				Printed on: 09/08/2024 09:10:10
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	<b>Comment:</b>	Response:
2024/1558/P	Victoria Black;	06/08/2024 12:18:51	INT	We are residents of Jeffrey's Place and our home adjoins 13 Jeffrey's Place ("13 JP"). We wish to object to

The basis of our objection is several-fold:

David Callear

the planning application 2024/1558P ("The Application").

1. 13 JP is a mid-terrace town house and, as such, is specifically included in the Jeffrey's Street Conservation Area Statement ("The Statement") as one of the unlisted buildings which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The Application proposes to make significant changes to the appearance of both the front and rear elevations of 13 JP in a manner which clearly contradicts The Statement regarding the buildings which make that positive contribution.

These changes are also inconsistent with the generally uniform appearance of the other houses in that same terrace ("the terrace"), particularly the distinguishing 'one house and one garage door' feature of all the other front elevations.

Further, in its guidance for 'Materials and Maintenance', The Statement (JS 13) prescribes that, in all cases, existing/original architectural features and detailing characteristic of the Conservation Area should be retained....[unless] there is no alternative.

It is apparent that changes that have been made to the external appearance of other homes in Jeffery's Place have been restricted by these general principles. If The Application goes ahead, 13 JP will look markedly different to all other houses in the terrace and would detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

2. The Application proposes to create substantial balcony area/window expansion over three levels to the rear of 13 JP which, obviously, will adversely impact the privacy of neighbouring homes both in the terrace and in Jeffery's Street.

In addition, such substantial balcony and window areas are at odds with both the original design of the terrace and the minimal balcony spaces (essentially planting shelves with neither sitting nor excessive glass areas) that have been added (presumably with appropriate permissions) to (a few) other houses in the terrace. If allowed, the Conservation Area principles will be further compromised.

3. The Application proposes to site an air source heat pump ("ASHP") in the garden area of 13 JP. The garden area offers a limited space potentially unsuitable for the efficient and environmentally sound running of an ASHP.

In addition, other properties and gardens adjoin the garden area of 13 JP and will be subject to any noise and vibration caused by the ASHP which is why such units are generally deemed unsuitable other than in remote locations.

4. The Application proposes significant internal demolition as part of the development. The architect's Demolition Plan envisages removal of a significant proportion of the original internal walls. Quite apart from the long period of disruption, noise and vibration that the scale of the demolition and internal changes are likely to cause, both the demolition itself and the subsequent recreation of the internal walls gives rise to the risk of consequent structural issues for all properties in the terrace but particularly for Nos 12 and 14 which have party walls with 13 JP.

Surely, this risk should at least be tested by appropriately qualified engineers before this process continues.

In summary, we believe that there are compelling reasons to reject The Application given its detrimental

Printed on: 09/08/2024 09:10:10

Application No: Consultees Name: Received: Comment: Response:

impact on the basics of the Conservation Area and the quality of life of the existing residents in the area.