

chartered town planners  
Tintagel House  
92 Albert Embankment  
London SE1 7TY  
02039481975

Ms Alyce Jeffery  
Camden Planning

15<sup>th</sup> July 2020

Dear Ms Jeffery,

**Site:** 25a Mornington Crescent, London,

**Proposed development:** Change of use from office (Use Class A2) to residential (Use Class C3) to create one studio unit; erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension; creation of a first floor roof terrace including raising front and rear parapet walls; erection of metal railings to create new front boundary treatment; installation of a refuse store and two cycle parking space within front garden; removal of the existing front canopy; replacement of front door and fanlight; replacement of secondary front door with a window and refurbishment of front elevation wall to match existing; replacement windows to the front and rear elevations to match existing; installation of new opening and door to first floor side elevation to provide access to the roof terrace; installation of a timber gate to side access.

**Camden refs:** 2020/2313/P and 2020/2842/L

I have been appointed by Mr Jo Johnson, the owner and occupier of No. 26 Mornington Crescent, to review the above applications. My comments are as follows.

*Living conditions*

The proposed first floor roof terrace will create an unacceptable degree of overlooking towards upper floor habitable windows in my clients property and the existing flats in No. 25 Mornington Crescent .

25 Mornington Crescent.



Proposed roof terrace

View from upper ground floor sitting room window  
in No. 26

The applicant proposes to erect a privacy wall. This will reduce some overlooking. However, occupants using the terrace can still look back over the wall and towards my client's windows, particularly as the proposed wall incorporates a raised planter. This could be used as a platform.

Since the applicant sought pre-app advice, they have removed a proposed first floor side/rear extension. However, the rear ground floor would still be extended. This would box in a rear ground floor bedroom window on No. 25 Mornington Crescent.

The impact would be exacerbated by a proposed courtyard garden. To provide adequate privacy it would be necessary to erect a 1.8m high fence around the courtyard. The fence would be about 2m away from the face of the window. This raises concerns about loss of outlook and light.

This relationship was criticised by the council's pre app response. It has not been addressed.

#### *Standard of the proposed accommodation.*

The proposed development seeks to create a self-contained flat. However, the site is too small to provide any form of self-contained living accommodation.

The council's pre-app response was critical of the size and layout of the proposed flat. It said the unit should have a minimum GIA of 58m<sup>2</sup> (1 bed 2-person unit over 2 floors). There is no standard for a 1 person 1 bed roomed flat over 2 floors.

Now the first-floor extension has been deleted, the standard of the proposed accommodation is even worse.

25 Mornington Crescent.

According to the applicant's drawings the proposed flat would have a GIA of just 28m<sup>2</sup>. This under ½ the minimum standard for a 1 person 2 bedroom flat (the applicants have shown a double bed on the drawing).

The councils concern about the standard of the proposed accommodation has not been addressed.

*Character and Heritage.*

No. 25 is a Grade 2 listed building. The council's pre-app response criticised a proposed first-floor rear /side extension, because it would infill the historic gap and restrict views of the rear elevation of the property.

The removal of the first floor would lead to a slight improvement. However, works to create the roof terrace means it would not be dissimilar to a first-floor extension. Therefore, it would still infill the historic gap.

The council's pre-app advice said increasing the height of the single storey element would be acceptable, if it was marginal. The response said it would have to be a height set well below No. 1a and 1b. Mornington Place. As proposed the roof terrace and privacy wall would be the same height as No. 1a and 1b.

No. 25a has a shopfront and canopy. The council's pre-app response noted these were not in keeping with the building. It advised the applicant to do some historic research of the area, to help determine a suitable replacement entry door.

The submission contains no evidence of any historic research.

The application proposes to introduce a timber door with a portico surround. This match's the existing flank entrance, all be it on a slightly smaller scale.

This is the wrong response. The proposed portico surround competes with the original side door which in turn detracts from the special historic character of the listed building.

The roof terrace should also be resisted. The provision of planting at first floor level, outdoor furniture and its use by the occupants of the proposed dwelling would also detract from the special historic character of the property.

25 Mornington Crescent.

The plan drawings show a 2 unit-cycle parking area and a refuse store. These would be crammed onto the narrow frontage. They would detract from the special historic character of No. 25.

Unsurprisingly, the applicant has not shown these stores on the proposed elevation drawings, nor the proposed gated access to the bin store with the railings that would open out onto the pavement. This is unlikely to be supported by highways.

The submission should contain a record with photos, cataloguing any original internal features (or lack of) and provide details of how they would be retained.

The council's pre-app also asked the applicant to provide this information, including a review of historic joinery and an assessment relating of the loss of any historic floorboards.

This assessment is missing from the submission. The heritage statement says;

'There are no historic features of relevance or historical importance that can be salvaged. If any are further discovered as part of the works they shall be preserved and restored where possible'.

This approach is not good enough.

The submission would fail to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting and features of special and/or historic interest. It therefore conflicts with Section 66 of the planning (listed building and conservation areas act) (1990).

The proposed cycle store is also inadequate as it would not be covered or secure. It is also not clear how 2 bikes can be manoeuvred into the store because the access is so cramped.

Officers are therefore urged to take all the points in this letter into account and refuse planning permission and listed building consent.

Andy Hollins  
Consultant Chartered Planner