

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0124/P	Roger Low	20/02/2021 22:04:26	OBJ	<p>As a neighbourhood resident for more than 40 years, I value the view of this 19th century terrace of five houses. Architecturally and visibly, this terrace is a single unit.</p> <p>To change the skyline of one house, detracts from all the others. To grant planning permission for a loft extension on one house presupposes another will be granted, at some point. The result will be jarring. Gap-toothed is fine for a 5 year old's mouth but not for the roof line of a terrace of two hundred year old houses.</p> <p>A loft extension would be inappropriate in this Conservation Area but would be, particularly, inappropriate in this terrace where "Butterfly" or "Valley" roofs are an architectural feature.</p> <p>The proposal neither preserves nor enhances the Conservation Area in which it is cited nor the the Listed Buildings, nearby. The application should be denied.</p>
2021/0124/P	rosie thompson	16/02/2021 08:50:34	COMMNT	This little street should have been listed and obviously a mansard will spoil the architecture and take sun off north facing gardens.
2021/0124/P	rosie thompson	16/02/2021 08:50:32	COMMNT	This little street should have been listed and obviously a mansard will spoil the architecture and take sun off north facing gardens.
2021/0124/P	Sebastian Tennant	16/02/2021 08:56:23	OBJ	This terrace of houses on Mornington Place is a unique and very well-preserved example of valley roofing which creates a distinctive "sawtooth" skyline, especially when seen from Albert Street, approaching the junction with Mornington Place. This proposed mansard roof extension will rob the community of a fine example of architectural history and alter the aesthetic character of the terrace and its immediate neighbourhood.
2021/0124/P	rosie thompson	16/02/2021 08:50:30	COMMNT	This little street should have been listed and obviously a mansard will spoil the architecture and take sun off north facing gardens.
2021/0124/P	chris	16/02/2021 15:24:05	OBJ	<p>Objection to the new design of the roof/Extension</p> <p>This will limit the light that is already very limited on the adjoining properties, it will not be in keeping with the conservation area.</p> <p>It looks very modern in a location that has a historical look.</p>
2021/0124/P	Hazel and Janos Abel	15/02/2021 21:07:55	OBJ	<p>This terrace of houses, i.e. Mornington Place, dates back to the early eighteen hundreds and is one of the oldest in the area. The houses have been cared for by the residents without defacing them and changing the character of the terrace. In our opinion, a mansard roof is inappropriate and the terrace should have a preservation order put on it.</p> <p>The gardens at the back of the houses are north facing so have very little sunshine i.e. only for a few hours in the summer. An extra story on top of any of the houses would reduce the amount of sunshine. The enjoyment of a garden as an amenity is largely dependent on there being some hours of sun. This should not be taken away.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0124/P	Robert Latham	14/02/2021 15:58:35	COMMNT	<p>I am writing to oppose this planning application. I live at Silsoe House and we look across the Cutting to Mornington Place.</p> <p>This is a conservation area. The terrace houses in Mornington Crescent were built between 1820 and 1830. Nos. 3 to 7 form a little terrace that was built in the 1830s. The leases came up for sale in 1839 and the houses were described by the auctioneer in the Morning Post as</p> <p>“houses of a size conformable to that class of persons who are in need of such delightful abodes upon a small scale and at an easy rent. Stone galleries and balconies, waterclosets, small gardens etc.”</p> <p>I lived in Mornington Terrace for a number of years where the terrace was built somewhat later in the 1860s. I suggest that it is inappropriate to put a mansard roof on a house in the middle of a terrace that was built around 1833/4. The terrace is one of the oldest in the area, built immediately after Mornington Crescent - but for some reason it isn't listed. The terrace has a distinctive skyline of “Butterfly” or “Valley” rooves which has remained unchanged for nearly two hundred years.</p> <p>To build a Mansard roof would impact on the historical integrity of the terrace and contravene Camden's own planning guidance which states that:</p> <p>“A roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances where there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene”.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0124/P	Sandra Nicholls and Dick Booth	22/02/2021 09:17:20	OBJ	<p>Our objection to the proposed Mansard roof on No.5 Mornington Place is twofold:</p> <p>1. The impact on the architectural integrity of the terrace.</p> <p>The five houses in the terrace, comprising Nos 3-7, are the earliest remaining group of houses from the original expansion of residential streets west of Mornington Crescent. They pre-date the completion of Albert Street, Arlington Road and Mornington Terrace and are recorded in the St Marylebone Borough Survey of 1834.</p> <p>These houses are architecturally distinctive and form a unique design in the wider Conservation Area. They were originally designed as a complete composition, all having rusticated ground floors, four with single arched windows. Number 5 in particular provides a striking central focus to the terrace, with grand pilasters framing two single windows.</p> <p>The back of the terrace is no less architecturally distinctive, with its saw-tooth silhouettes, created by the distinctive 'valley' or 'butterfly' rooves, prominently visible from Albert Street at the rear. The symmetry, front and back, gives this terrace an overall, shared design which has been noted as a "positive contributor" to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The addition of a mansard in the centre of an otherwise intact terrace with original valley rooves will impact on the architectural integrity of the terrace. This would contravene the Camden Planning Guidance which states that 'A roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances...where there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene'.</p> <p>2. The loss of sunlight in the terrace gardens.</p> <p>The gardens behind the terrace are north-facing and only receive sunlight when the sun's elevation is high enough to reach over the terrace rooves. This means that for nine months of the year the terrace gardens are largely in shade. The gardens are only in receipt of full sunlight for three months of the year, from the middle of May to the middle of August.</p> <p>The erection of a Mansard roof on No.5 will increase the height of the middle terrace house and infill the gap created by its valley-roof design, both of which will result in a loss of sunlight hours in the adjacent gardens. This would contravene the Camden Planning Guidance (January 2021) which states 'Ensure your proposal does not reduce your neighbours' access to daylight and sunlight'.</p>
2021/0124/P	rosie thompson	16/02/2021 08:50:25	COMMNT	<p>This little street should have been listed and obviously a mansard will spoil the architecture and take sun off north facing gardens.</p>