

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0263/P	Mr. & Mrs. T. Finnerty	4 Mornington Crescent London NW1 7RH	19/03/2018 17:31:02	OBJEMAI L	<p>This is a synopsis of our letter dated 14.03.2018 sent by registered post to Mr. Ben Farrant, Planning Solutions Team, London Borough of Camden.</p> <p>We have been the freehold owners of 4, Mornington Crescent, London, NW1 7RH since December, 1993 & posit:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed extension in glass & concrete is incompatible with the nature of the building & its conservation status 2. We have no desire whatsoever to inhibit Mr. & Mrs. Sebastians desire "to revive and upgrade their family home", but an increase of floor space of 30% would appear somewhat excessive given the size of their present accommodation. A third WC may also be regarded as excessive for just three persons and environmentally indefensible. The creation of a 1.2M gap to create a new staircase serves no practical purpose except to provide access to the site for building purposes. In case of fire, the 4 existing exits would appear adequate. An additional external staircase would serve no practical purpose. 3. PP applications mentioned have no relevance BUT PEX 0001054 and LEX0001055 which rejected extension on 1, Mornington Cres. would appear correct. 4. No actual height is given for extension. But an increase of height by "6 courses of brick" + more not mentioned but on the "Axo view" on the party wall between No's 3&4 is completely unacceptable given that 4 of the 5 rear rooms in No.4 overlooking and adjacent to the site are bedrooms 2 of which are occupied by people with handicaps who will be deprived of even more sunlight & daylight. 5. In the past few years, this area of Camden has had excavations for new sewers/water mains, the on-going refurbishment of Greater London House and the never-ending turmoil of HS2. All of these had at least some utility/public merit. This proposal will serve only 3 people and will greatly disturb or inconvenience some 12 others. 6. Since no height has been given for the proposed structure, it is difficult to assess its real visual impact. However, the Design Statement drawings would appear to indicate that it should be readily visible from Ground Level and above in the neighbouring/adjacent buildings and from the higher floors in the Ampthill Estate, the Regents Park Estate, parts of Park Village East, possibly the upper floors of Greater London House and even HS2 when it is finally built. This is no "shrinking violet". It will hardly be invisible and as for its "limited effect" it will, to quote HRH Prince Charles, become a "monstrous carbuncle" on an otherwise homogenous and consistent area of residential houses. 7. Mornington Crescent was first listed on 14th. May, 1974 and was designated as a Conservation Area on 11th. November, 1986. Much has been made of rear walls and what or was not in place as an extension at various dates. The owner of Flat 3A from 1976 until 2003 knew the builder involved with No.3 and can attest to the fact that the rear wall was demolished prior to listing because it was "rotten". Nothing was demolished in 1976 and

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>nothing was added to any part of the exterior fabric of the building after it was listed in 1974.</p> <p>8. We believe that this proposal meets none of the requirements of Camden Local Plan D1 para 7.2 and ignores completely the first five points of para 4.10. of Camden Planning Guidance, particularly No.5 which prohibits causing "a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, etc.,".</p> <p>9. The Basement Impact Statements claim to be only an initial assessment but they envisage the "risk of movement in neighbouring property and the possible requirement to install a permanent water pumping system. Quite an overwhelming amount of possible disruption for 30 square metres of extra space and one damp room! The latter problem must have been obvious at the time of purchase for it certainly was in 1976 and well before then as was reflected in the property prices for 3A and for other similar flats in the area.</p> <p>10. According to the Statements, the local impact will be "Minimalised". This can hardly be the case with basement vibration, hoarding erection, construction traffic, loss of parking spaces, noise, dirt and dust. For this little corner of Mornington Crescent, the impact may very well be much greater than for HS2.</p> <p>11. It is obvious from the size and duration of the proposed project that the residents of 3A will have to move out of their accommodation during the entire progress of the works. It is unlikely in the extreme that we of the neighbouring and adjoining properties will have the same privilege and will have to remain in situ for the duration. Some 12 people at least will therefore be completely inconvenienced, disrupted and discomforted to meet the whimsical desires of just two!</p> <p>We, both the tenants and owners of the residential properties in the vicinity are entitled to the "Quiet Enjoyment" of our properties and any breach of this could quite reasonably be construed as "Nuisance".</p> <p>For all the above, we consider this proposal to be poorly thought through, inadvisable and completely unsuitable. It is our considered opinion that not only Listed Building Consent but also Planning Permission should not even be contemplated in this instance.</p> <p>N.B. We will be overseas until mid-April.</p> <p>I have signalled my desire to attend/speak at committee but in order to do so I will need some handicapped parking available in the immediate vicinity and wheelchair access to the</p>

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

committee location.