

**Peter Clapp RIBA FCSD**  
**22 The Green**  
**Exeter EX2 7SQ**  
**telephone** [REDACTED]  
**mobile** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

27<sup>th</sup> February 2024

Daren Zuk  
Case Officer  
London Borough of Camden  
Planning and Building Development

Dear Daren Zuk

**Re: Planning Application 2023/5081/P 13 Jeffreys Place NW1 9PP**

I write as a registered architect, and until very recently the owner of No.12 Jeffreys Place, where after sensitive re-furbishment I lived for 20 years. I was deeply involved in planning issues in the wider locality and still take an interest in the area as a visitor.

This terrace of eight houses was designed by John Renton and Tony Welch in 1973 a very active architect's partnership in the area at that time. They lived in Nos. 25 and 27 Prowse Place, which were used as prototypes for the larger Jeffreys Place terrace. The houses attracted much press publicity on completion, being described as "upside down houses" with their living accommodation sited above the bedrooms. A set of their original hand drawn working drawings still exists.

It is very sad to see how this remarkable example of high-density housing is being steadily eroded by inappropriate purchasers and their architects. The Kevin Mc Cloud Grand Designs approach is not suited to this very sensitively designed terrace of houses.

Why for example buy a house with a garage, such a rarity, if you don't want a car?

Why buy a terrace house with solid, quite thin party walls and narrow staircase if you have a grand piano?

Why have a due south facing roof slope with the optimum angle for maximum generation at that latitude and then put virtually flat PV panels on the roof? Because of the optimum angle, the Feed in Tariff (FIT) at No 12 Jeffreys Place exceeds the cost of both gas and electricity consumption throughout the year.

Why remove a large rooflight which not only lights the top floor, but when the vents are open and the ground floor north facing patio door open, provides stack ventilation, keeping the whole house cool on the hottest summer days. This is why relatively small windows have been provided to the South elevation, so that with translucent roller blinds, the entire house remains cool passively.

The mezzanine floor in the original design, retained at No.12 and most other properties, provides an amazing sense of volume and space in an otherwise relatively small house. The proposals completely eliminate this wonderful volume as well as destroying the mansard continuity of the terrace, very visible from the flats and penthouse opposite.

Heat pumps only work effectively when you have a large, insulated, ground floor concrete slab with underfloor heating. Otherwise they require excessively large radiators because of the low flow temperatures. No such radiators are indicated on the drawings. Furthermore, they only work at a maximum coefficient of 3:1 in cold conditions, and as electricity in the UK is three times the cost of gas are simply not cost effective for the considerably higher expenditure. They also, like air conditioning condensers, are a constant source of noise irritation to neighbours, and are therefore only suited to remote locations.

Several of the points mentioned above are not planning matters, but as an architect who has not only lived in No.12, but has wide experienced with both PV and heat pump installations, indicate just how the proposals and their justification are inaccurate, costly and impractical.

On the surface, this proposal holds itself out as being a green solution, with bicycles, heat pumps and photovoltaic panels, but it is anything but. This house has had no upgrading whatsoever since 1973 and is both dark with its varnished boarding and old polycarbonate rooflight and generally tired. It needs TLC by someone who appreciates it for what it is and not attempts to turn it into a different animal.

Turning to planning matters.

#### FRONT ELEVATION

- The simple rhythm of front doors and up-and-over garage doors along the terrace would be destroyed.
- The continuity of mansard roofs running along the terrace, very visible from the flats and penthouse opposite would be destroyed.
- The opportunity of providing PV panels in the optimum location would be lost.
- There would be serious overlooking from the proposed roof terrace into habitable rooms in the flats opposite, which themselves have no outdoor space.
- The front elevation drawing indicates the first floor windows to No 13 are larger than the remainder of the terrace. In fact they are all identical as the photograph clearly shows.
- The front elevation drawing does not represent the façade of No 12 Jeffreys Place, which is accurately depicted on Page 8 of the Design Statement.

#### REAR ELEVATION

- Although some of the terrace have larger “balconies”, No 12 was only given planning permission for a “planting shelf that must not project more than 600mm from the face of the building”. In practice, as this is a North elevation, this proved to be a benefit as the smaller shelf did not overshadow the bedroom window beneath.
- Because of the proximity of the houses in Jeffreys Street, approximately 16 metres away, there can be no justification for either enlarging the bedroom window at first floor level or extending the room. Camden’s requirement being a minimum of 18 metres.
- The Velux type windows proposed in the mansard roof are likely to cause noise from the kitchen/dining area, bearing in mind the proximity of Jeffreys Street houses. If a hinged glass rooflight were to be substituted for the existing cheap and yellowed polycarbonate one, this room would be dramatically improved over the present proposals. A visit to No 12 would demonstrate this.

In conclusion I would request that this application be REFUSED and the owners and their architects be requested to submit proposals that give greater consideration both to their neighbours, the Conservation Area and to genuinely “Green” issues.

I feel certain that owners of other houses in the terrace would encourage viewing to see just how amazing the original concept can be updated at relatively little cost.

Yours sincerely,



Peter Clapp