

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1558/P	Bevis and Susanna Sale	17/07/2024 13:44:45	OBJ	<p>The housing development constructed in Jeffreys Place during the 1970s was explicitly designed to fit tactfully into a small footprint in a densely occupied part of Camden. The rear windows were expressly designed not to compromise the privacy of residents in the listed Jeffreys Street terrace facing the back of the development.</p> <p>This principle has already been compromised by planning permission being granted for Jeffreys Place residents to enlarge their rear windows, thus adversely affecting the privacy of Jeffreys Street residents through their back windows and in their gardens.</p> <p>We hope Camden Planning will not allow a further undermining of the principle of tactful co-existence by permitting the construction of a rear inset balcony at no 13 Jeffreys Place. This would expose Jeffreys Street residents to noise, as well as far worse visual intrusion, in a way that was never intended by the original construction of this group of houses. It would also create a precedent likely to be taken up by other residents of Jeffreys Place. Jeffreys Place houses already have their own outdoor space, so it is not reasonable to expect additional high level outdoor space in a situation where it would cause maximum impact on the surrounding properties. Nor should Jeffreys Place residents expect to ignore the principles on which their houses were originally built.</p> <p>In the DAS /Heritage Statement accompanying this application it is quoted that, during the process of his consideration, the case officer responded to a request to replace permission for a front inset balcony with a rear inset balcony as follows: 'we would ...resist the installation of a rear balcony into the uninterrupted roofline within this conservation area.' It is then stated that the application has been submitted to formally test this position. We ask that the case officer's original view on this matter should be upheld.</p>
2024/1558/P	Peter Langworth	17/07/2024 22:16:31	OBJ	<p>This proposal amounts to an invasion of privacy of residents opposite in Jeffreys St. The planning officer (Chris Smith) has already submitted reservations about the suitability of a roof terrace. A previous application in 2001 for 12 Jeffreys Place was rejected for the reason that it did not meet the legal planning criteria regarding neighbour privacy. Apart from visibility noise intrusion would also be a factor. The architect's submission admits to not properly consulting Jeffreys St. residents affected, which is a stated national legal requirement. This should have been done. The statement about conservation area does not recognise that this comprises both Jeffreys St. and Jeffreys Place and therefore proper consultation is both necessary and a communal responsibility welcomed by all residents. Again there has been no attempt at all to inform the established Residents Association, a key part of the effective management of a conservation area. Camden Council should institute this.</p> <p>The statements about the nature of the balcony ignore the fact that minor alterations subsequently might change this without any planning consent. Accepting this application might therefore set a dangerous precedent adopted by other properties in Jeffreys Place on the spurious grounds of establishing a new uniformity to the rear look of these houses.</p> <p>The claim to need more family space is not an argument for this plan, rather it is one for seeking a larger property elsewhere.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1558/P	Gillian McCabe	17/07/2024 13:51:49	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the planning application for a rear inset balcony at No 13 jeffreys Place. This will obviously be intended as as space for entertaining and is likely to generate a lot of noise at high level to the enclosed space between the terraces of Jeffreys Place and Jeffreys Street. It will also mean that the residents of the Jeffreys St south-side properties backing on to 13 Jeffreys Place will experience people overlooking their gardens and rear windows. The propsed works are extremely close to the south side Jeffrey's Street properties and will potentially be intrusive and an invasion of our privacy.</p> <p>Given that a front inset balcony was refused (which would create liitle additional noise above that already generated by the high level balcony at 7 Jeffreys Place and the traffic from street businesses) the grounds for refusing a rear inset balcony appear even stronger.</p>
2024/1558/P	Peter Hodgman	17/07/2024 10:32:08	OBJ	<p>I support the objection submitted by John and Priscilla Green of 4 Jeffreys Street.</p> <p>The applicant is proposing that on the first and second floors the rear high level windows are removed and replaced with floor to ceiling fully glazed double doors together with balconies. Again these are going to be highly intrusive, allowing occupants to step outside and look directly into habitable rooms opposite. In this case the distance between the balcony balustrade and our rooms is 15.8m - considerably less than Camden's planning guidance of 18.0m.</p> <p>When the eight town houses in Jeffreys Place were designed and approved, the design took into consideration their close proximity to the listed houses in Jeffreys Street. Accordingly rooms at the rear of the new houses were designed with high level windows to minimise overlooking and intrusion - the need for privacy has not changed in the 50 years since they were built and remains as relevant now as it did then. The proposal in this application would negate that and should therefore be rejected.</p>