

Laura Hazelton  
Planning & Built Environment,  
London Borough of Camden,  
5 Pancras Square,  
Judd Street,  
London,  
WC1H 9JE

Re: **Planning Application - 2016/6238/P**

Re: **Objection**

Dear Laura

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed changes to The House, Lissenden Gardens (planning application 2016/6238/P).

As outlined in greater detail below, the proposed changes to the existing building will have a significant and detrimental impact on the community of the Lissenden Gardens Estate.

These objections can be summarised as follows:

I object to the application on grounds of **excess height, bulk and over development**. The addition of a new office floor to what is already a substantial family home plus a music room rear extension, is inappropriate for this already densely populated and developed residential location. The development will not only detrimentally impact on the well-being of immediate neighbours in terms of enclosure, outlook and loss of light but also the amenity of the wider Lissenden Garden's community and the public by closing off the open North end of Lissenden Gardens and detracting from the architecture of the Victorian mansions blocks.

The Lissenden Gardens mansion flats are designed with a very deep plan in which can often be dark internal spaces. It is therefore essential that any changes safeguard natural light to homes and any open views to the sky, whilst not extending the already significant shade and shadow on the estate resultant from the already close proximity of The House to the North end of Parliament Hill and Clevedon Mansions. The proposed development will result in a **loss of light, increasing shadow and loss of openness** particularly for the residents at the most northerly blocks on the estate. This is particularly the case for those that live on the ground floor where properties are often occupied by older or disabled people who tend to spend more time at home.

The proposed application cannot be assessed in isolation, but should be evaluated in light of the approved redevelopment plans for Parliament Hill School. The combined effect of the new school development to the north of the estate combined with the plans in this application will **box-in** Clevedon Mansions and **create a sense of enclosure and over development**. While there are arguments that the development of the school is necessary to address public need, there is no similar rationale for over-development to accommodate a private need.

**The planning application is misleading with regards to the impact of the additional bulk and height.** Elevations show the development against the planned new Parliament Hill School "Ribbon Building" which implies the new school building will close off views and openness to the North of Lissenden Gardens, therefore mitigating the impact of the redeveloped House. This is wrong as this assertion is based on old plans from 2014 and portrays that the new school building will extend further West than will actually be the case. The designs for the new school building were revised to reduce the footprint to help minimise adverse impacts on the amenity of Lissenden Gardens, with the new

---

school building terminating at the east side of The House. Future loss of openness and sky will actually be the result of The House redevelopment and not Parliament Hill School.

The applicant intends to alter and expand the footprint of The House from multiple aspects and such development is clearly **beyond what could be considered a standard and permissible roof extension**. Although people have openly supported the quality of the architecture, it is not the architecture which is in question but rather, it's **inappropriateness for this site, and its disregard for the residents of Lissenden Gardens**.

I therefore respectfully request that this application is rejected.

Best regards,



Name: 43 Parliament Hill mansion  
Address: ~~Clevedon Mansions~~  
Lissenden Gardens  
London  
NW5

Laura Hazelton  
Planning & Built Environment,  
London Borough of Camden,  
5 Pancras Square,  
Judd Street,  
London,  
WC1H 9JE

Re: **Planning Application - 2016/6238/P**

Re: **Objection**

Dear Laura

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed changes to The House, Lissenden Gardens (planning application 2016/6238/P).

As outlined in greater detail below, the proposed changes to the existing building will have a significant and detrimental impact on the community of the Lissenden Gardens Estate.

These objections can be summarised as follows:

I object to the application on grounds of **excess height, bulk and over development**. The addition of a new office floor to what is already a substantial family home plus a music room rear extension, is inappropriate for this already densely populated and developed residential location. The development will not only detrimentally impact on the well-being of immediate neighbours in terms of enclosure, outlook and loss of light but also the amenity of the wider Lissenden Garden's community and the public by closing off the open North end of Lissenden Gardens and detracting from the architecture of the Victorian mansions blocks.

The Lissenden Gardens mansion flats are designed with a very deep plan in which can often be dark internal spaces. It is therefore essential that any changes safe guard natural light to homes and any open views to the sky, whilst not extending the already significant shade and shadow on the estate resultant from the already close proximity of The House to the North end of Parliament Hill and Clevedon Mansions. The proposed development will result in a **loss of light, increasing shadow and loss of openness** particularly for the residents at the most northerly blocks on the estate. This is particularly the case for those that live on the ground floor where properties are often occupied by older or disabled people who tend to spend more time at home.

The proposed application cannot be assessed in isolation, but should be evaluated in light of the approved redevelopment plans for Parliament Hill School. The combined effect of the new school development to the north of the estate combined with the plans in this application will **box-in** Clevedon Mansions and **create a sense of enclosure and over development**. While there are arguments that the development of the school is necessary to address public need, there is no similar rationale for over-development to accommodate a private need.

**The planning application is misleading** with regards to the **impact of the additional bulk and height**. Elevations show the development against the planned new Parliament Hill School "Ribbon Building" which implies the new school building will close off views and openness to the North of Lissenden Gardens, therefore mitigating the impact of the redeveloped House. This is wrong as this assertion is based on old plans from 2014 and portrays that the new school building will extend further West than will actually be the case. The designs for the new school building were revised to reduce the footprint to help minimise adverse impacts on the amenity of Lissenden Gardens, with the new

school building terminating at the east side of The House. Future loss of openness and sky will actually be the result of The House redevelopment and not Parliament Hill School.

The applicant intends to alter and expand the footprint of The House from multiple aspects and such development is clearly **beyond what could be considered a standard and permissible roof extension**. Although people have openly supported the quality of the architecture, it is not the architecture which is in question but rather, it's **inappropriateness for this site, and its disregard for the residents of Lissenden Gardens**.

I therefore respectfully request that this application is rejected.

Best regards,



*M. Lennard*

Name:

Address: ~~44~~ Clevedon Mansions  
Lissenden Gardens  
London  
NW5

Laura Hazelton  
Planning & Built Environment,  
London Borough of Camden,  
5 Pancras Square,  
Judd Street,  
London,  
WC1H 9JE

Re: **Planning Application - 2016/6238/P**

Re: **Objection**

Dear Laura

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed changes to The House, Lissenden Gardens (planning application 2016/6238/P).

As outlined in greater detail below, the proposed changes to the existing building will have a significant and detrimental impact on the community of the Lissenden Gardens Estate.

These objections can be summarised as follows:

I object to the application on grounds of **excess height, bulk and over development**. The addition of a new office floor to what is already a substantial family home plus a music room rear extension, is inappropriate for this already densely populated and developed residential location. The development will not only detrimentally impact on the well-being of immediate neighbours in terms of enclosure, outlook and loss of light but also the amenity of the wider Lissenden Garden's community and the public by closing off the open North end of Lissenden Gardens and detracting from the architecture of the Victorian mansions blocks.

The Lissenden Gardens mansion flats are designed with a very deep plan in which can often be dark internal spaces. It is therefore essential that any changes safeguard natural light to homes and any open views to the sky, whilst not extending the already significant shade and shadow on the estate resultant from the already close proximity of The House to the North end of Parliament Hill and Clevedon Mansions. The proposed development will result in a **loss of light, increasing shadow and loss of openness** particularly for the residents at the most northerly blocks on the estate. This is particularly the case for those that live on the ground floor where properties are often occupied by older or disabled people who tend to spend more time at home.

The proposed application cannot be assessed in isolation, but should be evaluated in light of the approved redevelopment plans for Parliament Hill School. The combined effect of the new school development to the north of the estate combined with the plans in this application will **box-in** Clevedon Mansions and **create a sense of enclosure and over development**. While there are arguments that the development of the school is necessary to address public need, there is no similar rationale for over-development to accommodate a private need.


**The planning application is misleading** with regards to the **impact of the additional bulk and height**. Elevations show the development against the planned new Parliament Hill School "Ribbon Building" which implies the new school building will close off views and openness to the North of Lissenden Gardens, therefore mitigating the impact of the redeveloped House. This is wrong as this assertion is based on old plans from 2014 and portrays that the new school building will extend further West than will actually be the case. The designs for the new school building were revised to reduce the footprint to help minimise adverse impacts on the amenity of Lissenden Gardens, with the new

school building terminating at the east side of The House. Future loss of openness and sky will actually be the result of The House redevelopment and not Parliament Hill School.

The applicant intends to alter and expand the footprint of The House from multiple aspects and such development is clearly **beyond what could be considered a standard and permissible roof extension**. Although people have openly supported the quality of the architecture, it is not the architecture which is in question but rather, it's **inappropriateness for this site, and its disregard for the residents of Lissenden Gardens**.

I therefore respectfully request that this application is rejected.

Best regards,



Name: *L. BURNS*

Address: *44 Cleveland Mansions P H M*  
Lissenden Gardens  
London  
NW5

*GEORGIA HAWKINS.*

Laura Hazelton  
Planning & Built Environment,  
London Borough of Camden,  
5 Pancras Square,  
Judd Street,  
London,  
WC1H 9JE

Re: **Planning Application - 2016/6238/P**

Re: **Objection**

Dear Laura

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed changes to The House, Lissenden Gardens (planning application 2016/6238/P).

As outlined in greater detail below, the proposed changes to the existing building will have a significant and detrimental impact on the community of the Lissenden Gardens Estate.

These objections can be summarised as follows:

I object to the application on grounds of **excess height, bulk and over development**. The addition of a new office floor to what is already a substantial family home plus a music room rear extension, is inappropriate for this already densely populated and developed residential location. The development will not only detrimentally impact on the well-being of immediate neighbours in terms of enclosure, outlook and loss of light but also the amenity of the wider Lissenden Garden's community and the public by closing off the open North end of Lissenden Gardens and detracting from the architecture of the Victorian mansions blocks.

The Lissenden Gardens mansion flats are designed with a very deep plan in which can often be dark internal spaces. It is therefore essential that any changes safeguard natural light to homes and any open views to the sky, whilst not extending the already significant shade and shadow on the estate resultant from the already close proximity of The House to the North end of Parliament Hill and Clevedon Mansions. The proposed development will result in a **loss of light, increasing shadow and loss of openness** particularly for the residents at the most northerly blocks on the estate. This is particularly the case for those that live on the ground floor where properties are often occupied by older or disabled people who tend to spend more time at home.

The proposed application cannot be assessed in isolation, but should be evaluated in light of the approved redevelopment plans for Parliament Hill School. The combined effect of the new school development to the north of the estate combined with the plans in this application will **box-in** Clevedon Mansions and **create a sense of enclosure and over development**. While there are arguments that the development of the school is necessary to address public need, there is no similar rationale for over-development to accommodate a private need.

**The planning application is misleading** with regards to the **impact of the additional bulk and height**. Elevations show the development against the planned new Parliament Hill School "Ribbon Building" which implies the new school building will close off views and openness to the North of Lissenden Gardens, therefore mitigating the impact of the redeveloped House. This is wrong as this assertion is based on old plans from 2014 and portrays that the new school building will extend further West than will actually be the case. The designs for the new school building were revised to reduce the footprint to help minimise adverse impacts on the amenity of Lissenden Gardens, with the new

school building terminating at the east side of The House. Future loss of openness and sky will actually be the result of The House redevelopment and not Parliament Hill School.

The applicant intends to alter and expand the footprint of The House from multiple aspects and such development is clearly **beyond what could be considered a standard and permissible roof extension**. Although people have openly supported the quality of the architecture, it is not the architecture which is in question but rather, it's **inappropriateness for this site, and its disregard for the residents of Lissenden Gardens**.

I therefore respectfully request that this application is rejected.

Best regards,



Name:

Address:

Lissenden Gardens

London

NW5 1UB

~~Cleveland Mansions~~

63 P. Hill Mansions

---



Laura Hazelton  
Planning & Built Environment,  
London Borough of Camden,  
5 Pancras Square,  
Judd Street,  
London,  
WC1H 9JE

Re: **Planning Application - 2016/6238/P**

Re: **Objection**

Dear Laura

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed changes to The House, Lissenden Gardens (planning application 2016/6238/P).

As outlined in greater detail below, the proposed changes to the existing building will have a significant and detrimental impact on the community of the Lissenden Gardens Estate.

These objections can be summarised as follows:

I object to the application on grounds of **excess height, bulk and over development**. The addition of a new office floor to what is already a substantial family home plus a music room rear extension, is inappropriate for this already densely populated and developed residential location. The development will not only detrimentally impact on the well-being of immediate neighbours in terms of enclosure, outlook and loss of light but also the amenity of the wider Lissenden Garden's community and the public by closing off the open North end of Lissenden Gardens and detracting from the architecture of the Victorian mansions blocks.

The Lissenden Gardens mansion flats are designed with a very deep plan in which can often be dark internal spaces. It is therefore essential that any changes safeguard natural light to homes and any open views to the sky, whilst not extending the already significant shade and shadow on the estate resultant from the already close proximity of The House to the North end of Parliament Hill and Clevedon Mansions. The proposed development will result in a **loss of light, increasing shadow and loss of openness** particularly for the residents at the most northerly blocks on the estate. This is particularly the case for those that live on the ground floor where properties are often occupied by older or disabled people who tend to spend more time at home.

The proposed application cannot be assessed in isolation, but should be evaluated in light of the approved redevelopment plans for Parliament Hill School. The combined effect of the new school development to the north of the estate combined with the plans in this application will **box-in** Clevedon Mansions and **create a sense of enclosure and over development**. While there are arguments that the development of the school is necessary to address public need, there is no similar rationale for over-development to accommodate a private need.

**The planning application is misleading** with regards to the **impact of the additional bulk and height**. Elevations show the development against the planned new Parliament Hill School "Ribbon Building" which implies the new school building will close off views and openness to the North of Lissenden Gardens, therefore mitigating the impact of the redeveloped House. This is wrong as this assertion is based on old plans from 2014 and portrays that the new school building will extend further West than will actually be the case. The designs for the new school building were revised to reduce the footprint to help minimise adverse impacts on the amenity of Lissenden Gardens, with the new

---

school building terminating at the east side of The House. Future loss of openness and sky view actually be the result of The House redevelopment and not Parliament Hill School.

The applicant intends to alter and expand the footprint of The House from multiple aspects and such development is clearly **beyond what could be considered a standard and permissible roof extension**. Although people have openly supported the quality of the architecture, it is not the architecture which is in question but rather, it's **inappropriateness for this site, and its disregard for the residents of Lissenden Gardens**.

I therefore respectfully request that this application is rejected.

Best regards,



Name: *Imogen West*  
Address: ~~Cleveland Mansions~~ *67 Parliament Hill Mns.*  
Lissenden Gardens  
London  
NW5

Laura Hazelton  
Planning & Built Environment,  
London Borough of Camden,  
5 Pancras Square,  
Judd Street,  
London,  
WC1H 9JE

Re: **Planning Application - 2016/6238/P**

Re: **Objection**

Dear Laura

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed changes to The House, Lissenden Gardens (planning application 2016/6238/P).

As outlined in greater detail below, the proposed changes to the existing building will have a significant and detrimental impact on the community of the Lissenden Gardens Estate.

These objections can be summarised as follows:

I object to the application on grounds of **excess height, bulk and over development**. The addition of a new office floor to what is already a substantial family home plus a music room rear extension, is inappropriate for this already densely populated and developed residential location. The development will not only detrimentally impact on the well-being of immediate neighbours in terms of enclosure, outlook and loss of light but also the amenity of the wider Lissenden Garden's community and the public by closing off the open North end of Lissenden Gardens and detracting from the architecture of the Victorian mansions blocks.

The Lissenden Gardens mansion flats are designed with a very deep plan in which can often be dark internal spaces. It is therefore essential that any changes safeguard natural light to homes and any open views to the sky, whilst not extending the already significant shade and shadow on the estate resultant from the already close proximity of The House to the North end of Parliament Hill and Clevedon Mansions. The proposed development will result in a **loss of light, increasing shadow and loss of openness** particularly for the residents at the most northerly blocks on the estate. This is particularly the case for those that live on the ground floor where properties are often occupied by older or disabled people who tend to spend more time at home.

The proposed application cannot be assessed in isolation, but should be evaluated in light of the approved redevelopment plans for Parliament Hill School. The combined effect of the new school development to the north of the estate combined with the plans in this application will **box-in** Clevedon Mansions and **create a sense of enclosure and over development**. While there are arguments that the development of the school is necessary to address public need, there is no similar rationale for over-development to accommodate a private need.

**The planning application is misleading** with regards to the **impact of the additional bulk and height**. Elevations show the development against the planned new Parliament Hill School "Ribbon Building" which implies the new school building will close off views and openness to the North of Lissenden Gardens, therefore mitigating the impact of the redeveloped House. This is wrong as this assertion is based on old plans from 2014 and portrays that the new school building will extend further West than will actually be the case. The designs for the new school building were revised to reduce the footprint to help minimise adverse impacts on the amenity of Lissenden Gardens, with the new

school building terminating at the east side of The House. Future loss of openness and sky will actually be the result of The House redevelopment and not Parliament Hill School.

The applicant intends to alter and expand the footprint of The House from multiple aspects and such development is clearly **beyond what could be considered a standard and permissible roof extension**. Although people have openly supported the quality of the architecture, it is not the architecture which is in question but rather, it's **inappropriateness for this site, and its disregard for the residents of Lissenden Gardens**.

I therefore respectfully request that this application is rejected.

Best regards,

Name: 

Address: 

89  
Lissenden Gardens  
London  
NW5 1NB

ANTHONY BARNETT  
89, Parliament Hill Mansions.