

Unfortunately, I can't get access to the planning site right now, but I think an elevation is required in the opposite direction. I believe the extension has an elevation facing directly onto the rear elevation of the original building. But there are no drawings of it!

Difficult to tell without access to a plan right now.

Owen



**BLOOMSBURY
CONSERVATION AREAS**

Advisory Committee | Est. 1968

61B Judd Street, Bloomsbury, London. WC1H 9QT

bloomsburyconservation.org.uk

On 9 Mar 2025, at 19:02, Obote Hope wrote:

Dear Owen,

Thank you for your email. I have attached the proposed plan showing the rear of the property which includes section and elevation drawings. I believe the windows being replaced would be the non-historic windows. However, a condition would be attached as below on the listed building consent:

Before the relevant part of the work is begun, detailed drawings, or samples of materials as appropriate, in respect of the following, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

- a) Details including sections at 1:10 of all windows (including jambs, head and cill), ventilation grills, external doors and gates;
- b) Plan, elevation and section drawings, including fascia, cornice, pilasters and internal doors at a scale of 1:10;
- c) Manufacturer's specification details of all facing materials (to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority) and samples of those materials (to be provided on site).

The relevant part of the works shall be carried out in accordance with the details thus approved and all approved samples shall be retained on site during the course of the works.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of policy D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

<image001.png>

The works at First floor level involves both the front and rear rooms would be restored back to their original/historic proportions due to the removal of unsympathetic partitions. The front room has been subdivided in the past so the reinstatement back to a full width room and the

reinstatement of the multi pane sashes to the rear as attached above showing the existing and proposed drawing.

Kind Regards,

Obote Hope
Planning Officer

Economy, Regeneration and Investment
Supporting Communities
London Borough of Camden

Tel:

Web: camden.gov.uk

5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

-----Original Message-----

From: Owen Ward

Sent: 07 March 2025 20:35

To: Obote Hope Cc: Bloomsbury Conservation; Planning

Subject: Objection to 2024/4688/P - 22 Great James Street

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Dear Obote,

The committee visited the site and objected to the previous proposal by the same architect (2021/6263/P), which curiously seems to have disappeared from the online register. The current scheme is much reduced which we welcome.

We have no objection to change of use from Class E to C3 in heritage terms although any incidental interventions should benefit the heritage significance of the building. This is the general precedent that has been set in this area (Great James St, John St, Doughty St, etc).

In this respect, I cannot really say the proposal enhances the significance of the listed building. What appear to be altered-but-historic sash windows are to be replaced with double glazed equivalents with a 6 over 6 or 9 over 6 design. It's debatable whether this really enhances significance but details should certainly be secured by condition to ensure the replacement design is appropriate.

Similarly, it does not seem as though any works internally are to benefit the significance of the building. There is no restoration of historic features/details/joinery or plan form. In other boroughs, an extension would usually at least be offset by some beneficial internal alterations.

Correct me if I am wrong, but there do not seem to be any drawings or visualisations showing what the rear extension is to look like, which is a basic requirement of planning and especially important for a listed building! These should be submitted as part of the application itself rather than be left to conditions. It is impossible to properly assess the application without these.

Overall it's a fairly lacklustre application given that this is a listed building rather than simply unlisted in a CA, but there does not seem to be anything particularly objectionable about it. I will however register an objection until further details on the rear extension are submitted at planning stage.

Owen Ward
Bloomsbury CAAC