this application go forward without this main and vital component being missing and nothing is known about the thermal outcome.

It was agreed that residents could view the work undertaken in Flat 347 to assess the outcome of the installation vacuum double glazing and what thermal improvements were recorded, this has not happened. There has been ZERO effort to invite residents to view the works so far undertaken.

The extent of the works has to include the repair/restoration to window frames, as some are in a very bad state of repair and urgently need skilful restoration/repair.

The application had said that there was to be no stripping out of the interiors of the flats. However, the ceilings to third floor oriels appear to be marked for removal. I object to this.

The bay window areas in many flats have extensive damp and mould, this has to be addressed in the schedule of works, as any project that fails to make these repairs, is failing to address the real scope of work.

I object to the removal of the louvre windows in the bathroom on the 3rd floor, this plan was never

put forward or discussed with residents; this is a wonderful feature of the listed building and needs to remain in situ.

The application says: 'Repairs and minor alterations....' then why are residents are being prepped for full scale decanting for periods of up to three weeks. This is a major undertaking and residents must be confident that the work required is fully understood. No such confidence currently exists.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: Sarah O'Connor

Address: 321 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I strongly object to this application, as the vacuum double glazing has not been installed in 347, how can this application go forward without this main and vital component being missing and nothing is known about the thermal outcome.

It was agreed that residents could view the work undertaken in Flat 347 to assess the outcome of the installation vacuum double glazing and what thermal improvements were recorded, this has not happened. There has been ZERO effort to invite residents to view the works so far undertaken.

The extent of the works has to include the repair/restoration to window frames, as some are in a very bad state of repair and urgently need skilful restoration/repair.

The application had said that there was to be no stripping out of the interiors of the flats. However, the ceilings to third floor oriels appear to be marked for removal. I object to this.

The bay window areas in many flats have extensive damp and mould, this has to be addressed in the schedule of works, as any project that fails to make these repairs, is failing to address the real scope of work.

I object to the removal of the louvre windows in the bathroom on the 3rd floor, this plan was never

put forward or discussed with residents; this is a wonderful feature of the listed building and needs to remain in situ.

The application says: 'Repairs and minor alterations....' then why are residents are being prepped for full scale decanting for periods of up to three weeks. This is a major undertaking and residents must be confident that the work required is fully understood. No such confidence currently exists.

Adjei, William

From: PLN - Comments
Subject: FW: PLANNING OBJECTION : 23/00650/LBC & 23/00466/FULL

From: Sarah Batty-Smith
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2023 11:52 PM
To: PLN - Comments [REDACTED]
Subject: PLANNING OBJECTION : 23/00650/LBC & 23/00466/FULL

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I should like to say I support in principle the window refurbishment, the roof and soffit insulation, but have to object to it for the reasons below

The illustrations are hard to decipher, not easily cross referenced and flats are different. Mine in the corridor on the first floor, east facing is not the same as one on the third or either end of the first and second floors, so the drawings should be specific to areas and easily identified. A resident meeting should have been called by city officers to go through all these illustrations.

This planning application is way too premature. The pilot flat has not been finished. The pilot project is being carried out in a 3rd floor flat, wholly different to mine. We were told we would have sight of the finished flat, and we know that is months off. I want to see the vacuum glazing in situ, the trickle vents and the working ventilation, although mechanical ventilation is not wholly needed in 347 as it has windows at the front and back. Mine only has windows on the front. Hence why a first floor corridor flat should have been the subject of a pilot project too.

How can an informed opinion be given on an unfinished project? Ventilation is the key thing for the corridor flats and any flats without kitchen/bathroom windows. It needs to be the very best ventilation there is. It needs to be the best to wick away condensation and if possible cool the flat as they are hot houses in the summer. Not only do the flats need to retain the heat they need not to absorb and keep it. There seemingly is no ventilation mentioned in this planning application and it should go hand in hand with the window refurb and insulation. It is a key part of this refurbishment, on that basis alone, I object to this application.

Darker panes of glass, with an 8mm wide glass (surely there is narrower vacuum glass?), an evacuation port and with dots. Why? Is that all that is available? This will affect the look of the flats, individually and en masse, plus the feel when inside. I object to this.

I object to the window frames being painted. Oiled or varnished is the way to go? Brown paint is just cheap looking and I certainly don't want it in (or on the outside) of my flat.

Any internal insulation that reduces the floor and wall space of the flat I object to. The flats are too small already to reduce this further.

The louvre windows in the bathrooms need to stay in the third floor flats and refurbished as necessary, or renewed but with the best materials and workmanship. They need to stay they are a listed aspect of the flats and slow erosion of these features changes what was listed. I object to any removal of them.

In regard to the Design & Access Statement

4.1 ironmongery overhauled. Does that mean cleaning as well, if not? I object

5.4.2 trickle vents/ventilation anticipation of future installation of mechanical ventilation. Mechanical ventilation should be in this planning application. I object

6.0 why no front and back insulation on the outer walls? I object. Why leave areas out? It doesn't make sense.

I am of the understanding that work is intended to start in December 2023. This is way too soon, considering people and some of their possessions need to be out of their homes to facilitate the works. Consider people who have been there a longtime, the possessions they have accumulated. Additionally, some of us will be having our heating and hot water removed because of the gas flue presently through the living room window. Not the time of year to start this kind of work

Sarah Batty-Smith (Miss)
130 Crescent House
Golden Lane Estate
EC1Y 0SJ

Sent from my iPhone

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: pablo abellan villastrigo

Address: 307 crescent house golden lane estate city of london

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I am a leaseholder at 307 crescent house.

I strongly OBJECT to this application 23/00466/FULL

I live on the 3rd floor of crescent house and I have tried to get my bay window frame repaired by the corporation since 2013 when I purchased the property. The main post that supports the oriel roof is rotten beyond repair and will have to be replaced.

In 2013 it could have been repaired but instead bracing was added to stop the window from falling onto traffic on Goswell road. The asbestos cement board was damaged.

Two main reasons have contributed to the severe wet rot that has destroyed this structural wood support.

One is the design of the oriel roof which was changed by the corporation in the 80's.

Two is the brown paint that was also added in the 80's, water penetrates paint when it cracks and doesn't get a chance to ever dry.

In the planning application for the pilot project it was agreed the oriel roof design would be addressed, this has not happened.

It was also agreed that vacuum glazing and a double glazing would be trialled and shown to residents. This has not happened.

I also strongly object to any further destruction of original window components. many of the original internal beading is in very good condition and should be not be replaced with new timber. The bathroom louvred vents and door vents are mostly in good working order and should be kept. The new insulation to bookcases should be designed as an insert and not routed into the original

wood.

Mechanical trickle vents are also shown on drawings and instead original built-in vents will be sealed. this is not necessary or adequate to the listing.

I strongly object to the detail shown in this application as is not adequate to a grade II* listed buildings alterations.

Is strongly object to the wording used to describe the works. The reality of upgrading the glazing, repairing and in some cases replacing the frames, adding ventilation to 150 flats.

These is major works and should be described as such.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: pablo abellan villastrigo

Address: 307 crescent house golden lane estate city of london

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I am a leaseholder at 307 crescent house.

I strongly OBJECT to this application 23/00650/LBC

I live on the 3rd floor of crescent house and I have tried to get my bay window frame repaired by the corporation since 2013 when I purchased the property. The main post that supports the oriel roof is rotten beyond repair and will have to be replaced.

In 2013 it could have been repaired but instead bracing was added to stop the window from falling onto traffic on Goswell road. The asbestos cement board was damaged.

Two main reasons have contributed to the severe wet rot that has destroyed this structural wood support.

One is the design of the oriel roof which was changed by the corporation in the 80's.

Two is the brown paint that was also added in the 80's, water penetrates paint when it cracks and doesn't get a chance to ever dry.

In the planning application for the pilot project it was agreed the oriel roof design would be addressed, this has not happened.

It was also agreed that vacuum glazing and a double glazing would be trialled and shown to residents. This has not happened.

I also strongly object to any further destruction of original window components. many of the original internal beading is in very good condition and should be not be replaced with new timber. The bathroom louvred vents and door vents are mostly in good working order and should be kept. The new insulation to bookcases should be designed as an insert and not routed into the original

wood.

Mechanical trickle vents are also shown on drawings and instead original built-in vents will be sealed. this is not necessary or adequate to the listing.

I strongly object to the detail shown in this application as is not adequate to a grade II* listed buildings alterations.

Is strongly object to the wording used to describe the works. The reality of upgrading the glazing, repairing and in some cases replacing the frames, adding ventilation to 150 flats.

These is major works and should be described as such.

Adjei, William

From: PLN - Comments
Subject: FW: 23/00466/FULL , 23/00650/LBC Comments

From: Gaby Robertshaw <
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2023 4:00 PM
To: Lin Zhao, Janey <>
Subject: Re: 23/00466/FULL , 23/00650/LBC Comments

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Janey Lin Zhao

Further to our correspondence last week please find below my comments relating to the current applications for Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate, London.

Gaby

**204 Crescent House
Golden Lane Estate
London EC1Y 0SL**

**23/00466/FULL and 23/00650/LBC
OBJECTION**

Dear Janey Lin Zhao

I welcome the expedited repairs and refurbishment project for Crescent House following over 20 years of neglect by the City of London Corporation, however I have misgivings relating to some of the small yet important details and must therefore object to the current applications.

Studio Partington's specificy matt brown paint to be once again put on the window frames, timber panel and the tounge and grooved exterior of our bookcases

This is shown in the PROPOSED ELEVATION PLAN AND SECTION diagrams 01 and 02 posted online 30 May 2023

It is inconceivable after all the many man hours that will be expended in removing the existing window finishes (incorrectly specified in 2004 and responsible for the dire state of the woodwork today) that mat brown paint is once again to be applied instead of the original varnished finish as shown on the Historic England listing 1021941

Similarly I would question the replacement of the muroglass spandrel panels with toughened glass painted white from the outside, where the specification for the Pilot flat at 347 Crescent House (22/00332/FULL + 22/00323//LBC) was for opaque white toughened glass.

No allowance was made in the application for any replacement window frames and casements that will be needed as the result of the Hallas & Co 2020 condition survey.

The City of London Corporation commissioned Hallas & Co to undertake a windows condition survey in 2020 which was charged to leaseholders and is publicly available on the website goldenlanewindows.site

This report highlighted that wet rot is severe -

'In some cases, affecting window casement corners, making long-lasting repairs, challenging. The damage caused by the wet rot has made the public at risk from falling parts of windows, including glass and timber.'

This survey also informed the Corporation of three emergency repairs where - *'window casements looked as if they were going to fall onto the street if moved, which could have caused major injury to the public below.'*

Furthermore, survey also advised -

'Repairing timber windows which have rotted corners and joints is challenging. In those areas where rot has occurred adjacent to an existing wet rot repair full casement requires replacement is required.'

This is well illustrated on the final pages of the Condition Survey listed under 23/00602/MDC on 8 June 2023 relating to the pilot flat, 347 Crescent House where the surface finishes have been fully removed prior to remediation and reglazing with vacuum double glazing.

I am aware that their updated survey is about to be delivered, if anything, this is now even more important.

Lack of a regular coherent maintenance programme.

The Hallas & Co report also highlights that -

'the wet rot is severe as a result of the Corporation's 'lack of regular maintenance'.

At no stage has a repairs and redecorations schedule been advised by the Major Works Team (Hallas recommend every 5 or 7 years).

Crescent House was completed in 1962 and deserves to be as iconic and much loved in a further 60 years as it is today.

Gaby Robertshaw

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: Mr Gavin Hutchison

Address: 103 Crescent House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:Objection grounds:

This application was to be made following the carrying out of a 'Pilot Scheme' whose Committee validated purpose was to provide empirical evidence on the right refurbishment approaches for Crescent House. The pilot project has been curtailed by the applicant without even the first stage having been completed or preliminary conclusions having been shared with consultees.

The application documents are misleading :-

Application Form

Do the proposals cover the whole existing building(s)? - Answer - No 'First, second and third floors only.'

Works are proposed on all levels of the building Ground to Roof. This is a prioritised full building refurbishment

Application General Description

The work is being presented as 'repairs and minor alterations' when it is clear as a whole scope of works this is a significant refurbishment project with almost all aspects of fabric and systems under

consideration. eg. Full façade refurbishment including complete replacement* of some sections of the façade that have failed (*not mentioned) Full glazing replacement and enhancement with technically advanced vacuum glazing, Full re-roofing with significant enhancement of insulation levels, Full soffit insulation to exposed ground level, Comprehensive replacement of building ventilation and heating to remove gas use and improve internal air quality etc.

Other Objections

The application drawings are expansive on the proposed changes to the standard flat typologies but does not include full proposed details of the non-standard conditions of the façade

The application is not deliverable in its current form as it does not include a coherent services design. ie. it includes the removal of all external boiler flues to the building façade without including proposals for their system replacement.

The application does not include changes to the building previously proposed eg. mosaic spandrel insulation and oriel roof returned to the original flat drained design.

From:
To: Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate - Applications 23/00466/FULL and 23/00650/LBC
Cc: 17 July 2023 17:15:05
Subject:
Date:

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Janey Lin Zhao,
On behalf of the Golden Lane Estate Residents' Association I would like to OBJECT to the above applications.

While it is essential that work is carried out to repair the existing windows which have not been maintained for over 20 years and improve the thermal efficiency of the block as a whole there are several issues with the current application. These are:

1. The works are described as *repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works*. As the works replacing the glazing with vacuum double-glazing, the addition of metal drips and the extra thickness of roof insulation that will be visible from the light wells with change the appearance of the block the phrase "minor alterations" is not an accurate description of the works. This is especially evident in the reglazing as the change from single to double glazing would not be permitted in, for instance, a Georgian listed building because of the change to its appearance and although it is desirable here it should be properly acknowledged that it will have a major impact.
2. It is premature to submit this application until the pilot project is complete and its findings have been analysed. The pilot project was sold to residents as essential to investigate the construction of the windows and test how they can be made thermally efficient, water-proof and less prone to damage. Residents have accepted this and were reassured that the problems with the Great Arthur House recladding might be avoided. We are now being told that a design has been decided on before this work has been completed and residents left with no confidence that the mistakes made at Great Arthur House will not be made again.
3. The new soffit insulation (as shown in Detail 15) will have a major impact on the appearance of the block as the existing concept of a flat slab sitting on circular columns will be compromised by the proposed changes in ceiling level and the the new upstand along the edge of the insulation fronting Goswell Road and the tennis courts to the East. I would also note that the detail as drawn is unlikely to be successful as the existing slab, as it passes beyond the insulation, will be cold and this cold-bridge, passing back along the slab is likely to lead to interstitial condensation in the insulated zone. If this happens mineral wool insulation is a poor choice of material as it will become sodden and lose its insulative properties.
4. Heating. In the 1980s the Estates communal heating system was transferred to individual flat systems by, in Crescent House either gas boilers or electric heating. Where gas boilers are present the flues pass through widows to vent. Provision is being made for flues where they exit through bathroom windows but in cases where they exit through the windows on the main facades there is no provision and no detail of how this will be progressed. We understand that the proposal to reinstate the communal heating is on hold.
5. Repainting the existing sapele timber frames. It is not clear what these are to be repainted with but we would ask that it be conditioned that a suitable varnish be used

- and that the manufacturer's details be submitted for approval.
6. The glass spandrel panels. It is proposed that the new panels be painted externally. This is a long term maintenance issue and also why is glass being used if it is to be painted. The spandrel panels on the estate have been much altered over the years with a plasticised coating being applied to the ones in the maisonette blocks and only Great Arthur House, which has been re-clad, shows the original intention. We would ask that further research be carried out to find out the original finish and this be reinstated as far as is possible using current materials. Again could it be conditioned that the material used be submitted for approval.
 7. It is usual with listed buildings applications that a proper schedule of works is submitted with the application so that it is evident what is being conserved and what is being replaced. This has not been submitted so we would ask that the submission of a schedule of works be conditioned before works begin.

We should emphasise that we do not want to delay this very necessary project but believe that by putting in place the essential research and by reviewing the solutions to the issues that become apparent through this research the delays and over-spend of the Great Arthur House project can be avoided. We understand that there is a delay before the project can be tendered and we would encourage the applicants to use that time to complete and analyse the pilot project and use the information gained to amend the proposals.

Regards,

Tim Godsmark
Chair Golden Lane Estate Residents' Association

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: Dr Philippe Rogueda

Address: 342 Crescent House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Following my objection to 23/00466/FULL, I wish to confirm that I also object to the parent application 23/00650/LBC.

The comments are in an attachment sent by email to the CoL.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objections to Planning application 23/00650/LBC.
Date: 17 July 2023 17:33:24

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Following the submission online of my comments objecting to planning application 23/00650/LBC please see below the full text of my objections. This comes in addition to my comments on the parent application 23/00466/FULL.

Philippe Rogueda
342 Crescent House
London EC1y 0SN

17 July 2023

Objection to Planning application 23/00466/FULL

I am objecting to this application although I fully agree that the windows of Crescent House are in dire need of repairs because of the wonton neglect inflicted on them by the City of London for decades. This constitutes nothing less than a dereliction of duties of the landlords and a wilful breach of our leases.

My objections are the following:

- A year ago, we stood in front of this very committee to discuss the necessity of a pilot project on the windows of flat 347 Crescent House. We were assured that this pilot project was needed on scientific grounds to inform the larger project. The pilot project is at least 18 months away from being completed, nothing of much value has been learnt and yet the larger project is now put forward for proposal. This makes no sense. Let alone the fact your committee was clearly misled and lied to by the major work team, without valuable knowledge, the current proposal will lead to a fiasco.
- The proposal talks about minor works yet recommends that the residents be removed from their properties. What is it then? A major work that requires the residents to move out? Or a minor undertaking? Studio Partington is clearly intending to mislead this committee and us the residents by deliberately engineering confusion.
- The proposal wishes to introduce a number of betterments to the properties regardless of the rights of the lease holders. I mention in particular: a new ventilation system, vacuum glazing and electrical heating, and shelves insulation. Studio Partington is planning to destroy perfectly well-ventilated windows (this is true for the 3rd floor flats) with a totally inadequate ventilation system. Studio Partington (SP) is recommending to install electric heating and removing gas boilers, this will come at a huge cost not accounted for in this proposal, both in terms of a new heating system but litigation due to a de facto derogation of grant of the leases of the leaseholders. The same logic applies to the shelves insulation. This is inside the flats and is not ordinarily accessible to the landlord.
- I am surprised that the C20 society has not been consulted on the matter and this leads to an incomplete and misleading application.
- The application mentions the CoL has held a number of consultation events with the

residents and had organised a liaison group. This is true, but the reality is that the consultation was manipulated by the MWT and their appointed communication agency YouShout. The residents have on many occasions complained to the MWT of the inaccuracy of the minutes of the meetings held and how these minutes were not representative of the discussion. This committee is therefore misled as to truthfulness of these consultations.

- The application details do not take into consideration the differences between the 150+ properties at Crescent House. No pilot work has been carried out on the 1st and 2nd floor properties to check what ventilation system would work best for them. The CoL and MWT has a now a long- and well-established tradition of messing up every ventilation project it undertakes (twice failed in the last 3 years, it takes some skills!). The lack of details in the application regarding the ventilation is preparing a 3rd fiasco.
- The application treats the properties at Crescent House as if they all belonged to the City. They do not. The application should be clear about the difference in treatment of the flats owned by the city and those leased out and no longer under the same legal framework.
- The application intends to destroy historical and original features of the fabric of the building: the louvres windows and other ventilation traps of the 3rd floor flats.
- The application claims the work does not affect the whole building, that is clearly a lie or a mistake. All the flats are affected as well as the roof and soffit. That must be at least 90% of the building, discounting the shop units.

This application needs to be withdrawn and redrafted with unique proposals for each flat and once the full knowledge from the pilot flat project has been gathered.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: Ms Sarah Winman

Address: 115 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:OBJECTION

I am a leaseholder in Crescent House and have lived here since 1992.

I am troubled by many aspects of this project, one being the speed with which this application is being pushed through.

The Crescent House repair and renovation is one of the most complicated major works that is happening - and has ever happened - on this estate, and will set the standard for the proceeding window replacement across the estate.

For such a massive undertaking, the thinking feels, at best, blasé and at worst, sub par.

Many of us in the residents group whole-heartedly supported the pilot project that was introduced a year ago to problem solve the gargantuan task ahead. And yet the project has been stopped without the installation of the new windows. How on earth is that possible seeing that it is a windows project? We were also told that we would be allowed to view the progress and yet no contact was forthcoming regarding this. The pilot project to me, then, seems a complete failure. So how on earth can the project proceed?

There has been no solution offered, as yet, to an alternative heating system to those flats that cannot have a gas boiler. Also, the thinking around ventilation is ill-thought through and many residents are being forced to agree to 'betterments' against their will.

There has been no solution offered as to the relocation of residents which could be for anything up to three weeks.

For those of us in Crescent house, this is a deja-vu of the many botched repairs that has happened to the interiors and exteriors of our homes over the years. The CoL has failed us time and again.

This is an incredibly complex repair and renovation project and it seems that you do not have expertise at the helm, and more importantly, the willingness to bring this all together. Until we do, I am in OPPOSITION to this application.

Sarah Winman

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works. Additional Listed Building Consent sought under reference 23/00650/LBC.

Case Officer: Janey Lin Zhao

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Elia

Address: 247 crescent house London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:OBJECTION

I have been living in Crescent House since 2013 and I wish to object to this application on the following basis:

1. Condition Survey. The state of my window frames is in a very poor condition. All flats were supposed to be surveyed internally but my flat was not. No inspector visited my flat.
2. Warranty. No information was provided about what happens if a new window gets broken.
3. Heating. I will not be allowed to keep the existing gas fired boiler heating system, but no information was provided about a new heating system.

I therefore object to this application.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works (RECONSULTATION DUE TO AMENDED DRAWINGS).

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Ognjen Ristic

Address: 317 Crescent House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I am writing to object as the leaseholder, to the revised application following my visit to the pilot flat.

In general I am in favour of the window replacement project. The work that has been carried out in the pilot flat is generally of good quality.

My objection is specifically related to the retained aluminium pivot window. The pivot window is proposed to be anodised, the glass upgraded to vacuum glass and compression seals added. The aluminium window will however remain a cold bridge, with all the original problems suffered by residents exacerbated by the higher indoor temperature that will be the result of all upgrade work. The consequence is that the previous mould and condensation on the window frame will be far worse.

The decision to retain this window seems to me rather perplexing if the council wants the Golden Lane Estate project to be an exemplar project on retrofitting in the UK.

We obviously don't know what Chamberlin, Powell and Bon would have designed if they had thermally broken windows available at that time, but one would expect that they would have used logic and common sense if they were designing it today and installed a thermally broken frame.

We hope that the Conservation Officer would be willing to accept a compromise for this element by allowing a thermally broken frame that can complement the original design. The design architects managed to do a clever and sensitive intervention to the trickle vent and I believe that they are able to be equally sensitive with an upgrade to the aluminium window.

The problem of mould and condensation is solvable if we want to do it. Not doing it is saying that in 2023 we are happy with wet surfaces and black mould on the inside frame of windows.

On a separate note, I observed that not all the brush and compression seals in the pilot flat were installed even though they were shown in the drawings. We expect that this was an oversight and that they will be installed in the final project.

209 Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate, London EC1Y 0SL

Planning Department
City of London

Application no - 23/00466/FULL and 23/00466/FULL - Reconsultation
Repairs to Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate, EC1
Letter of objection

I am a long leaseholder in the subject building.

Some of the matters covered in my previous letter of objection dated 17 July 2023 have been addressed by changes to the scheme since the application was first made. As this application has been formally reconsulted due to the extent of the changes I am writing to **Object**.

Firstly, however, there have been some positive changes to the proposals and those which I particularly welcome are:

- The inclusion of insulation to the soffit of the building (above walkways) to address the extreme thermal loss to the first floor flats.
- The renewal of lighting to common parts as part of the project, previously omitted, (but see also reservations below).

I **object** to the extensively revised proposals because:

- The scheme as evidenced by the drawings submitted is inadequately developed and detailed for a major refurbishment of a Grade II* listed building.
- The pilot flat assessment in Flat 347 has not been completed and consulted upon. I understand this is a condition of the consent for that work and that the City of London is therefore now in breach of its own conditions. Thermal and acoustic tests, among other appraisals, were due to have been carried out before the present application is submitted and have not yet been undertaken (due to painfully slow progress of works on the pilot flat).
- At the time the consultation on this application closes the alternative vacuum glass has not even been fitted to the pilot flat 347, so an important element of visual comparison of glazing across the whole building cannot inform this application.
- The present Landvac brand vacuum glazing installed in flat 247 has a distinct blue tint which detracts from the original design intent which was for clear glass. The blue tint may be less obvious at a distance though it is

difficult to tell with scaffolding in place. In any case it needs to be assessed against Fineo brand glass side by side – i.e. half of the pilot flat with each brand. The Fineo glass is being used on a large scale at the City of London's Museum site in Smithfield nearby and appears on that site not to have a blue tint so undertaking this comparison is vital.

- The consultation on the proposals with residents has haphazard and patchy. It has, as far as I am aware, been entirely silent on the matter of a warranty for the performance of the vacuum glass. As this is a relatively new product in the first decade of use since initial development this must be a matter of concern since. If the vacuum fails or some other defect appears and the glazing of Crescent House needs replacing (either wholesale or extensively) to maintain the thermal upgrade at the heart of this project, a solution will be needed to ensure the appearance is maintained across the facades. Without a suitable warranty or bond enforceable against a UK legal entity there is a major design risk. This is therefore a planning/ listed building matter (as well as a grave financial risk to resident leaseholders).
- There is no strategy for heating those 60% of all flats that are heated by gas boilers properly consulted on and agreed by occupiers of the building. At no point in the consultation has the corporation as landlord written to leaseholder indicating it is their intention to remove all gas boiler flues. Information about the proposals has leaked out in a haphazard fashion. A suggestion has been made that space and water heating are both by electricity; but this is likely to be ruled out by both tenants and leaseholders as having unaffordable costs in use. This is of importance since the design of the facades must accommodate all residents who wish to retain gas their gas heating which leaseholders have a legal right to do. I consider this too important a matter to be left to officers to condition as it affects the facades of the building extensively.
- The detailing of the insulation of the soffit is inelegant around the shop window fascia panels (i.e. above the main shop windows). As this is by far the most visible elevation of Crescent House, as it forms a retail arcade, I consider this is too important a matter to be left to officers to condition.
- At no point in the resident consultation have the City of London written to all occupants indicating it is their intention that all residents are decanted for the works to be carried out. Many residents will want to stay put, so a method statement is needed as part of the planning application to show how works will be carried out. A draft legal agreement/ licence for temporary possession of leasehold flats is also needed or there can be no guarantee that the proposals are achievable. A similar system of false walls to that used at Gt Arthur House could be adopted.
- The replacement white panels to the facades (muraglass) are very smooth and shiny and give the appearance of perspex or plastic sheet; the original

panels were cast glass with a texture and were non-reflective. The replacements should have a similar appearance. The shiny panels will doubtless get dirty over time but are unlikely to weather to a matt/textured finish for many years, perhaps decades. The finishes of Crescent House are non-shiny throughout.

- The existing integrated street lighting should be retained, even if it is not made to operate as functional street lighting. It is an important design feature, even mentioned in the list description for Crescent House.
- The lighting proposals are inadequately developed. This is not just a matter of the selection of fittings, but of the functionality of the lighting and its effect close-to and in the distance. In common with the rest of the Estate indirect and masked lighting was prevalent in almost all common lighting and this effect has been carelessly eroded by haphazard and unthinking replacements. In the case of Crescent House walkways all lights were recessed (the evidence remains though masked by clumsy later trunking) so that they functioned as downlighters not floodlights. A lighting strategy is needed to ensure that the same design approach is adopted in the proposed comprehensive replacement. This is especially important since the casual and inappropriate replacement light fittings installed in recent years cause light to stream into bedrooms and cause sleepless nights and customised adaptations to light fittings as a survival strategy.
- It appears that it is still not intended to clean the concrete to mitigate the very visible and ugly concrete repairs carried out by the City of London four years ago. This omission would go some way to remedying the visual damage done by these works. As insulation works are proposed at roof level the scaffolding will be reaching to that height and it seems a grave oversight.

The above matters are in some cases matters of detail. However, taken cumulatively they amount to an application which merits further substantial design development. The registration of this application was long delayed so that the minimum requirements for registration could be met by consultants. The application has already been delayed many months due to the fact that it was submitted prematurely. I consider it should now be withdrawn/refused until a adequate research and design development has been completed.

The fact that the City of London is the applicant makes it all the more important that fair dealing and a proper standard of information is required in this case.

Roland Jeffery

13th November 2023

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: PLANNING APPLICATION 23/00466/FULL
Date: 14 November 2023 15:07:03

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Planning

I have tried to register my OBJECTION to this application online and have been thwarted time and again from doing so.

And so an email it is.

I OBJECT to this planning application 23/00466/FULL on these grounds.

I do not agree with the removal of the Louvres windows from the third floor flats. They are necessary for ventilation and have not been proven otherwise. They are part of the original features of the design of the Grade II* listing.

The Fineo Glass:

We still do not know how the Fineo glass would have performed because it was never installed. Although it can't be made into the larger panes needed on the third floor, it certainly could be used for other flats. It is after all the chosen glass for the Museum of London. And there are huge benefits in having Fineo, especially in the aftercare of the product.

The black mosaic tiles on the exterior of the building were also supposed to be insulated and now they're not. I feel they need to be.

I also believe the exterior concrete needs to be cleaned. Why the half measures?

I would also like to add a CONDITION: that the CoL creates a maintenance programme for this new work to -

- a) respect the building from hereon in
- b) prevent further disruption to people's lives
- c) protect its legacy that we have all worked so hard for.

Thank you

Sarah WINMAN

115 Crescent House

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: APPLICATION NUMBER 23/00466/FULL
Date: 14 November 2023 15:19:50

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Planning

I OBJECT to this planning application 23/00466/FULL on these grounds.

I do not agree with the removal of the Louvres windows from the third floor flats. They are necessary for ventilation and have not been proven otherwise. They are part of the original features of the design of the Grade II* listing.

The Fineo Glass:

We still do not know how the Fineo glass would have performed because it was never installed. Although it can't be made into the larger panes needed on the third floor, it certainly could be used for other flats. It is after all the chosen glass for the Museum of London. And there are huge benefits in having Fineo, especially in the aftercare of the product.

The black mosaic tiles on the exterior of the building were also supposed to be insulated and now they're not. I feel they need to be.

I also believe the exterior concrete needs to be cleaned. Why the half measures?

I would also like to add a CONDITION: that the CoL creates a maintenance programme for this new work to -

- a) respect the building from hereon in
- b) prevent further disruption to people's lives
- c) protect its legacy that we have all worked so hard for.

Thank you

Sarah WINMAN

115 Crescent House

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works (RECONSULTATION DUE TO AMENDED DRAWINGS).

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: pablo abellan villastrigo

Address: 307 crescent house golden lane estate city of london

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I strongly OBJECT to application 23/00466/FULL

The additional drawings and findings from the PILOT project do not fix some of the main issues affecting residents.

Cold bridging has not been resolved in key areas like behind the mosaics and internal courtyard facades. Lack of insulation in these areas will make areas prone to mould.

The design of the oriel roofs has not been addressed and prevailing winds will make any additional drip details redundant.

Many of the original woodwork has been replaced with new timber when unnecessary. All beading details on the bottom edges of windows have been replaced with chunky drip detailed replacements. These must only be used in exposed and necessary locations or where the original wood cannot be salvaged.

Louvred windows have been replaced with vacuum glazing and ventilation added instead. At any opportunity original ventilation systems should be kept and not replaced with modern equivalents to achieve the same airflows.

An electric heating system has been specified in an arbitrary way when the current market offers

many low cost solutions to heat such small spaces. Crescent house flats are small and any space is precious.

Insulation added to bookcases has also been over specified as the vertical fins do not need to be insulated. They are internal features. Again i would like this insulation to be self supporting and not affect the original woodwork. Simply placed within the openings and freestanding.

I encourage all parties to respect this historic grade II* asset and follow the guidelines updated in 2013 to protect it from deterioration for future generations.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: PLANNING OBJECTION : 23/00650/LBC & 23/00466/FULL
Date: 14 November 2023 23:44:19

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I write with further **objection**, in part, to the above.

My objections are based on the fact that again the the planning application is premature, as without all the proposed work and tests to flat 347 having been undertaken, can residents form opinions of the work/outcome. Glass comparisons are necessary between the Landvac and Fineo. Ideally, we should be seeing the windows in the sunlight as some of the vacuum seals? I understand can glare/shine/flash silver. Again the Landvac has a blue hue to it. What is it like in different lights? What is the spec of the seals around the windows?

Additionally, the proposed removal of the heating and hot water in flats that can't have a gas flue exiting a window has been skimmed over and is a real source of consternation for me personally. Not enough information has been given, no choices of radiators or boilers have been offered for an electric system in long leaseholders flats. Just a fait accompli seemingly of too large for the space, ugly, storage heaters.

The gas boiler will be removed is it the same for the gas pipes, these cover about a third of the flat, no one has given any detail or information on this? The related make good works, will there be chasing in of the electricity cables?

No acknowledgement of the fact that 347 is a different flat to 130, or any of the others in the corridors. How does what is going on in 347 relate to 130, in regard to ventilation in the windowless kitchen/bathroom and the siting of radiators? Ventilation needs to be tested in a corridor flat, if it fails in a flat with windows in the kitchen and bathroom, then people will just open their windows! The proposed ventilation of 1st and 2nd floor flats sited in the corridor needs to be looked at again. The one flow from main window vent to a vent/outlet in either the kitchen or bathroom, I don't see how this can work. Both areas create a lot of steam, ventilation needs to be in both. Clothes are dried in the bathroom.

No upstand insulation, 3rd floor gets it, what about the 1st and 2nd floor corridor flats? Plus no insulation in the metal pivot window, which I understand EH had/have a resistance to, but surely practicality and warm liveable homes is what we are trying to achieve here. Who is fighting the fight for an insulated metal window? When will the upstand be included in the insulation works?

There is no proposal to have the outside of the building cleaned which is an opportunity not to be missed. It's scruffy!

The removal of the louvres in the third floor flats, they are a listed feature and should not be removed, but worked around. They should be refurbished or renewed but with the best materials and workmanship.

I understand that ongoing maintenance of Crescent House is a prerequisite of the granting of planning permission for this project and quite rightly so. There should be a vow enshrined in the constitution of the City of London Corporation to ensure a proper maintenance programme for Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate and its environs, that transcends any 'head of maintenance'. Any person in this position should be overseen and made accountable.

Thanks

Sarah Batty-Smith (Miss)
130 Crescent House
Golden Lane Estate
EC1Y 0SJ

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Application 23/00466/FULL
Date: 15 November 2023 12:44:43

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Amy Williams and Planning

I have been trying the last 48 hours to write my objections online but have been unable to do so.

So I write this email.

I OBJECT to this planning application 23/00466/FULL on these grounds.

I do not agree with the removal of the Louvres windows from the third floor flats. They are necessary for ventilation and have not been proven otherwise. They are part of the original features of the design of the Grade II* listing.

The Fineo Glass:

We still do not know how the Fineo glass would have performed because it was never installed. Although it can't be made into the larger panes needed on the third floor, it certainly could be used for other flats. It is after all the chosen glass for the Museum of London. And there are huge benefits in having Fineo, especially in the aftercare of the product.

The black mosaic tiles on the exterior of the building were also supposed to be insulated and now they're not. I feel they need to be.

I also believe the exterior concrete needs to be cleaned. Why the half measures?

I would also like to add a CONDITION: that the CoL creates a maintenance programme for this new work to -

- a) respect the building from hereon in
- b) prevent further disruption to people's lives
- c) protect its legacy that we have all worked so hard for.

Thank you

Sarah WINMAN

115 Crescent House
Golden Lane Estate
LONDON
EC1Y 0SJ

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Crescent House 23/0466/FULL and 23/00650/LBC
Date: 15 November 2023 14:45:50

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

OBJECTION

23/0466/FULL and 23/00650/LBC

I am writing to ask that the following be conditioned before granting planning permission:

Benchmarking

I am generally very happy with the standard of the work undertaken in the pilot flat and grateful to the Corporation for listening to residents and electing to proceed with a vacuum glazing and refurbishment approach. I hope that the care the tradespeople and team have taken with the pilot will be extended across the whole building and in fact that this standard of work be held as a benchmark and conditioned as such.

Aluminium window

As a result of the improved air tightness in the flat it has been acknowledged by the architects and project manager that the original refurbished aluminium window frame will be subject to even more condensation than we currently have to deal with. I understand that the team has ordered and agreed to test a replacement aluminium frame with a thermal break, which would reduce this problem. Could full details be submitted and approved for the replacement aluminium frame before the tender process gets underway.

Louvre Windows

Some of the flats have louvre windows in the bathroom and these are an original feature, considered by many to be an intrinsic design element worth retaining. As lots of residents choose to have their bathroom windows open the issue of airtightness in that room is for them essentially redundant. These windows should not be replaced as a matter of course, but instead only on an optional basis and this should be formalised as a condition of planning.

Maintenance Programme

As the intention of the scheme is to improve the environmental performance of the flats overall it makes sense for a maintenance plan to be agreed that ensures that the performance levels are met and maintained during the life of the windows. Could a maintenance programme please also be conditioned.

Whilst the above issues are outstanding I object to the application. Thank you.

Jacqueline Swanson
324 Crescent House / 13 Basterfield House

Golden Lane Estate

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works (RECONSULTATION DUE TO AMENDED DRAWINGS).

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr Philippe rogueda

Address: 342 Crescent House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Following the updating of the Planning Application 23/00466/FULL, I wish to make the following comments.

The residents were promised that the work at Crescent House would not start until the works at flat 347 Crescent House was completed. Councillor John Edwards was adamant that a scientific method be followed. The current application is being submitted before the work at 347 has been finished and the benefits or issues with some changes are understood. The application should be approved on the condition that the work of 347CH be finished and learnings transferred.

The ventilation scheme proposed by Studio Partington is based on fantasies and not justified. The proposed ventilation will not improve the conditions in the flat. It is window dressing to tick a box. The ventilation system is not backed by any calculations or experience that it will be sufficient. The application should only be approved on the condition that an engineer be employed to design a relevant ventilation system, or the ventilation to be postponed in a different project.

Studio Partington is proposed to manage the ventilation of Crescent House. Studio Partington has already failed very badly once to instal a ventilation system at Crescent House 3 years. Residents have been without ventilation for 3 years because of the incompetence of Studio Partington. Any ventilation proposal should be approved with the condition that Studio Partington be excluded for taking part in the design and management of the ventilation.

The planning application intends to have the Louvres windows of the 3rd floor bathrooms removed. This will destroy a Grade II* feature of the buildings, ruin the ventilation of the bathrooms and turn them into furnaces in the summer. The application must only be approved on the

condition that the Louvres windows be kept.

more in a separate file

Following the updating of the Planning Application 23/00466/FULL, I wish to make the following comments.

The residents were promised that the work at Crescent House would not start until the works at flat 347 Crescent House was completed. Councillor John Edwards was adamant that a scientific method be followed. The current application is being submitted before the work at 347 has been finished and the benefits or issues with some changes are understood. The application should be approved on the condition that the work of 347CH be finished and learnings transferred.

The ventilation scheme proposed by Studio Partington is based on fantasies and not justified. The proposed ventilation will not improve the conditions in the flat. It is window dressing to tick a box. The ventilation system is not backed by any calculations or experience that it will be sufficient. The application should only be approved on the condition that an engineer be employed to design a relevant ventilation system, or the ventilation to be postponed in a different project.

Studio Partington is proposed to manage the ventilation of Crescent House. Studio Partington has already failed very badly once to instal a ventilation system at Crescent House 3 years. Residents have been without ventilation for 3 years because of the incompetence of Studio Partington. Any ventilation proposal should be approved with the condition that Studio Partington be excluded for taking part in the design and management of the ventilation.

There is no justification for the specification of the heating system proposed. The planning application should be approved on the condition that the heating system be planned by an engineer and its specification be justified and measurable success parameters.

The planning application intends to have the Louvres windows of the 3rd floor bathrooms removed. This will destroy a Grade II* feature of the buildings, ruin the ventilation of the bathrooms and turn them into furnaces in the summer. The application must only be approved on the condition that the Louvres windows be kept.

The application makes light of the impact of the changes on the residents. Already residents have been bursting into tears in the pilot flat. City tenants are afraid of being permanently rehoused away from the area, and leaseholders are facing crimpling debts imposed on them by the city (to the tune of GBP 100,000 per flat).

Following the updating of the Planning Application 23/00466/FULL, I wish to make the following comments.

The residents were promised that the work at Crescent House would not start until the works at flat 347 Crescent House was completed. Councillor John Edwards was adamant that a scientific method be followed. The current application is being submitted before the work at 347 has been finished and the benefits or issues with some changes are understood. The application should be approved on the condition that the work of 347CH be finished and learnings transferred.

The ventilation scheme proposed by Studio Partington is based on fantasies and not justified. The proposed ventilation will not improve the conditions in the flat. It is window dressing to tick a box. The ventilation system is not backed by any calculations or experience that it will be sufficient. The application should only be approved on the condition that an engineer be employed to design a relevant ventilation system, or the ventilation to be postponed in a different project.

Studio Partington is proposed to manage the ventilation of Crescent House. Studio Partington has already failed very badly once to instal a ventilation system at Crescent House 3 years. Residents have been without ventilation for 3 years because of the incompetence of Studio Partington. Any ventilation proposal should be approved with the condition that Studio Partington be excluded for taking part in the design and management of the ventilation.

There is no justification for the specification of the heating system proposed. The planning application should be approved on the condition that the heating system be planned by an engineer and its specification be justified and measurable success parameters.

The planning application intends to have the Louvres windows of the 3rd floor bathrooms removed. This will destroy a Grade II* feature of the buildings, ruin the ventilation of the bathrooms and turn them into furnaces in the summer. The application must only be approved on the condition that the Louvres windows be kept.

The application makes light of the impact of the changes on the residents. Already residents have been bursting into tears in the pilot flat. City tenants are afraid of being permanently rehoused away from the area, and leaseholders are facing crimpling debts imposed on them by the city (to the tune of GBP 100,000 per flat).

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works (RECONSULTATION DUE TO AMENDED DRAWINGS).

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: B. Bennett

Address: 121 Crescent House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Councillor/Ward Member

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:a) the various electrical remedies against condensation, e.g. inadequate fans;

b) the requirement to change the heating in some residences due to their position in Crescent House was only mentioned

around a week before residents were to view the show flat;

c) without resident consultation, decision to install Economy7: no longer as economical as it might have been before the cost of living crisis;

d) it is not clear from the show flat, which is on the third floor, how the first and second floor flats will really be served and what they will look like, (what will remain? What will be altered? How the ventilation will really be handled in flats with vents to the outside only on one side of the building?)

The flats facing Goswell Road are all different; have different specifications, are different sizes, have on the first floor, different cupboard spaces, different ways the previous gas boiler heating has been installed- pipes, radiators, etc.;

e) It is clear that there will be an adverse effect on the residential amenity by reason of noise, and the indefinite disturbance due to the execution of the works; the so far lack of clarity of how residents are to manage during the execution of the works: "decanting" of the resident and the residents' belongings - as mentioned, flats are different sizes, residents have different number of belongings, in different states of mind, have no idea what the outcome of such a temporary site change entails for tenants and, as such, am shocked (in the sense of "there but for the Grace of

God") that leaseholders are required to pay £100,000 up front without a contract: how long, how well priced and no guarantee the work will be done to perfection or the state their (or our, tenants'), flats will be left;

f) little to add regarding the windows apart from that by the time they will have been installed, most vehicles will have changed from petroleum to alternative energy and there will be less traffic noise to contend with.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00466/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00466/FULL

Address: Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SL

Proposal: Repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing at first, second and third floor levels of Crescent House, including: stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single-glazing with vacuum glazing panels; insulation works to the main concrete vaulted roof and first floor concrete soffit; and associated works (RECONSULTATION DUE TO AMENDED DRAWINGS).

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Gavin Hutchison

Address: 103 Crescent House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I am a leaseholder and would like to update my objection given the additional information provided since the original application was and consultation period.

The original application was submitted in an incomplete form and at a time when the pilot flat was not complete, an approach that has undermined consultees faith in the designs produced.

The pilot is now largely completed and can be considered a reasonable success but this application for the full building is still flawed.

Although I have a fully electric heating system I object to residents being forced to remove gas boilers from their properties. The Building Regulation justification utilised is tenuous as existing buildings are considered on a 'no worsening' basis. Listed buildings are also treated differently when considering compliance and designs can be agreed as a relaxation of the usual standard.

The storage heating system and number of units proposed is particularly bulky and would cause difficulties for residents interior arrangements. Not to mention the changes required removing existing systems and adding wiring and conduit to supply new within existing finishes.

I also object to the omission of works to the roof of the bay windows. The sloping design of the 80's retrofit has been a major cause of the degradation of the facade with water pushed down the

surface. The original design had flat roofs with water spout drains. In my view the replaced windows will be subject to a new cycle of water damage caused by an ill considered design response.