

**48 MORNINGTON TERRACE NW1 7RT  
CONSULTATION COMMENTS & NOTES from Camden Town CAAC**

**A LIST OF ATTACHMENTS TO BE EMAILED WITH THESE NOTES**

- A1 List from Camden website of all applications made for 48 Mornington Terrace
- A2 4no 'website snapshots' from Undercover Architecture's website
- A3 the D&A STATEMENT for the permitted appns 2013/6592P & 6742/L
- A4 the MEMBERS BRIEFING REPORT (see pages 6-9) for the permitted appns as above
- A5 Extract from Planning & Heritage statement for current appns

**B DEFINITIONS USED IN NOTES**

"Current" refers to the retrospective appns 2014/7506/L & 7441/P

"Previous or permitted" refers to appns 2013/6742/L & 6592/P

"Earlier" refers to refused appns 2013/4379/L & 4286/P and 2343/L & 2239/P

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 The CAAC's reaction to Applications and Work at No48**

We are shocked at the extent and gravity of the demolition of parts of the Listed Building and the unlawful changes made to its original construction.

**1.2 Concern about the CA and Camden's Heritage Assets**

The work that has been done is a barbaric attack on Camden's Heritage assets and on a society that has voted to preserve its Heritage assets and agreed to pay national and local government to protect them.

We think that if any part of the unlawful work or retro-application work at this house is permitted retrospectively having been refused previously or if it does not preserve/ re-instate this asset completely it will encourage unscrupulous householders in Mornington Terrace and in all of Camden's 38 CA's to demolish and build at will.

We would welcome English Heritage's support in considering the current state of this Listed Building.

**1.3 Local residents' Reactions**

We have been contacted by some very concerned local residents, mostly about the Garden Room and also by fewer residents about the current works. Residents may think the works done are as in the advertised permission.

**1.4 CTCAAC meeting with No48**

In 2013 we were invited to coffee at No48 to hear about proposals and reasons for them. We explained the significance attached to the Listing of No48 and to the Conservation Area. We also appreciated a childcare problem the applicant described and we suggested an alternative solution that did not involve a new ground floor 'infill' rear addition, which alternative was not adopted.

## **2.0 NATURE OF THE APPLICATIONS**

### **2.1 Applicant's Intentions**

The current retrospective applications appear to raise queries about the final intentions of the applicant and the transparency of the application documents. It may seem reasonable to ask if further unlawful work and retrospective applications are in the pipeline. The Architect's website has photographs that seem to suggest a future full-width infill at ground floor level is intended and the basement, now unfit for residential use, looks like office premises and a resident of the CA recently saw several desks/tables set out.

### **2.2 Is applying to amend previous applications reasonable?**

In this current application and its Heritage and D&A Statements we think the linking of the current proposals as amendments to the permitted scheme is not true common sense and the applications should be withdrawn. The schemes are radically different internally and externally. The previous scheme was permitted following last-minute revised proposals for the rear basement area, which revisions were positively appreciated in the applicant's D&A Statement. This and the permitted drawings describe a scheme that the Council and the CTCAAC and the applicant (apparently) were all happy with.

### **2.3 Inaccuracies in application? - demolition**

Despite the radical differences the present applications seek to ride on the back of the permitted scheme and add some (but not all) of the unlawful work carried out in the meantime.

Our reading of the application form is that it denies the unlawful demolition needs permission because the permitted scheme has already approved it. However we cannot see any demolition described in the permitted scheme's drawings except in connection with new roof windows and a new window on the end of the existing rear addition.

### **2.4 Poor information submitted**

The quality of information provided in the current application and drawings is poor and does not mention some of the alterations made that need permission. We have listed some inadequacies in the Appendix section below.

## **3.0 UNLAWFUL WORKS AND UNDERCOVER ARCHITECTURE'S WEBSITE**

From photographs on the website of Undercover Architecture one can see some of the works carried out to the Listed fabric without permission. Some of these photographs are attached to these notes and notes on them are listed in the Appendix below.

## **4.0 COMMENTS ON PROPOSALS**

### **4.1 Overall Comments**

i) We must object to all the proposals because a coherent and complete picture of them has not been provided.

ii) We continue to object to any proposal that does not acknowledge in full the reasons for the revisions made to the last, permitted application. (See Members Briefing Report pages 6-9)

iii) We strongly object to the unlawful alterations that have already taken place, and that are proposed retrospectively in this revised application to this Listed building. As these changes would not have been acceptable first time around they should not be acceptable on a retrospective basis.

#### **4.2 Changes at Rear and Basement**

a)- we object to any alterations to the structure and openings of the main rear wall at any level and to alterations at basement level of the rear addition. We object to filling in the basement rear area.

b)- a reduction in length of the rear addition is welcome.

c)-we do not object to a green roof in principle but object until we can see details of what is proposed.

d)- we object to the construction proposed for the upper level of the rear addition until we can see what is actually proposed in detail because of concerns about light pollution and inappropriate detailing/ use of materials.

e)- we object to the increased width of the rear addition and any roof construction that affects the existing visual character of the main rear wall.

f)-we object to removing internal walls in the basement and making the basement unsuitable for residential use.

#### **4.3 Changes Elsewhere in the House**

Little or no information has been submitted for works in the whole of the house. Full information is required before we can comment.

### **APPENDIX**

#### **Appendix 1.0 RESEARCH**

##### **1.1 Undercover Architecture**

a) Undercover Architecture's website notes it is a team of eight persons one of whom is a trained architect. He is the Design Director and is registered with the Architect's Registration Board. The website notes he is a member of the RIBA. A quick search of the RIBA's website has not found his name.

The Land Registry shows he is a co-owner of 48 Mornington Terrace.

He is the applicant for the planning applications at No48.

b) Undercover Architecture's website notes its contact address is The Studio, 48 Mornington Terrace.

##### **1.2 Unlawful Works and Undercover Architecture's Website**

a) From photographs on the website one can see extensive unlawful work was done recently before the current applications were lodged.

b) One can see that other unlawful work affecting the fabric is done where consent has not been sought or has been refused in earlier applications.

c) we have not had resources to distinguish between the 'planning situations' at a) and b) above in the list of unlawful work in d) below.

d) From what we see the following unlawful works seem to have been done:

- 1-Demolition and rebuilding the rear addition to be wider and shorter and in different materials (Web-1,2,3)
  - 2-Removing the main rear wall in the basement each side of the original doorway to the basement area (Web4) and removal of the side wall of the rear addition
  - 3-'Infilling' the original basement rear area with solid roofed construction and removing the original basement external area (Web4)
  - 4-Creating a basement unsuitable for residential occupation (Web4,3)
  - 5-Removing all original internal partitions and staircase in the basement (Web4)
  - 6-Lowering the basement floor level by 300mm or more (Web4)
  - 7-Changes to rear addition windows (Web1,4)
  - 8-Changes to the internal arrangement and fabric of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor (not attached)
  - 9- Changing the ground floor main house rear room to a kitchen (Web1)
- e) There are differences between the current applications and what Undercover Architecture's website shows as going on. For example there is no application for the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor internal works that appear in photographs and where an earlier application refused permission for alterations to the internal arrangement.
- f) it seems a future full-width infill at ground floor level is being constructed which has not been applied for. (Web2, 3)

## **Appendix 2.0 QUALITY OF INFORMATION IN THE APPLICATIONS.**

### **Drawings:**

There are shortcomings in the drawings:

A-all drawings lack dimensions on plans and lack room heights. Scales are not adequate or binding.

B-some drawings lack scales

C-none of the rooms has its room use shown

D- information about existing materials and proposed materials and details etc are not as required for a Listed Building or even for a standard application as noted on Camden's website.

E-Drainage and rainwater pipe are not shown on plans

G-There is not enough daylight proposed in the basement for residential use

H- work on site is not always as drawings

J-statements like 'all existing features to be retained and maintained' do not correspond to photographs of work done.

K-the works at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor level are nowhere described

L- there are no plans for upper floors

### **Application Forms:**

i)-Our comments on section 9 (demolition) are noted previously.

ii)-The descriptions of materials existing and proposed are incomplete –

iii) to enter 'NA' in response to a question is not appropriate for a Listed building when new construction or new replacing existing is proposed.

## **Appendix 3.0 COUNCIL ACTION**

If it will deter unscrupulous owners elsewhere in Camden we would support the following action by the Council to preserve Camden's Heritage Assets:

- 1) enforce a stop to all work and obtain a complete record of all unlawful work carried out whether consent is being sought in the current applications or not, including examination of other approvals (Party Walls, Building Control etc)
- 2) commission a professional assessment of the measures necessary to return No48 to its prior configuration/structure or as proposed in the permitted applications.
- 4) consider with English Heritage what action can be taken to pay for the costs to the public purse resulting from the unlawful work.
- 5) suggest the applicant withdraws current applications and re-instates a residential basement with a main rear wall and additions as the permitted applications.

END OF DOCUMENT