

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Philip Kemp	20 Jeffreys Street London NW1 9PR	21/11/2014 12:32:05	COMMNT	Even with the stated modifications, this plan is unacceptable. The proposed building line is too far forward, jutting out beyond that of the Georgian terraces in the rest of the street. The failure of the developers to secure garage #4 makes a nonsense of the whole design - and the idea of leaving it as a recessed alcove invites use as a public toilet. The proposed buildings are too high, out of scale with Nos. 3-9 immediately opposite. The exterior design is bland and undistinguished; as one of the best preserved Georgian streets in the borough, Jeffreys Street deserves something far better.
2014/4777/P	Mark McCarthy	5 Rochester Terrace	21/11/2014 09:47:14	OBJ	<p>South Kentish Town CAAC continues to consider the proposal for three storey building in Jefferys Street is excessive for height for this historic road.</p> <p>The proposal to build on the forecourt is inappropriate use of space that should properly be a gated open area with railings.</p> <p>Leaving one garage unconverted is highly unsatisfactory, and will create a laughable frontage.</p> <p>The proposal for open terrace at the top floor instead of pitched roofs (which other houses have in the street) is unacceptable in potential noise disturbance and character.</p>
2014/4777/P	Nico Clark	25 Prowse Place	24/11/2014 12:27:39	OBJ	<p>Having already commented on the original application my general objections are still at issue. There are a few points that have arisen as a result of the revision to the design. The original application constituted a package of information which from my understanding must now be treated as irrelevant as it does not refer to the significantly altered design under consideration. This would suggest that the only evidence that the planning office should consider is "amended plans 1207-DRAWINGS_PL02".</p> <p>The original package of plans, sections and elevations were troubling in their over-simplicity and now that there is no valid supporting documentation it is hard to ignore the unresolved details which may well create a major difference between what is under consideration and what might eventually be built. For example if you read Section D (1207-0300-AP-002) you would imagine that either the new development is built on the existing walls of Garage 4 or that Garage 4 had been demolished and the roof replaced. Clearly this is architect shorthand but the question of how this new development is supported and how it connects with the neighbouring structure is not an issue to be considered after the planning stage. Similarly the stairway to the roof terraces doesn't seem to have a door. Is the stairway exposed to the elements or is there some kind of flap to allow access? The eventual resolution to these issues will more than likely change the external appearance of the building from what we are being presented with here.</p> <p>I could go into a more detailed evaluation of the revision to the design but it seems clear that the basic concept of the development is flawed and any level of adjustment to the layout won't change that.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Bevis & Susanna Sale	25 Jeffreys Street Camden London NW1 9PS	23/11/2014 16:26:19	OBJ	<p>COMMENTS ON THE REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION 2014/4777/P - REDEVELOPMENT OF GARAGES 1-3, 5-6 JEFFREYS STREET AND 29 PROWSE PLACE. NW1 9PN</p> <p>The removal of inappropriate pitched roofs is a big improvement to this plan. However the design still suffers from fundamental flaws as it is premised on retaining the garages and building two storeys above them, and the fact that the developers have failed to purchase one of the six garages.</p> <p>The exclusion of garage 4 from the scheme creates an ugly gap between the buildings, and a recess which Jeffreys Street residents know only too well from past experience will be abused by drug dealers, antisocial urinating, etc.</p> <p>Although the height of the development has been reduced in the revised plan, the three storeys created as a result of building on top of the garages are still out of proportion with the two storey villas opposite in Jeffreys Street, and out of scale with the much smaller houses in Prowse Place. The revised plan also retains a frontage which projects 1.0m beyond the line of the main Georgian terrace on the south side of Jeffreys Street, and is cantilevered even further out on the second and third floors. The development would be most visible from Jeffreys Street itself, so these problems of scale and proportion would be very apparent.</p> <p>The revised design still retains the characteristics of an opportunistic compromise, which prioritizes the creation of marketable flats over a genuine attempt to create buildings which preserve and enhance the Jeffreys Street Conservation Area.</p> <p>Bevis and Susanna Sale 25 Jeffreys Street London NW1 9PS</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Andrew Lock	9 Jeffrey's Street London NW1 9PS	21/11/2014 11:42:12	OBJNOT	Ref. Planning Application No. 2014/4777/P

I am the resident and owner of 9 Jeffrey's Street, London NW1 9PS.

My house is almost directly opposite to the garages that are being proposed for re-development. I therefore feel that this has a significant and direct effect on my wife and I.

I am objecting to this development in the strongest possible terms for multiple reasons.

First of all, I have received no official notification of this development despite being directly affected by it, and have only found out about it by chance. There are supposed to be notice put up outside any proposed planning development and this has not been the case here, on either the original application or this altered proposed development. This means that many people will not have been given the chance to fully assess these proposals and object to them.

This proposed development is completely contrary to guidelines set out by Camden Council in respect to Conservation areas.

UDP Policy EN31 states "The Council will seek to ensure that development in conservation areas preserves or enhances their special character or appearance, and is of high quality in terms of design, materials and execution."

I would say that this proposed development totally contravenes this statement. The design and bulk of the buildings, as well as the materials being used neither preserve nor enhance the character of Jeffrey's Street, and the execution is frankly laughable. They are trying to develop these garages, but leave one still there in place. This is deplorable execution of a development and will look ridiculous and will seriously damage the look and feel of the street and for this reason alone, among many others, this should be enough of a reason for planning permission to be denied.

The proposed development is overbearing and totally out of context with the rest of the buildings. It's height and bulk completely jars compared to the other buildings on the street. The architects drawing 1207-0400-AP-005 illustrates how absurd the frontage of this proposed buildings are retaining one of the garages. The street is used by various people during the day and night as a cut through but especially on weekends at night by people returning home from going out within the Camden area – they would use this as a place to stop and urinate in. Also it could be used easily for dumping rubbish and other forms of anti-social behaviour. More absurdly, the architects/developers have tried to propose that leaving the existing garage would reflect the style of the houses opposite it (3-7 Jeffrey's Street). This just shows how misguided and frankly, deluded they are in their assessments of this proposed development.

The fronts of the proposed buildings would extend about 1 metre further out than the Georgian houses further up the street and the second floor extends even further out by another 0.5 metres thus spoiling

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>the lines and views up and down the street and ruining the feel of the street. Also virtually all the houses on the street are flat fronted so having these proposed houses protruding further out on the other floors is totally out of context with the other buildings. Also they have very pitched roofs which are not reflected anywhere else on the street.</p> <p>Also the height of these proposed 3 storey houses is completely out of context with the listed buildings opposite which are 2 storey Georgian villas. It contravenes the guidelines once again set out in the Camden Planning Conservation Area Statement on Camden Council's website which states:</p> <p>“Where development detracts from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, it is often through lack of respect for historic context, use of inappropriate materials, inappropriate bulk or height or use of unsympathetic signage.”</p> <p>Referring to this as well, proposing brick on the lower part of the building, and rendering the top part is totally opposite to the rest of the buildings in Jeffrey's Street. This seems perverse and will destroy any harmonious looks in the street, and is completely at odds with the other buildings.</p> <p>The buildings along Prowse Place would be completely overshadowed by the height and bulk of these proposed buildings. They are all 2 storey houses along this road, so these new houses would destroy the entrance to a lovely street.</p> <p>The development has been described as two flats but looks to me like it is two houses with built-in garages, so it seems to have been deliberately described in the wrong terms, possibly to pass planning easier.</p> <p>These proposals are shoddy, out of context and completely unsympathetic to the conservation area, and with one of the garages being retained, completely laughable architecturally and should be turned down for planning permission immediately.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Misha and Luke Moore	10 Prowse Place London NW1 9PN	24/11/2014 14:51:42	OBJ	<p>We note the revised planning application for this site. We continue to object to the current proposals for the following reasons:</p> <p>The reduction in height and loss of the pitched roofs of the development is an improvement to the original proposal, however it remains 2 storeys above the height of the original property and significantly alters the look and feel of this historic street. A two storey development would be much more appropriate and would be much less likely to detract from the local architecture.</p> <p>There remains a fourth storey visible at the back of the building (elevation adjoining 29 Prowse Place) which is unsightly and dwarfs the smaller buildings adjacent to it. It also alters an 'important view' according to the conservation area statement (the view from Prowse Place through the railway arch towards 3-9 Jeffrey's Street and rear of Kentish Town Road terraces).</p> <p>The development continues to extend beyond the existing building line of Jeffreys Street which is entirely unacceptable. This will look out of keeping with the architecture in the street and will render the development overbearing.</p> <p>Extension beyond the current building line means that there is a recess in front of garage 4. We already have a problem with public urination in the recess created behind the garages in front of 27 and 29 Prowse place, which we have witnessed on several occasions. This will inevitably occur in the recess created in front of garage 4 and its possible use for antisocial behaviour such as drug dealing means that the development is a threat to public order.</p> <p>A fundamental flaw in this proposal to redevelop the garages remains the fact that one garage is not included in the development. This will look ridiculous and no development should go ahead without inclusion of all the garages. This is particularly important if any recess is to be created in front of the remaining garage which will become a public nuisance.</p> <p>Any development should be in keeping with the architecture of the street. It is unclear why the current proposal is of brick for the ground floor and render for the upper floors when this is the reverse for the majority of the houses on Jeffrey's Street.</p> <p>For the above reasons, along with the additional reasons stated in our initial comment, we continue to oppose the current planning application which will not enhance or preserve the features of this street. Given that this is a large development in a conservation area containing listed buildings, which will be particularly imposing at the entrance to Jeffreys street, proper and formal consultation should occur before any development goes ahead.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Peter Hodgman	22 Jeffreys Street Camden Town London NW1 9PR	21/11/2014 12:49:25	OBJ	<p>The following comments should be read alongside the previously submitted comments, most of which remain relevant,</p> <p>In particular it remains the case that the proposal still fails to meet the requirements in the Jeffreys Street Conservation Area Statement that “All development should respect existing features such as building lines, elevation design, and where appropriate, architectural characteristics , detailing, profile and materials of adjoining buildings.’</p> <p>The main alteration to the original proposals is that the pitched roofs have been removed and replaced with paved accessible terraces surrounded by planting. The removal of the pitched roofs is an improvement and certainly reduces some of the vertical bulk of the development.</p> <p>However the main issues of concern against this development still remain from the original proposal namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No proposals for this site should have been put forward to Camden planning whilst one garage remained outside of the architect/developers ownership. Its continued presence should this development be given planning permission would be absurd. - Retention of garage 4, creating a recess in the street frontage which will inevitably be used as a public toilet. The architects drawing 1207-0400-AP-005 illustrates just how ridiculous a street frontage this will be. - The development extends beyond the existing building line of Jeffreys Street on the ground floor by approximately 1.0m and is cantilevered a further 350mm on the first and second floors. This brings the bulk of the buildings beyond the line of the railings of the Georgian houses in Jeffrey"s Street. This is wholly unacceptable. The building line of this development should follow that of the street as a whole and be brought back to the line of the existing garages. - It seems perverse to use brick for the ground floor and render the upper floors when the majority of the houses on both sides of Jeffrey"s Street are precisely the opposite. - Removal of the pitched roofs is welcome but does not really address the underlying fact that a three storey development in this location is inappropriate. It overwhelms 29 Prowse Place as is evident from the 3D Views and drawings 1207-0400-AP-002 and 004. A three storey development is equally out of scale with the two storey villas directly opposite. A completely two storey development across all six garages would be more respectful of the scale of the houses in Prowse Place and 3 - 9 Jeffrey"s Street. Two storeys would also keep intact the integrity of the two complete listed Georgian terraces and not fight against them. This proposal by being forward of the main building line would be an over assertive presence in the street and certainly does not preserve or enhance its setting. - Whilst the removal of the pitched roofs has reduced the anomalous gable ends and some of the height, both houses now have flat roofs with concealed terraces which will require access. It is unclear from

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

the drawings just how this is to be achieved. However what is clear is that along the SE elevation at the abutment with 29 Prowse Place there is a further half storey - see drawing 1207-0400-AP-004 with an extension of the main staircase within it up on to the terrace. It is unclear what this roof extension is constructed of - there don't appear to be any notes on the drawings by way of explanation - this is unacceptable in a planning application for a development in a conservation area and in such close proximity to listed buildings.

-There is also a risk that the use of these terraces will cause noise disturbance.

- The inability of the architect/developer to bring garage 4 into the development may result in the three new garages not being fit for purpose. Space within the existing garages is already tight for a modern saloon car. By keeping garage 4 and then having to build new walls either side of it reduces the width of the garages to below what they are at present. The architects have not provided any dimensions other than a scale bar but it would appear that the new garages have a clear internal width of 2300mm. A Vauxhall Astra for example is 2020mm wide - this gives a clearance each side of 140mm (5.5") - extremely tight.

- Garage 6 is also limited in length as it has the entrance staircase to Flat 2 at one end - the only place it can be whilst garage 4 remains outside of the development. The need for this staircase and to provide just enough length for a garage is what pushes the whole development further forward than the established building line by between 850mm and 1000mm on the ground floor. Whilst there is no minimum width for staircases in the Building Regulations the entrance staircase appears to be 700mm wide which is quite narrow and even more so if handrails are added.

- It is not clear why this development is described as two flats as it would seem from the drawings that they are town houses with integral garages. It is also not clear why there is no indication on the drawings that compliance with Lifetime Homes has been met.

These revised proposals are still unacceptable for the reasons outlined above and should be refused planning permission.

2014/4777/P	Peter Hodgman	22 Jeffreys Street Camden Town London NW! 9PR	21/11/2014 12:49:25	OBJ
-------------	---------------	---	---------------------	-----

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Priscilla Green	4 Jeffreys St London NW1 9PR	21/11/2014 13:14:41	OBJEMAIL	<p>I am a long term resident at 4 Jeffreys Street and I endorse all my husband's comments on the revised designs. I am especially concerned about the vagueness of the proposals for the ground floor facades in Jeffreys Street, which appear to be blank brick at present, and the unsympathetic proposals for the Prowse Place aspect of the development, which bear little relation to the surrounding buildings. I am also concerned that one of the garages is not included in the scheme, and this lack seems to have driven and distorted the design, resulting in excessive height and pushing construction over the building line.</p> <p>In addition, I object to the proposed roof terraces, which are a new feature of the development. We already suffer considerable noise nuisance from roof top parties in the summer which reverberates in the tunnels formed by our tightly packed streets. Planning consents for roof terraces in Jeffreys Place have already been refused for this reason and this should also apply to Jeffreys Street.</p> <p>I would, however, welcome the redevelopment of the garages, in principle, providing all are included in the work, and the resulting building is appropriate to its position opposite one of the most charming listed terraces in Camden.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Peter Hodgman	22 Jeffreys Street Camden Town London NW1 9PR	21/11/2014 12:49:03	OBJ	<p>The following comments should be read alongside the previously submitted comments, most of which remain relevant,</p> <p>In particular it remains the case that the proposal still fails to meet the requirements in the Jeffreys Street Conservation Area Statement that “All development should respect existing features such as building lines, elevation design, and where appropriate, architectural characteristics , detailing, profile and materials of adjoining buildings.’</p> <p>The main alteration to the original proposals is that the pitched roofs have been removed and replaced with paved accessible terraces surrounded by planting. The removal of the pitched roofs is an improvement and certainly reduces some of the vertical bulk of the development.</p> <p>However the main issues of concern against this development still remain from the original proposal namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No proposals for this site should have been put forward to Camden planning whilst one garage remained outside of the architect/developers ownership. Its continued presence should this development be given planning permission would be absurd. - Retention of garage 4, creating a recess in the street frontage which will inevitably be used as a public toilet. The architects drawing 1207-0400-AP-005 illustrates just how ridiculous a street frontage this will be. - The development extends beyond the existing building line of Jeffreys Street on the ground floor by approximately 1.0m and is cantilevered a further 350mm on the first and second floors. This brings the bulk of the buildings beyond the line of the railings of the Georgian houses in Jeffrey"s Street. This is wholly unacceptable. The building line of this development should follow that of the street as a whole and be brought back to the line of the existing garages. - It seems perverse to use brick for the ground floor and render the upper floors when the majority of the houses on both sides of Jeffrey"s Street are precisely the opposite. - Removal of the pitched roofs is welcome but does not really address the underlying fact that a three storey development in this location is inappropriate. It overwhelms 29 Prowse Place as is evident from the 3D Views and drawings 1207-0400-AP-002 and 004. A three storey development is equally out of scale with the two storey villas directly opposite. A completely two storey development across all six garages would be more respectful of the scale of the houses in Prowse Place and 3 - 9 Jeffrey"s Street. Two storeys would also keep intact the integrity of the two complete listed Georgian terraces and not fight against them. This proposal by being forward of the main building line would be an over assertive presence in the street and certainly does not preserve or enhance its setting. - Whilst the removal of the pitched roofs has reduced the anomalous gable ends and some of the height, both houses now have flat roofs with concealed terraces which will require access. It is unclear from

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

the drawings just how this is to be achieved. However what is clear is that along the SE elevation at the abutment with 29 Prowse Place there is a further half storey - see drawing 1207-0400-AP-004 with an extension of the main staircase within it up on to the terrace. It is unclear what this roof extension is constructed of - there don't appear to be any notes on the drawings by way of explanation - this is unacceptable in a planning application for a development in a conservation area and in such close proximity to listed buildings.

-There is also a risk that the use of these terraces will cause noise disturbance.

- The inability of the architect/developer to bring garage 4 into the development may result in the three new garages not being fit for purpose. Space within the existing garages is already tight for a modern saloon car. By keeping garage 4 and then having to build new walls either side of it reduces the width of the garages to below what they are at present. The architects have not provided any dimensions other than a scale bar but it would appear that the new garages have a clear internal width of 2300mm. A Vauxhall Astra for example is 2020mm wide - this gives a clearance each side of 140mm (5.5") - extremely tight.

- Garage 6 is also limited in length as it has the entrance staircase to Flat 2 at one end - the only place it can be whilst garage 4 remains outside of the development. The need for this staircase and to provide just enough length for a garage is what pushes the whole development further forward than the established building line by between 850mm and 1000mm on the ground floor. Whilst there is no minimum width for staircases in the Building Regulations the entrance staircase appears to be 700mm wide which is quite narrow and even more so if handrails are added.

- It is not clear why this development is described as two flats as it would seem from the drawings that they are town houses with integral garages. It is also not clear why there is no indication on the drawings that compliance with Lifetime Homes has been met.

These revised proposals are still unacceptable for the reasons outlined above and should be refused planning permission.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	K Gemmell	3 Ivor Street	21/11/2014 15:49:07	OBJ	<p>I write on behalf of the NCTNF Steering group to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4777/P.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The proposed development is within Jeffery's Street Conservation Area and indeed on Jeffery's Street it's self. We have already objected to the original application and what has been submitted now, as a revision, has not addressed the issues raised in our original objection.</p> <p>The main alteration to the original proposals is that the pitched roofs have been removed and replaced with paved accessible terraces surrounded by planting. The removal of the pitched roofs somewhat reduces the vertical bulk of the development. However, the main issues against this development still remain from the original proposal namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No proposals for this site should have been put forward to Camden planning whilst one garage remained outside the scheme. 2. Retention of garage 4, creates a recess in the street frontage which will inevitably be used as a public toilet or for drug dealing. The architects drawing 1207-0400-AP-005 illustrates just how ridiculous and out of context a street frontage this would be. 3. The development extends beyond the existing building line of Jeffreys Street on the ground floor by approximately 1.0m and is cantilevered a further 350mm on the first and second floors. This brings the bulk of the buildings beyond the line of the railings of the Georgian houses in Jeffrey's Street. This is unacceptable. The building line of this development should follow that of the street as a whole and be brought back to the line of the existing garages. 4. It seems strange to propose the use of brick for the ground floor and render the upper floors when the majority of the houses on both sides of Jeffrey's Street are the opposite. 5. Removal of the pitched roofs is welcome but does not address the underlying fact that a three storey development in this location is inappropriate. It overwhelms 29 Prowse Place as is illustrated from the 3D Views and drawings 1207-0400-AP-002 and 004. A three storey development is equally out of scale with the two storey villas directly opposite. A completely two storey development across all six garages would be more respectful of the scale of the houses in Prowse Place and 3 - 9 Jeffrey's Street. Two storeys would also keep intact the integrity of the two complete listed Georgian terraces and not fight against them. This current proposal would be an over assertive presence in the street and would neither preserve or enhance its setting. 6. Both houses now have flat roofs with concealed terraces which will require access. It is unclear from the drawings just how this is to be achieved. However, what is clear is that along the SE elevation at the abutment with 29 Prowse Place there is a further half storey - see drawing 1207-0400-AP-004 with an extension of the main staircase within it up on to the terrace. It is unclear what this roof extension is constructed of - there don't appear to be any notes on the drawings by way of explanation - this is unacceptable in a planning application for a development in a conservation area and in such close proximity to listed buildings.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

7. The inability of the architect/developer to bring garage 4 into the development may result in the three new garages not being fit for purpose. Space within the existing garages is already tight for a modern saloon car.

By keeping garage 4 and then having to build new walls either side of it reduces the width of the garages to below what they are at present.

8. Garage 6 is also limited in length as it has the entrance staircase to Flat 2 at one end - the only place it can be whilst garage 4 remains outside of the development. The need for this staircase and to provide just enough length for a garage is what pushes the whole development further forward than the established building line by between 850mm and 1000mm on the ground floor.

9. It is not clear why this development is described as two flats as it would seem from the drawings that they are town houses with integral garages. It is also not clear why there is no indication on the drawings that compliance with Lifetime Homes has been met.

These revised proposals remain unacceptable and flawed for the reasons outlined above and should be refused planning permission. We urge you to reject this application as it currently stands and would seek a local working group to be assembled to work alongside the developer to agree a suitable scheme for this site.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Peter Langworth	16 Jeffreys St	24/11/2014 12:47:35	OBJEMPER	<p>1. Neither the Jeffreys St Association nor Jeffreys St Conservation Committee have been consulted on this proposal. This is an abuse of proper procedures.</p> <p>2. Conservation Area developments are required to enhance or preserve the conservation area. This development is out of sympathy with a Georgian St so does neither. It is possible to design a modern building to be worthy of the street, this is not it.</p> <p>3. The height is unacceptable compared to Jeffreys St and compared to the listed houses opposite 3-7. It will block sunlight on the street and on to 3-7 from the south. It would also dominate the approach/hide the view of Jeffreys St from the junction with Kentish Town Road.</p> <p>4. The proposal is fundamentally flawed in the middle. Leaving the garage No.4 makes a very odd gap and will create a nasty corner for fly-tipping and defacing, already a problem and Council expense here.</p> <p>5. Design: the projecting bays/balconies are very crude & obtrusive & not in character with the street</p> <p>6. The roofing & facing of copper bronze will look stark and are not in character with the street. Low level bare facings will attract defacement and graffiti.</p> <p>7. The view from Prowse Place is very stark and obtrusive The curved wall is not in character. The height is also over-dominant for that corner of Prowse Place with high walls far above the level of houses in Prowse Place.</p> <p>8. A good sympathetic development would be welcome to replace the garages</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	North Camden Town neighbourhood Forum	3 Ivor Street	21/11/2014 15:48:20	OBJ	<p>I write on behalf of the NCTNF Steering group to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4777/P.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The proposed development is within Jeffery's Street Conservation Area and indeed on Jeffery's Street it's self. We have already objected to the original application and what has been submitted now, as a revision, has not addressed the issues raised in our original objection.</p> <p>The main alteration to the original proposals is that the pitched roofs have been removed and replaced with paved accessible terraces surrounded by planting. The removal of the pitched roofs somewhat reduces the vertical bulk of the development. However, the main issues against this development still remain from the original proposal namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No proposals for this site should have been put forward to Camden planning whilst one garage remained outside the scheme. 2. Retention of garage 4, creates a recess in the street frontage which will inevitably be used as a public toilet or for drug dealing. The architects drawing 1207-0400-AP-005 illustrates just how ridiculous and out of context a street frontage this would be. 3. The development extends beyond the existing building line of Jeffreys Street on the ground floor by approximately 1.0m and is cantilevered a further 350mm on the first and second floors. This brings the bulk of the buildings beyond the line of the railings of the Georgian houses in Jeffrey's Street. This is unacceptable. The building line of this development should follow that of the street as a whole and be brought back to the line of the existing garages. 4. It seems strange to propose the use of brick for the ground floor and render the upper floors when the majority of the houses on both sides of Jeffrey's Street are the opposite. 5. Removal of the pitched roofs is welcome but does not address the underlying fact that a three storey development in this location is inappropriate. It overwhelms 29 Prowse Place as is illustrated from the 3D Views and drawings 1207-0400-AP-002 and 004. A three storey development is equally out of scale with the two storey villas directly opposite. A completely two storey development across all six garages would be more respectful of the scale of the houses in Prowse Place and 3 - 9 Jeffrey's Street. Two storeys would also keep intact the integrity of the two complete listed Georgian terraces and not fight against them. This current proposal would be an over assertive presence in the street and would neither preserve or enhance its setting. 6. Both houses now have flat roofs with concealed terraces which will require access. It is unclear from the drawings just how this is to be achieved. However, what is clear is that along the SE elevation at the abutment with 29 Prowse Place there is a further half storey - see drawing 1207-0400-AP-004 with an extension of the main staircase within it up on to the terrace. It is unclear what this roof extension is constructed of - there don't appear to be any notes on the drawings by way of explanation - this is unacceptable in a planning application for a development in a conservation area and in such close proximity to listed buildings.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

7. The inability of the architect/developer to bring garage 4 into the development may result in the three new garages not being fit for purpose. Space within the existing garages is already tight for a modern saloon car.

By keeping garage 4 and then having to build new walls either side of it reduces the width of the garages to below what they are at present.

8. Garage 6 is also limited in length as it has the entrance staircase to Flat 2 at one end - the only place it can be whilst garage 4 remains outside of the development. The need for this staircase and to provide just enough length for a garage is what pushes the whole development further forward than the established building line by between 850mm and 1000mm on the ground floor.

9. It is not clear why this development is described as two flats as it would seem from the drawings that they are town houses with integral garages. It is also not clear why there is no indication on the drawings that compliance with Lifetime Homes has been met.

These revised proposals remain unacceptable and flawed for the reasons outlined above and should be refused planning permission. We urge you to reject this application as it currently stands and would seek a local working group to be assembled to work alongside the developer to agree a suitable scheme for this site.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	North Camden Town Neighbourhood Forum	3 Ivor Street Camden Town NW1 9PL	21/11/2014 15:43:54	OBJ	<p>North Camden Town Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group Objection 21 November 2014</p> <p>OBJECTION TO THE REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION 2014/4777/P - REDEVELOPMENT OF GARAGES 1-3, 5-6 JEFFREYS STREET AND 29 PROWSE PLACE. NW1 9PN</p> <p>I write on behalf of the NCTNF Steering group to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4777/P.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The proposed development is within Jeffery's Street Conservation Area and indeed on Jeffery's Street it's self. We have already objected to the original application and what has been submitted now, as a revision, has not addressed the issues raised in our original objection.</p> <p>The main alteration to the original proposals is that the pitched roofs have been removed and replaced with paved accessible terraces surrounded by planting. The removal of the pitched roofs somewhat reduces the vertical bulk of the development. However, the main issues against this development still remain from the original proposal namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No proposals for this site should have been put forward to Camden planning whilst one garage remained outside the scheme. 2. Retention of garage 4, creates a recess in the street frontage which will inevitably be used as a public toilet or for drug dealing. The architects drawing 1207-0400-AP-005 illustrates just how ridiculous and out of context a street frontage this would be. 3. The development extends beyond the existing building line of Jeffreys Street on the ground floor by approximately 1.0m and is cantilevered a further 350mm on the first and second floors. This brings the bulk of the buildings beyond the line of the railings of the Georgian houses in Jeffrey's Street. This is unacceptable. The building line of this development should follow that of the street as a whole and be brought back to the line of the existing garages. 4. It seems strange to propose the use of brick for the ground floor and render the upper floors when the majority of the houses on both sides of Jeffrey's Street are the opposite.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Lindsay Douglas	19 Jeffrey's St London NW19PS	23/11/2014 21:58:11	COMMNT	<p>Jeffrey's Street is one of Camden's oldest and most attractive streets. Since the first buildings were completed in 1816 it has spent nearly 200 years as the modest but elegant residential link between Camden and Kentish Town.</p> <p>The use of brick and white stucco is welcome, a clever inverse of how the historic houses use it.</p> <p>The new flat roof is far more fitting but it seems the roof extension and garden will be visible and so could maintain the impression that these twin buildings dominate the rest of the street.</p> <p>Similarly, the overhanging upper bays create an oppressive look that also clashes with and disrupts the line of the flat-fronted historic terraces.</p> <p>When (rather than if) the garages are vandalised or damaged is this proposed grey finish easy and inexpensive to clean, paint, repair or replace? Otherwise the garages will quickly become a blight on the street and the architect's vision will be undermined.</p> <p>The central garage provides an area for people to wee on the way home from the pub. That's at best. There are many worse reasons for people to loiter somewhere they can not be seen. It's currently boarded up after being broken into and with an absent owner, there's nothing to stop that being its permanent look even after any new build. Without that final garage any proposed design can't really do justice to such a beautiful historic street.</p> <p>I'm sure a design that respects the street will be possible and that it would benefit Jeffrey's St's next 200 years to get that right.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	North Camden Town Neighbourhood Forum	K Gemmell	21/11/2014 15:46:01	OBJ	<p>North Camden Town Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group Objection 21 November 2014</p> <p>OBJECTION TO THE REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION 2014/4777/P - REDEVELOPMENT OF GARAGES 1-3, 5-6 JEFFREYS STREET AND 29 PROWSE PLACE. NW1 9PN</p> <p>I write on behalf of the NCTNF Steering group to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4777/P.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The proposed development is within Jeffery's Street Conservation Area and indeed on Jeffery's Street it's self. We have already objected to the original application and what has been submitted now, as a revision, has not addressed the issues raised in our original objection.</p> <p>The main alteration to the original proposals is that the pitched roofs have been removed and replaced with paved accessible terraces surrounded by planting. The removal of the pitched roofs somewhat reduces the vertical bulk of the development. However, the main issues against this development still remain from the original proposal namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No proposals for this site should have been put forward to Camden planning whilst one garage remained outside the scheme. 2. Retention of garage 4, creates a recess in the street frontage which will inevitably be used as a public toilet or for drug dealing. The architects drawing 1207-0400-AP-005 illustrates just how ridiculous and out of context a street frontage this would be. 3. The development extends beyond the existing building line of Jeffreys Street on the ground floor by approximately 1.0m and is cantilevered a further 350mm on the first and second floors. This brings the bulk of the buildings beyond the line of the railings of the Georgian houses in Jeffrey's Street. This is unacceptable. The building line of this development should follow that of the street as a whole and be brought back to the line of the existing garages. 4. It seems strange to propose the use of brick for the ground floor and render the upper floors when the majority of the houses on both sides of Jeffrey's Street are the opposite.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	John Green	4 Jeffrey's Street NW1 9PR	21/11/2014 13:47:54	OBJEMAIL	COMMENTS ON THE REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION 2014/4777/P - REDEVELOPMENT OF GARAGES 1-3, 5-6 JEFFREYS STREET AND 29 PROWSE PLACE. NW1 9PN

OBJECTION

I am the resident and owner of 4 Jeffreys Street. NW1 9PR

The main alteration to the original proposals is that the pitched roofs have been removed and replaced with paved accessible terraces surrounded by planting. The removal of the pitched roofs is an improvement and certainly reduces some of the vertical bulk of the development.

However the main issues against this development still remain from the original proposal namely:

- No proposals for this site should have been put forward to Camden planning whilst one garage remained outside of the architect/developers ownership. Its continued presence should this development be given planning permission would be absurd.
- Retention of garage 4, creating a recess in the street frontage which will inevitably be used as a public toilet. The architects drawing 1207-0400-AP-005 illustrates just how ridiculous a street frontage this will be.
- The development extends beyond the existing building line of Jeffreys Street on the ground floor by approximately 1.0m and is cantilevered a further 350mm on the first and second floors. This brings the bulk of the buildings beyond the line of the railings of the Georgian houses in Jeffrey's Street. This is wholly unacceptable. The building line of this development should follow that of the street as a whole and be brought back to the the line of the existing garages.
- It seems perverse to use brick for the ground floor and render the upper floors when the majority of the houses on both sides of Jeffrey"s Street are precisely the opposite.
- Removal of the pitched roofs is welcome but does not really address the underlying fact that a three storey development in this location is inappropriate. It overwhelms 29 Prowse Place as is evident from the 3D Views and drawings 1207-0400-AP-002 and 004. A three storey development is equally out of scale with the two storey villas directly opposite. A completely two storey development across all six garages would be more respectful of the scale of the houses in Prowse Place and 3 - 9 Jeffrey"s Street. Two storeys would also keep intact the integrity of the two complete listed Georgian terraces and not fight against them. This proposal by being forward of the main building line would be an over assertive presence in the street and certainly does not preserve or enhance its setting.
- Whilst the removal of the pitched roofs has reduced the anomalous gable ends and some of the height, both houses now have flat roofs with concealed terraces which will require access. It is unclear from the drawings just how this is to be achieved. However what is clear is that along the SE elevation at the abutment with 29 Prowse Place there is a further half storey - see drawing 1207-0400-AP-004 with an

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

extension of the main staircase within it up on to the terrace. It is unclear what this roof extension is constructed of - there don't appear to be any notes on the drawings by way of explanation - this is unacceptable in a planning application for a development in a conservation area and in such close proximity to listed buildings.

- The inability of the architect/developer to bring garage 4 into the development may result in the three new garages not being fit for purpose. Space within the existing garages is already tight for a modern saloon car.

By keeping garage 4 and then having to build new walls either side of it reduces the width of the garages to below what they are at present. The architects have not provided any dimensions other than a scale bar but it would appear that the new garages have a clear internal width of 2300mm. A Vauxhall Astra for example is 2020mm wide - this gives a clearance each side of 140mm (5.5") - extremely tight.

- Garage 6 is also limited in length as it has the entrance staircase to Flat 2 at one end - the only place it can be whilst garage 4 remains outside of the development. The need for this staircase and to provide just enough length for a garage is what pushes the whole development further forward than the established building line by between 850mm and 1000mm on the ground floor. Whilst there is no minimum width for staircases in the Building Regulations the entrance staircase appears to be 700mm wide which is quite narrow and even more so if handrails are added.

- It is not clear why this development is described as two flats as it would seem from the drawings that they are town houses with integral garages. It is also not clear why there is no indication on the drawings that compliance with Lifetime Homes has been met.

These revised proposals are still unacceptable and flawed for the reasons outlined above and should be refused planning permission.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	North Camden Town Neighbourhood Forum	3 Ivor Street Camden Town NW1 9PL	21/11/2014 15:44:19	OBJ	<p>North Camden Town Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group Objection 21 November 2014</p> <p>OBJECTION TO THE REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION 2014/4777/P - REDEVELOPMENT OF GARAGES 1-3, 5-6 JEFFREYS STREET AND 29 PROWSE PLACE. NW1 9PN</p> <p>I write on behalf of the NCTNF Steering group to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4777/P.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The proposed development is within Jeffery's Street Conservation Area and indeed on Jeffery's Street it's self. We have already objected to the original application and what has been submitted now, as a revision, has not addressed the issues raised in our original objection.</p> <p>The main alteration to the original proposals is that the pitched roofs have been removed and replaced with paved accessible terraces surrounded by planting. The removal of the pitched roofs somewhat reduces the vertical bulk of the development. However, the main issues against this development still remain from the original proposal namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No proposals for this site should have been put forward to Camden planning whilst one garage remained outside the scheme. 2. Retention of garage 4, creates a recess in the street frontage which will inevitably be used as a public toilet or for drug dealing. The architects drawing 1207-0400-AP-005 illustrates just how ridiculous and out of context a street frontage this would be. 3. The development extends beyond the existing building line of Jeffreys Street on the ground floor by approximately 1.0m and is cantilevered a further 350mm on the first and second floors. This brings the bulk of the buildings beyond the line of the railings of the Georgian houses in Jeffrey's Street. This is unacceptable. The building line of this development should follow that of the street as a whole and be brought back to the line of the existing garages. 4. It seems strange to propose the use of brick for the ground floor and render the upper floors when the majority of the houses on both sides of Jeffrey's Street are the opposite.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

- Whilst the removal of the pitched roofs has reduced the anomalous gable ends and some of the height, both houses now have flat roofs with concealed terraces which will require access. It is unclear from the drawings just how this is to be achieved. However what is clear is that along the SE elevation at the abutment with 29 Prowse Place there is a further half storey - see drawing 1207-0400-AP-004 with an extension of the main staircase within it up on to the terrace. It is unclear what this roof extension is constructed of - there don't appear to be any notes on the drawings by way of explanation - this is unacceptable in a planning application for a development in a conservation area and in such close proximity to listed buildings.

-There is also a risk that the use of these terraces will cause noise disturbance.

- The inability of the architect/developer to bring garage 4 into the development may result in the three new garages not being fit for purpose. Space within the existing garages is already tight for a modern saloon car. By keeping garage 4 and then having to build new walls either side of it reduces the width of the garages to below what they are at present. The architects have not provided any dimensions other than a scale bar but it would appear that the new garages have a clear internal width of 2300mm. A Vauxhall Astra for example is 2020mm wide - this gives a clearance each side of 140mm (5.5") - extremely tight.

- Garage 6 is also limited in length as it has the entrance staircase to Flat 2 at one end - the only place it can be whilst garage 4 remains outside of the development. The need for this staircase and to provide just enough length for a garage is what pushes the whole development further forward than the established building line by between 850mm and 1000mm on the ground floor. Whilst there is no minimum width for staircases in the Building Regulations the entrance staircase appears to be 700mm wide which is quite narrow and even more so if handrails are added.

- It is not clear why this development is described as two flats as it would seem from the drawings that they are town houses with integral garages. It is also not clear why there is no indication on the drawings that compliance with Lifetime Homes has been met.

These revised proposals are still unacceptable for the reasons outlined above and should be refused planning permission.

Peter Hodgman
Secretary, Jeffrey's Street Association

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Paul Watkins	23 Jeffreys Street London NW1 9PS	23/11/2014 12:44:56	COMMNT	<p>Despite the removal of the ugly pitched roofs my original objections to the incongruity of this development in this listed Georgian/early Victorian heritage street still stand. The white exterior and modern design is not in keeping with the harmonious brick ranges of Jeffreys Street.</p> <p>I concur with the detailed objections raised by Jeffreys Street resident Mr John Green, in essence the distortions created by the protruding street line of the building and the cantilevering of the upper floors.</p> <p>In addition to the unsympathetic white rendering there is a question of what materials have been used for the doors of the garages facing on to Jeffreys Street. The minimal descriptive detail on the drawings will be intelligible only to those in the building trade. The same question applies to the roof extensions giving access to the terraces (which incidentally, though shown in the photographic representation seen from Prowse Place, are largely absent from the architects' drawings).</p> <p>I would also endorse the point about the absurdity of the retention of one garage in the centre of the elevation, which undermines the feasibility of the whole project. I would suggest in addition that the concept of retaining three garages that are not available to the residents of the building is incongruous.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Andrew Gemmell	3 Ivor Street	21/11/2014 15:49:56	OBJ	<p>I write on behalf of the NCTNF Steering group to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4777/P.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The proposed development is within Jeffery's Street Conservation Area and indeed on Jeffery's Street it's self. We have already objected to the original application and what has been submitted now, as a revision, has not addressed the issues raised in our original objection.</p> <p>The main alteration to the original proposals is that the pitched roofs have been removed and replaced with paved accessible terraces surrounded by planting. The removal of the pitched roofs somewhat reduces the vertical bulk of the development. However, the main issues against this development still remain from the original proposal namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No proposals for this site should have been put forward to Camden planning whilst one garage remained outside the scheme. 2. Retention of garage 4, creates a recess in the street frontage which will inevitably be used as a public toilet or for drug dealing. The architects drawing 1207-0400-AP-005 illustrates just how ridiculous and out of context a street frontage this would be. 3. The development extends beyond the existing building line of Jeffreys Street on the ground floor by approximately 1.0m and is cantilevered a further 350mm on the first and second floors. This brings the bulk of the buildings beyond the line of the railings of the Georgian houses in Jeffrey's Street. This is unacceptable. The building line of this development should follow that of the street as a whole and be brought back to the line of the existing garages. 4. It seems strange to propose the use of brick for the ground floor and render the upper floors when the majority of the houses on both sides of Jeffrey's Street are the opposite. 5. Removal of the pitched roofs is welcome but does not address the underlying fact that a three storey development in this location is inappropriate. It overwhelms 29 Prowse Place as is illustrated from the 3D Views and drawings 1207-0400-AP-002 and 004. A three storey development is equally out of scale with the two storey villas directly opposite. A completely two storey development across all six garages would be more respectful of the scale of the houses in Prowse Place and 3 - 9 Jeffrey's Street. Two storeys would also keep intact the integrity of the two complete listed Georgian terraces and not fight against them. This current proposal would be an over assertive presence in the street and would neither preserve or enhance its setting. 6. Both houses now have flat roofs with concealed terraces which will require access. It is unclear from the drawings just how this is to be achieved. However, what is clear is that along the SE elevation at the abutment with 29 Prowse Place there is a further half storey - see drawing 1207-0400-AP-004 with an extension of the main staircase within it up on to the terrace. It is unclear what this roof extension is constructed of - there don't appear to be any notes on the drawings by way of explanation - this is unacceptable in a planning application for a development in a conservation area and in such close proximity to listed buildings.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>7. The inability of the architect/developer to bring garage 4 into the development may result in the three new garages not being fit for purpose. Space within the existing garages is already tight for a modern saloon car.</p> <p>By keeping garage 4 and then having to build new walls either side of it reduces the width of the garages to below what they are at present.</p> <p>8. Garage 6 is also limited in length as it has the entrance staircase to Flat 2 at one end - the only place it can be whilst garage 4 remains outside of the development. The need for this staircase and to provide just enough length for a garage is what pushes the whole development further forward than the established building line by between 850mm and 1000mm on the ground floor.</p> <p>9. It is not clear why this development is described as two flats as it would seem from the drawings that they are town houses with integral garages. It is also not clear why there is no indication on the drawings that compliance with Lifetime Homes has been met.</p> <p>These revised proposals remain unacceptable and flawed for the reasons outlined above and should be refused planning permission. We urge you to reject this application as it currently stands and would seek a local working group to be assembled to work alongside the developer to agree a suitable scheme for this site.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4777/P	Jeffreys Street Association	22 Jeffreys Street London NW1 9PR	24/11/2014 12:17:14	OBJ	<p>On behalf of the Jeffreys Street Association, I submit the following comments on the above revised planning application.</p> <p>These should be read alongside our previously submitted comments, most of which remain relevant,</p> <p>In particular it remains the case that the proposal still fails to meet the requirements in the Jeffreys Street Conservation Area Statement that “All development should respect existing features such as building lines, elevation design, and where appropriate, architectural characteristics , detailing, profile and materials of adjoining buildings.’</p> <p>The main alteration to the original proposals is that the pitched roofs have been removed and replaced with paved accessible terraces surrounded by planting. The removal of the pitched roofs is an improvement and certainly reduces some of the vertical bulk of the development.</p> <p>However the main issues of concern against this development still remain from the original proposal namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No proposals for this site should have been put forward to Camden planning whilst one garage remained outside of the architect/developers ownership. Its continued presence should this development be given planning permission would be absurd. - Retention of garage 4, creating a recess in the street frontage which will inevitably be used as a public toilet. The architects drawing 1207-0400-AP-005 illustrates just how ridiculous a street frontage this will be. - The development extends beyond the existing building line of Jeffreys Street on the ground floor by approximately 1.0m and is cantilevered a further 350mm on the first and second floors. This brings the bulk of the buildings beyond the line of the railings of the Georgian houses in Jeffrey"s Street. This is wholly unacceptable. The building line of this development should follow that of the street as a whole and be brought back to the line of the existing garages. - It seems perverse to use brick for the ground floor and render the upper floors when the majority of the houses on both sides of Jeffrey"s Street are precisely the opposite. - Removal of the pitched roofs is welcome but does not really address the underlying fact that a three storey development in this location is inappropriate. It overwhelms 29 Prowse Place as is evident from the 3D Views and drawings 1207-0400-AP-002 and 004. A three storey development is equally out of scale with the two storey villas directly opposite. A completely two storey development across all six garages would be more respectful of the scale of the houses in Prowse Place and 3 - 9 Jeffrey"s Street. Two storeys would also keep intact the integrity of the two complete listed Georgian terraces and not fight against them. This proposal by being forward of the main building line would be an over assertive presence in the street and certainly does not preserve or enhance its setting.