

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1077/P	Bevis and Susanna Sale	22/04/2021 11:48:37	OBJ	25 JEFFREYS STREET CAMDEN LONDON NW1 9PS 22 April 2021

Dear Sofie Fieldsend,

Re: Planning application 2021/1077/P: 27 Jeffreys Street, London, NW1

We object to this proposal for the following reasons:

1. The Design and Access statement refers (3.4) to the north-westerly orientation of the gardens, and the existing boundary walls, as already shading the back of the houses. Therefore, it claims the reduction in the amount of daylight available caused by the proposed increased height of the boundary wall "will not be affected in any notable way". In fact the reverse is true. It is because the gardens are already shaded by these two factors, that any increase in shading will be very noticeable.

The area outside our kitchen window is already shaded by the 4.5 metres high and 4.3 metres long extension wall of no 23 Jeffreys Street. The side wall of the first-floor closet wing of no 27 shades the area immediately outside our kitchen window. Our outhouses standing on the boundary with 27 Jeffreys Street, present when the house was purchased in 1973, also decrease available light. Increasing the height of the boundary wall with no 27 will further diminish any light available to our kitchen window.

The same factors apply to the sense of enclosure. No 23's extension, 27's closet wing and our outhouses all already create a very enclosed space outside our back door. Increasing the height of the boundary wall will only further exacerbate this.

2. Available documentation proves that numbers 25, 27, 29, and 31 were the first houses built in Jeffreys Street. Of the four, only numbers 25 and 27 still clearly show their relatedness. The ground floor window of no 25 is shown inaccurately in all the plans submitted as a plain sash window. It is in fact a six-over-six sash, of exactly the same design as that of the ground floor of no 27. The rear ground floor, first floor and second floor windows of 25 and 27 form an identical pattern of six-over-six sash windows. Further relatedness is shown by the identical closet wings on cast-iron pillars. Number 27 originally also had identical outhouses back-to-back with ours, but these were demolished prior to the buildings being listed. The changes proposed will destroy the historic connection between the two houses.

3. None of the other houses on the north side of Jeffreys Street that have been granted planning permission for extensions in recent times are directly comparable. Both 29 and 13 requested planning permission for changes to existing extensions. No 9 Jeffreys Street is an infill house of a later date.

4. The design proposes an irreversible change to the closet wing. This structure is historic rather than original, but on any reckoning is still well over 120 years old. It provides evidence of how 19/20th century builders responded to the challenge of adapting Georgian buildings to meet the hygiene needs of the time. As such it is part of the history of the house. It is proposed to remove the wing's context as a freestanding extension, and destroy its supporting cast-iron leg. Camden Planning Guidance: Design January 2021, Listed

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

Buildings, point 3.28, specifically states “We will expect original or historic features to be retained and repairs to be in matching material. Proposals should seek to respond to the special historic and architectural constraints of the listed building, rather than significantly change them.”

5. It is proposed to site the extension roof so that the original Georgian ground-floor window protrudes half in and half out of the roof. Although this leaves the window itself intact, it destroys the original context and purpose of the window and its place in the design of the rear elevation. So this proposal does not meet the requirements that an extension should be “as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building” and “be sensitive to the special qualities of the property and not undermine the features of the original building.” Points JS19 and JS22 Conservation Area Statement Jeffreys Street 21. Nor does it observe the requirement to “Respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style.” set out in section 2.1.1 Rear Extension: Home Improvements Camden Planning Guidance January 2021

6. Removal of part of the original ground-floor rear wall of the house is proposed and justified by the need to bring in building materials. This argument totally subjugates the value of the original fabric of the house to the building process of a modern extension. Camden planning’s pre-application advice in 2016 for 27 Jeffreys St pointed out that the removal of a section of the rear external wall (historic fabric) for access to the then proposed basement extension would not be supported.

7. In 2016 the Council indicated that any future proposed extension must be shown to cause far less visual impact and be reduced in projection to “sit sensitively within the terrace”. At a projection of over 4m, the 2021 proposed extension is still approximately 1 metre deeper than the maximum depth of projection the Council indicated it would support in 2016. At that time the Council recommended that the depth of projection of the extension should be reduced to no more than 3m to maintain “adequate visual subordination between the extension and the host property”.

We think the proposed extension does not consider the amenity of adjacent occupiers and, most importantly, it fails to meet Camden Council’s published policies towards listed buildings: “We seek to preserve listed buildings, their settings and any features of architectural or historic interest. We would not normally approve an application to demolish a listed building, allow alterations that would involve the loss of historic parts of the building, obscure the original plan form, layout or structural integrity, or otherwise diminish the historic value of listed buildings.” Camden Council Website: Listed Buildings: Policies.

Yours sincerely,

Bevis and Susanna Sale

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1077/P	Philip Kemp	22/04/2021 12:43:21	OBJ	<p>As proposed, this extension seems too high and too deep for at least two reasons. First, that it will further overshadow the already shaded area around the rear door of No. 25. Second, that it will block off the lower half of No 27's rear sash window (an original feature of this Georgian house), which will not only look clumsy, but seems contrary to the Council's stated policy on listed buildings: "We would not normally.... allow alterations that would involve the loss of historic parts of the building, obscure the original plan form, layout or structural integrity, or otherwise diminish the historic value of listed buildings."</p> <p>So if this proposal is to go ahead, it should (1) be lower and (2) project less far out from the back of the house.</p>
