

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2020/2842/L	Alison Read	16/07/2020 17:01:58	COMMNT	Planning App Mornington Crescent 25a Ref: 2020/2842/L Wed 15 July 2020

I am concerned about overlooking at the rear of this proposed development – the drawings are inaccurate and do not give a correct impression of the impact the roof terrace will have on the adjoining properties, 26 and 27 Mornington Crescent.

On drawing P202 the height of the party wall between 25 and 26 is shown as much higher than it is in reality (photos submitted to Planning Officer) this gives a false impression.

It appears as if the new Raised Rear Spine wall is the same height as the party wall this is not the case. The party wall has been drawn at approx. 1.5 to 2 metres higher than it is – this would lessen the impact of having a new high wall to avoid overlooking at the rear of the terrace.

To raise the height of the infill on this small site will have a very negative impact on light and air flow from the south in to the rear gardens.

It is difficult to comment on these plans when it appears the detail is inaccurate.

The overall development is very cramped and attempts to fill a very tiny space with far too many possible uses and the possibility of crowding of the dwelling.

I am concerned that, given the very limited amount of space for a permanent resident, the site is being seen as a potential income generator from short term lets such as AirBandB and do not think Camden should allow further development of this type of use. Such use contributes nothing to a quiet, mixed but mainly residential area and is more likely to have a negative impact of noise and disruption.

I am concerned about the detrimental impact on the basement flat of 25 Mornington Crescent – it looks as if there will be a very severe reduction of light/air to the rear window of this flat. Surely in 2020 we should not be allowing such over development which has such a detrimental impact on current flats?

Front elevation: it will be a pleasure to have what has been a very scruffy site for many years improved.

The suggested brick facing on the street seems very out of keeping – the north side, street level elevation of Mornington Place is traditional stucco. The proposed brick street frontage on such a small site seems ugly, fussy and out of keeping, surely the front facing should be similar to 25 Mornington Crescent.

The front door with it's fake portico mimicking the entrance door also seems too fussy in an attempted/failed grandiosity, surely inappropriate to such a tiny dwelling.

The proposed roof terrace is out of keeping with the area and the street and I do not think should be allowed. Any noise will cause disruption to the residents of Mornington Place and the backs of the houses in Mornington Crescent. It is likely that noise will echo and resound off the end wall of 25 Mornington Crescent. If my concerns that the flat is to be used for short term holiday lets is realised this could cause ongoing repeated disruption to the permanent residents. There is outside space in the development, to have two outside spaces in such a tiny flat seems odd especially given the negative impact on the street with a front wall of only 1.1 metre.

I am also concerned about the risk of setting a precedent re building a roof terrace at first floor level when this

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

				was not allowed when Planning permission was granted for the adjacent building of 1a and 1b Mornington Place in c. 2000
--	--	--	--	---

---