
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2021 01:59
To: Planning
Subject: 2020/5037/L - 48 Mornington Terrace

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Sirs

I am writing to object to the application for retrospective planning permission made in relation to Mornington Terrace.

I live in Albert St and no.48 is highly visible from my house.

First, I would point out that the notice of this planning application that was attached to the lamppost outside 91 Albert Street was covered approximately one week ago by notices warning of imminent parking bay restrictions. So the application has not been advertised in Albert Street for the past week.

I have written in relation to these unlawful alterations before and would like to repeat all points previously made.

I have four particular objections.

First, the new windows on the top floor do not align with the other rear windows of the property. And therefore the result is a blight on the terrace.

Second, the glass roof that has been constructed over one of the listed windows at ground floor level is an architectural mess. It is totally unacceptable to conceal an original window in this way and thus ruin what is otherwise a uniform terrace in this respect. It is also very intrusive to have an outdoor terrace at this level. When people sit on the terrace, we have a sense of them staring into our house and garden.

Third, because the basement is now constructed of so much glass, we experience a great deal of light pollution in Albert Street.

Fourth, it would be totally unacceptable for Camden to allow this application since it would never have been allowed in advance.

This reason alone is a reason to refuse the planning application.

Please see paragraph 59 of the decision below.

<https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2019-0006-judgment.pdf>

See also Welwyn Hatfield Council V Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2001] UKSC 15 in which the conduct of an applicant for planning permission, in pretending that his house was a hay barn and then applying for planning permission for change of use, was held to disentitle him from obtaining a certificate of lawful use.

The underlying rationale in each of these cases is that no-one should be able to put themselves in a better position by breaking the law.

For all of these reasons, I object to this application.

Yours sincerely

Emily Windsor.