From:
 Owen Ward 

 Sent:
 11 February 2024 20:14

To: Geri Gohin; Planning
Cc: Jane Wylie: Bloomsbury Co

 Cc:
 Jane Wylie; Bloomsbury Conservation

 Subject:
 OBJECTION - 13 Colville Place - 2024/0293/L and 2024/5148/P

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra

Dear Geri,

I'm writing to comment on behalf of the Charlotte Street CAAC in regard to the above applications.

care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

I note Anthony Jennings has already objected but I am superseding his comments following our most recent meeting.

Regarding the replacement of the glass blocks and new structural glazing, we have no objection.

Regarding the front window, it is a difficult one to assess, and probably best settled by a conservation officer site visit. To me the shutters appear to be historic fabric. The window is not original but appears to be historic (difficult to tell from the pixelated photos). To me the shutters appear to be valuable historic items with their flush-beaded panels. We would certainly resist their loss.

The heritage statement seems to establish the width of the 'original opening' but the use of a full-width bressumer beam is quite common and doesn't really indicate that the whole front was glazed. Rather it might have just been easier for builders of the day to span the full width of the building instead of using two separate lintels for the window and door, although this is a bit of speculation on my part. The photos inside show quite a mess of construction so it's difficult to tell what has happened and certainly there's no conclusive evidence the current elevation is entirely c20 and post-listing.

It comes down to a question of whether retention of historic fabric is preferable to a speculative restoration and I think given the evidence, retention of current historic fabric would be preferable. The existing front is characterful, matches number 14, and similar other shopfronts in the Central London area such as number 36 and 38 Earlham Street in the Seven Dials CA.

We therefore object to the application on the above grounds.

Owen Ward