
From: Ricci De Freitas [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 December 2020 14:07
To: Dempsey, Matthew; Planning
Subject: [REDACTED] 41 Marchmont Street 2020/5552/L & 2020/3275/A
Attachments: 41 Marchmont Street shop front 5.12.20 with original ship's timbers fascia revealed and painted black.JPG; 41 Marchmont Street shop front as operated by Shoppers News, with original ship's timbers preserved in fascia sign and unsightly shutters drawn down.JPG; 39-41 Marchmont Street in 1903 (web version).jpg
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

[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. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Matthew Dempsey
Case Officer
41 Marchmont Street – 2020/5552/L & 2020/3275/A

Dear Matthew

I wish to lodge an objection to the above two related applications.

I should first draw your attention to the misleading drawing of the existing shop front which suggests that the fascia sign of SHOPPERS NEWS was on a flat white vinyl sheet, when the name of the shop was in fact embossed on the original ship's timbers used to make the shop fascia. This is a unique feature of the original listed building which should be preserved, as it was by the previous occupant, who happens to own the freehold of the building. This is clearly illustrated in the attached photograph.

Secondly, neither of the drawings of the existing and proposed shop front show the redundant projecting sign above the right corbel which used to advertise Pay Point and has been painted black rather than removed by the existing occupant.

The remains of the projecting sign on the left pillar are also not shown and should also be removed as part of any works to improve the shop front, and the unsightly cables above the fascia should be tidied up.

Finally, the shutter box shown on both drawing is totally out of character with the Georgian host building and unnecessary.

It also has the effect of visually increasing the depth of the fascia and conceals part of the original fanlight above the residential door on the left.

I also object to the introduction of the internally illuminated window display screen as it contravenes the guidance in the Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and will be out of character with the listed terrace.

I seem to recall that a similar item had to be removed recently because it contravened planning regulations.

I have also attached a photograph of the original shop front showing the ship's timbers fascia as it appeared in 1903, when it was Nos. 39 and 41 were jointly occupied by 'High Class Tailors'. It shows the original residential doors and fanlights referred to above.

Please let me know if you have any queries about this objection.

Yours faithfully
Ricci de Freitas
Community Advocate/Enabler and Bloomsbury historian