

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0856/P	Paul Watkins	02/05/2022 11:37:12	OBJ	27 Jeffreys Street Comments on Proposal for construction of rear extension 1/5/22

Design and function

In relation to the Conservation Area Statement regarding the harmonisation of new extensions to the existing fabric and character of adjoining houses, it can be seen that the proposal conforms with this only in part. Though the right hand half of the extension (viewed from the north), using matching brick walls and window frame is acceptable (despite its elimination of the supporting pillar of the Victorian closet wing) the left hand side constitutes a radical change.

Although the arguments for the glazing of its roof and frontage (sightlines into the garden from the rear kitchen window and from the newly created living room) are demonstrated, the contradictions to the CPG commitment to 'respect and preserve the design and proportions of the building including its architectural period and style' are obvious.

A functional aspect of these contradictions would be the heat loss through the glass carapace, which although a presumed concern of the occupants also poses a challenge to the Camden's environmental stipulations concerning fuel efficiency and carbon emissions. There is also the question of light pollution, affecting the views from the rear of adjacent houses and those on the south side of Farrier Street. The light would not only come from the extension itself but from its reflection on surrounding trees and garden buildings.

Historical affinity

Viewed in a perspective reconstruction, the extension appears not only irregular but out of proportion to the house. Efforts to accommodate the closet wing, installed in the late Victorian period and a detail which adds to the historic interest of the house, have the result of partially rebuilding the wing and eliminating the characteristic iron pillar – details which can be seen in the rear elevation of the 'twin' building next door (No 25).

There is also the question of the impact of the proposed works on the historic outbuildings of No 25 adjacent to the party wall between Np 25 and 27. These buildings have been damaged by previous work next door and would be further destabilised by any work involving the construction of the new extension and restructuring of the closet wing.

Flood risk

This problem has already been addressed in my objections to the previous (January) proposal. The point made at that time was that as a victim of the floods of 1976 and 2002 I was concerned about the non permeability of the extension area resulting from the infilling of the land involved in the construction of the extension, with the probability of such an event (inherent in the inadequate capacity of the local drainage system) being increased by the imminence of climate-change induced flooding. I could not see that this problem had been properly addressed in the new proposals.

Access for materials

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

				<p>The question has been raised of the necessity of enlarging the opening of the doorway giving access to the garden in order to move large building materials through to the rear of the house. This could be resolved by passing them over the wall at the end of the garden with the agreement of the adjoining estate. Although this is not relevant to the overall proposal, this would save damage to the historic fabric of the rear elevation.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Paul Watkins, 23 Jeffreys Street, London NW1 9PS</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0856/P	Paul Watkins	02/05/2022 11:37:09	OBJ	27 Jeffreys Street Comments on Proposal for construction of rear extension 1/5/22

Design and function

In relation to the Conservation Area Statement regarding the harmonisation of new extensions to the existing fabric and character of adjoining houses, it can be seen that the proposal conforms with this only in part. Though the right hand half of the extension (viewed from the north), using matching brick walls and window frame is acceptable (despite its elimination of the supporting pillar of the Victorian closet wing) the left hand side constitutes a radical change.

Although the arguments for the glazing of its roof and frontage (sightlines into the garden from the rear kitchen window and from the newly created living room) are demonstrated, the contradictions to the CPG commitment to 'respect and preserve the design and proportions of the building including its architectural period and style' are obvious.

A functional aspect of these contradictions would be the heat loss through the glass carapace, which although a presumed concern of the occupants also poses a challenge to the Camden's environmental stipulations concerning fuel efficiency and carbon emissions. There is also the question of light pollution, affecting the views from the rear of adjacent houses and those on the south side of Farrier Street. The light would not only come from the extension itself but from its reflection on surrounding trees and garden buildings.

Historical affinity

Viewed in a perspective reconstruction, the extension appears not only irregular but out of proportion to the house. Efforts to accommodate the closet wing, installed in the late Victorian period and a detail which adds to the historic interest of the house, have the result of partially rebuilding the wing and eliminating the characteristic iron pillar – details which can be seen in the rear elevation of the 'twin' building next door (No 25).

There is also the question of the impact of the proposed works on the historic outbuildings of No 25 adjacent to the party wall between Np 25 and 27. These buildings have been damaged by previous work next door and would be further destabilised by any work involving the construction of the new extension and restructuring of the closet wing.

Flood risk

This problem has already been addressed in my objections to the previous (January) proposal. The point made at that time was that as a victim of the floods of 1976 and 2002 I was concerned about the non permeability of the extension area resulting from the infilling of the land involved in the construction of the extension, with the probability of such an event (inherent in the inadequate capacity of the local drainage system) being increased by the imminence of climate-change induced flooding. I could not see that this problem had been properly addressed in the new proposals.

Access for materials

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

				<p>The question has been raised of the necessity of enlarging the opening of the doorway giving access to the garden in order to move large building materials through to the rear of the house. This could be resolved by passing them over the wall at the end of the garden with the agreement of the adjoining estate. Although this is not relevant to the overall proposal, this would save damage to the historic fabric of the rear elevation.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Paul Watkins, 23 Jeffreys Street, London NW1 9PS</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0856/P	Paul Watkins	02/05/2022 11:37:07	OBJ	27 Jeffreys Street Comments on Proposal for construction of rear extension 1/5/22

Design and function

In relation to the Conservation Area Statement regarding the harmonisation of new extensions to the existing fabric and character of adjoining houses, it can be seen that the proposal conforms with this only in part. Though the right hand half of the extension (viewed from the north), using matching brick walls and window frame is acceptable (despite its elimination of the supporting pillar of the Victorian closet wing) the left hand side constitutes a radical change.

Although the arguments for the glazing of its roof and frontage (sightlines into the garden from the rear kitchen window and from the newly created living room) are demonstrated, the contradictions to the CPG commitment to 'respect and preserve the design and proportions of the building including its architectural period and style' are obvious.

A functional aspect of these contradictions would be the heat loss through the glass carapace, which although a presumed concern of the occupants also poses a challenge to the Camden's environmental stipulations concerning fuel efficiency and carbon emissions. There is also the question of light pollution, affecting the views from the rear of adjacent houses and those on the south side of Farrier Street. The light would not only come from the extension itself but from its reflection on surrounding trees and garden buildings.

Historical affinity

Viewed in a perspective reconstruction, the extension appears not only irregular but out of proportion to the house. Efforts to accommodate the closet wing, installed in the late Victorian period and a detail which adds to the historic interest of the house, have the result of partially rebuilding the wing and eliminating the characteristic iron pillar – details which can be seen in the rear elevation of the 'twin' building next door (No 25).

There is also the question of the impact of the proposed works on the historic outbuildings of No 25 adjacent to the party wall between Np 25 and 27. These buildings have been damaged by previous work next door and would be further destabilised by any work involving the construction of the new extension and restructuring of the closet wing.

Flood risk

This problem has already been addressed in my objections to the previous (January) proposal. The point made at that time was that as a victim of the floods of 1976 and 2002 I was concerned about the non permeability of the extension area resulting from the infilling of the land involved in the construction of the extension, with the probability of such an event (inherent in the inadequate capacity of the local drainage system) being increased by the imminence of climate-change induced flooding. I could not see that this problem had been properly addressed in the new proposals.

Access for materials

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

The question has been raised of the necessity of enlarging the opening of the doorway giving access to the garden in order to move large building materials through to the rear of the house. This could be resolved by passing them over the wall at the end of the garden with the agreement of the adjoining estate. Although this is not relevant to the overall proposal, this would save damage to the historic fabric of the rear elevation.

Paul Watkins, 23 Jeffreys Street, London NW1 9PS

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0856/P	Paul Watkins	02/05/2022 11:37:04	OBJ	27 Jeffreys Street Comments on Proposal for construction of rear extension 1/5/22

Design and function

In relation to the Conservation Area Statement regarding the harmonisation of new extensions to the existing fabric and character of adjoining houses, it can be seen that the proposal conforms with this only in part. Though the right hand half of the extension (viewed from the north), using matching brick walls and window frame is acceptable (despite its elimination of the supporting pillar of the Victorian closet wing) the left hand side constitutes a radical change.

Although the arguments for the glazing of its roof and frontage (sightlines into the garden from the rear kitchen window and from the newly created living room) are demonstrated, the contradictions to the CPG commitment to 'respect and preserve the design and proportions of the building including its architectural period and style' are obvious.

A functional aspect of these contradictions would be the heat loss through the glass carapace, which although a presumed concern of the occupants also poses a challenge to the Camden's environmental stipulations concerning fuel efficiency and carbon emissions. There is also the question of light pollution, affecting the views from the rear of adjacent houses and those on the south side of Farrier Street. The light would not only come from the extension itself but from its reflection on surrounding trees and garden buildings.

Historical affinity

Viewed in a perspective reconstruction, the extension appears not only irregular but out of proportion to the house. Efforts to accommodate the closet wing, installed in the late Victorian period and a detail which adds to the historic interest of the house, have the result of partially rebuilding the wing and eliminating the characteristic iron pillar – details which can be seen in the rear elevation of the 'twin' building next door (No 25).

There is also the question of the impact of the proposed works on the historic outbuildings of No 25 adjacent to the party wall between Np 25 and 27. These buildings have been damaged by previous work next door and would be further destabilised by any work involving the construction of the new extension and restructuring of the closet wing.

Flood risk

This problem has already been addressed in my objections to the previous (January) proposal. The point made at that time was that as a victim of the floods of 1976 and 2002 I was concerned about the non permeability of the extension area resulting from the infilling of the land involved in the construction of the extension, with the probability of such an event (inherent in the inadequate capacity of the local drainage system) being increased by the imminence of climate-change induced flooding. I could not see that this problem had been properly addressed in the new proposals.

Access for materials

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

The question has been raised of the necessity of enlarging the opening of the doorway giving access to the garden in order to move large building materials through to the rear of the house. This could be resolved by passing them over the wall at the end of the garden with the agreement of the adjoining estate. Although this is not relevant to the overall proposal, this would save damage to the historic fabric of the rear elevation.

Paul Watkins, 23 Jeffreys Street, London NW1 9PS

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0856/P	Paul Watkins	02/05/2022 11:36:51	OBJ	27 Jeffreys Street Comments on Proposal for construction of rear extension 1/5/22

Design and function

In relation to the Conservation Area Statement regarding the harmonisation of new extensions to the existing fabric and character of adjoining houses, it can be seen that the proposal conforms with this only in part. Though the right hand half of the extension (viewed from the north), using matching brick walls and window frame is acceptable (despite its elimination of the supporting pillar of the Victorian closet wing) the left hand side constitutes a radical change.

Although the arguments for the glazing of its roof and frontage (sightlines into the garden from the rear kitchen window and from the newly created living room) are demonstrated, the contradictions to the CPG commitment to 'respect and preserve the design and proportions of the building including its architectural period and style' are obvious.

A functional aspect of these contradictions would be the heat loss through the glass carapace, which although a presumed concern of the occupants also poses a challenge to the Camden's environmental stipulations concerning fuel efficiency and carbon emissions. There is also the question of light pollution, affecting the views from the rear of adjacent houses and those on the south side of Farrier Street. The light would not only come from the extension itself but from its reflection on surrounding trees and garden buildings.

Historical affinity

Viewed in a perspective reconstruction, the extension appears not only irregular but out of proportion to the house. Efforts to accommodate the closet wing, installed in the late Victorian period and a detail which adds to the historic interest of the house, have the result of partially rebuilding the wing and eliminating the characteristic iron pillar – details which can be seen in the rear elevation of the 'twin' building next door (No 25).

There is also the question of the impact of the proposed works on the historic outbuildings of No 25 adjacent to the party wall between Np 25 and 27. These buildings have been damaged by previous work next door and would be further destabilised by any work involving the construction of the new extension and restructuring of the closet wing.

Flood risk

This problem has already been addressed in my objections to the previous (January) proposal. The point made at that time was that as a victim of the floods of 1976 and 2002 I was concerned about the non permeability of the extension area resulting from the infilling of the land involved in the construction of the extension, with the probability of such an event (inherent in the inadequate capacity of the local drainage system) being increased by the imminence of climate-change induced flooding. I could not see that this problem had been properly addressed in the new proposals.

Access for materials

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

The question has been raised of the necessity of enlarging the opening of the doorway giving access to the garden in order to move large building materials through to the rear of the house. This could be resolved by passing them over the wall at the end of the garden with the agreement of the adjoining estate. Although this is not relevant to the overall proposal, this would save damage to the historic fabric of the rear elevation.

Paul Watkins, 23 Jeffreys Street, London NW1 9PS

2022/0856/P	Philip Kemp	01/05/2022 13:41:29	OBJ	
-------------	-------------	---------------------	-----	--

This application, though less visually disruptive than the previous application for the same address, still seems to intrude on the present architectural harmony between this and the neighbouring property at No 25. As such, it would contravene the Planning Policy advice that such developments should "respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style" and "respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space".

Furthermore, the inclusion of a glass roof would risk causing light pollution to surrounding properties, besides potentially adding to environmental detriment.

And once again the increased risk of flood damage, in a street where flooding has occurred twice within recent years, seems to have been brushed aside.

On these grounds I would oppose the application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0856/P	Bevis and Susanna Sale	30/04/2022 16:53:31	OBJ	Re: Planning application no: 2022/0856/P - 27 Jeffreys Street, London, NW1

We object to this proposal for the following reasons:

Although designed in two disparate sections, this application is again for a full width extension that will completely cover and change the original ground floor rear facade of 27 Jeffreys St, and extend 4 metres into the garden. As before, there has been no consultation with nextdoor neighbours, so no chance to seek clarification on any aspect of the plans. We have had to base our objection solely on the sparse information provided in the documents submitted. We also have not had the opportunity, prior to submission, to inform the applicants of the condition of the 100+ year old rear wall of our listed outhouses, which forms the party wall between 25 and 27 – see detailed information under Listed Outhouses at 25 Jeffreys Street.

Design of Extension

The proposed full width extension divides the rear elevation of the house into two disparate elements. On one side a traditionally built brick section with a reproduction window at its front and the protruding block of the altered closet wing at its rear. On the other, an uncompromisingly modern section with glass ceiling and frontage. We see nothing coherent or sympathetic in this design, which totally covers the listed rear ground floor façade in the service of providing the maximum interior space for the extension. The depth and width of the extension dominates the rear elevation and alters its character.

We think the design fails to meet the requirement set out in the Conservation Area Statement Jeffreys Street, point JS19 that extensions should be 'as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or the Conservation Area. Point JS19 also points out that 'Extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials.' Further, point JS20 requires that 'Extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group of buildings.'

Under the heading Current Issues, the Conservation Area Statement specifically cites rear or side extensions amongst the alteration that can 'lead to the degradation of the Conservation Area if carried out unsympathetically.'

It states '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.....'

Listed Outhouses at 25 Jeffreys St

Our 100+ year old outhouses, whose rear wall forms the party wall between 25 and 27 Jeffreys St, are listed as part of our curtilage. This rear wall was badly damaged many years back when a previous owner of 27 Jeffreys St knocked down the mirror image outhouses in 27, built back to back with ours. Deep cracks are now visible in the wall, and we cannot see that it would be safe for this wall to play any part in the additional load bearing proposed to support one side of the new plywood extension roof and its forward projecting brick side wall. Given the structure of our outhouses, demolishing and rebuilding their existing rear wall would unavoidably also involve demolishing the present roof and parts of the interior dividing walls.

Original Ground Floor Window

The proposed glass roof cuts across the original Georgian ground floor window at its lower quarter with a

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

substantial steel beam as well as the glass roof (see example provided in point 3.5 of Design and Access statement.) Although the window would still be visible through the glass, this design changes the character of an original feature of the rear elevation. Externally the window would appear partially sunk into the extension roof and divided into two parts.

Removal of Historic Fabric

The heading 2. Site and Context, page 10 of the Design and Access statement, asserts "We have removed the requirement to remove the brickwork in the stair hall and will instead be leaving this untouched." Yet Hawksmoor Construction, the company to be employed on this project, states on page 5 of their Method Statement:

'Delivery of the materials through the house is going to be very tricky. We strongly suggest to remove the wall beside the door on the access to the garden to allow us easy access for various sized materials to be delivered to the property. If this is not removed the turning circle for the stairs would be near impossible to get glazing, structural elements or sheet materials into the property. This will also hamper our ability to remove waste away effectively.'

No explanation is provided in this planning application as to how this 'near impossible' situation would be resolved without harmful and unacceptable loss of historic fabric.

Historic Closet Wing

The design proposes to permanently alter the original proportions of the closet wing and destroy its cast iron leg. Although not original, the closet wing is listed as a historic addition to the house, and the fact that it is matched by an identical closet wing in 25 is part of the history of the terrace. CPG Design 2021, 3.28, specifically makes the point that it is not only original features that should be retained: '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.' Point JS13 Conservation Area Statement Jeffreys Street requires that 'In all cases, existing/original architectural features and detailing characteristic of the Conservation Area should be retained and kept in good repair, and only be replaced when there is no alternative.....' Original detailing such as door/window architraves, fanlights, pediments and finials, porches, ironwork (window cills, railings), timber framed sash windows, casement windows, piers and coal-holes, where retained add to the visual interest of properties.' This proposal not only seeks to remove historic ironwork detailing (the closet wing's supporting cast iron leg) but also to destroy the context and original form of the closet wing by building it into the roof of a full width extension as an ungainly protrusion.

Light Pollution

The major part of this extension has been designed with a glass roof and frontage. There is no mention in the application of any measure to counter the problem of light pollution after dark. Light pollution from such a large area of glass would not only affect neighbours in Jeffreys Street, but also tenants in the upper floors of the housing association flats which face the rear of Jeffreys Street north side houses. Home Improvements (CPG Jan 2021 page 41) requires that rear extensions should 'not cause light pollution or excessive light spillage that would affect neighbouring occupiers...' On page 23 it asks, specifically in relation to roof glazing, that home owners should 'Please also consider the impacts of light pollution on adjoining properties'.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

Heat Loss

The proposed extension would be north west facing. The improved thermal performance of modern glass panels would only mitigate, but not eliminate, greater heat loss in cold weather through the choice of glass for the larger part of the roof and the whole frontage of the extension. The design does not meet the requirement (D2 Heritage, point 7.56) that buildings in conservation areas should 'be sensitively adapted to meet the needs of climate change and energy saving while preserving their special interest and ensuring their long-term survival.' We do not see that this choice of materials is consistent with Camden's environmental policies. Home Improvements CPG page 23 advises that 'a large proportion of glazing will likely cause overheating in the summer.....and heat loss in the winter.' For a Northerly orientation it advises, even for windows, to 'minimize window size to reduce heat loss.' Page 20 of this document states 'In Camden around 25% of carbon emissions come from our homes....Therefore, increasing the energy efficiency of the existing building stock in the borough is a critical component of reaching a Net Zero Carbon future.'

Privacy

The rear elevations of 25 to 31 Jeffreys Street are overlooked by the upper storeys of the Philia House housing association buildings opposite. The view is only screened by trees for just over half the year. In addition, both 25 and 29 Jeffreys St have raised terraces at the far end of their gardens with a lateral view into the rear of 27. We can find nothing in the application which addresses the issue of occupant privacy regarding the glass roof and frontage, either during the day or at night. A sustainable extension has to take into account differing views on privacy by future occupants of 27.

Flood Risk

This application not only proposes an impermeable roof of approx 4 x 4.2 metres, but added to this would be a further impermeable paved area of 4 x 4 metres in front of the extension. Camden Council has acknowledged Jeffreys Street to be a historically flooded street. Point 8.65 of Camden Local Plan states that 'By decreasing the amount of permeable surfaces into which rainwater can be absorbed and by changing the direction of surface water flows, new development can increase stress on the drainage network and increase risk of flooding.....Development located within areas at risk of flooding should not place additional pressure on the existing drainage infrastructure.'

In summary, we feel the extension proposal would cause harm to the historic and architectural interest of this listed building contrary to policy D2 Heritage of the Camden Local Plan (page 236, point j). It also fails to meet the requirements in CPG Home Improvements that extensions should:

- + 'Be subordinate to the building being extended, in relation to its location, form, footprint, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing.'
- + 'Be built from materials that are sympathetic to the existing building wherever possible.'
- + 'Respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style.'
- + 'Respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies, cornices and chimney stacks.'
- + 'Be carefully scaled in terms of its height, width and depth.'

Bevis and Susanna Sale

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