

Hazelton, Laura

Subject: FW: COMMENT on 2016/6238/P "THE HOUSE", Lissenden Gardens, NW5 1ND

From: Tony Edwards
Sent: 20 December 2016 23:35
To: Hazelton, Laura
Subject: COMMENT on 2016/6238/P "THE HOUSE", Lissenden Gardens, NW5 1ND

To laura.hazelton@camden.gov.uk **20/12/16**

I am unable to find the "make comment here" box, on the application page of website, as have a number of other people.

please include this in the Formal comments on this TP application, Yours, Tony Edwards

**Anthony Edwards architect RIBA, Dip Arch (Hons) retired
Cert Project Management Dip Building Conservation
Flat 47 Lissenden Mansions, Lissenden Gdns, London, NW5 1PR**

**COMMENT on "THE HOUSE", Lissenden Gardens, NW5 1ND
TOWN PLANNING APPLICATION NO:- 2016/6238/P, 14/12/16**

- I do NOT support this proposal. I am an experienced architect, with a training in the environment around buildings, and landscape architecture. I have a diploma in Historic Building Conservation. I live within sight of The House, which is on our skyline now.
- The application drawings A 02, 3 and DAS, should be withdrawn and resubmitted with correction of substantially misleading errors, with extended time for comments (see below).
- This proposal substantially changes the character of Lissenden Estate, by building bulk, enclosing the open North end, and by commercial use.

1) QUALITY OF DESIGN:- I am not commenting on the quality of building design, because the main issue is the overdevelopment, irrespective of design quality. I see the applicant has got many people, commenting on the design, but not the bulky effect on the Lissenden Estate.

2) BULK, HEIGHT AND OVER-DEVELOPMENT

THIS IS OVERDEVELOPMENT OF THE HOUSE. Proposal cuts out the open sky, and makes an enclosing, claustrophobic, bulk, across the North end of Lissenden Estate, as you see from homes, or walk along the pavement to The House.

THE SKYLINE OF "THE HOUSE" IS MUCH MORE PROMINENT THAN SCHOOL BEHIND, now, and more so if the extensions are built (see below: "Incorrect Drawings").

This is on a busy, major, route to Hampstead Heath, From Dartmouth Park, buses, and Estate.

Building footprint is 46% of site owned (with Site Plan error corrected, see below).

The proposed EXTENSION AT REAR, PROJECTS TOO CLOSELY TOWARDS 43 CLEVEDON Mansions for a noisy “music room”. Noise nuisance increases exponentially, with square of reduced distance away.

EXTENSION AT REAR, WILL KILL THE LARGE 15M, MATURE, PROTECTED, LIME TREE (, see drawing A 05, the Music Room). It is almost touching the trunk. Proposed extension is on top of 30% of the roots, which is too much for survival of the tree.

This tree is a significant feature, against the sky, of Lissenden Estate, which has little communal garden. Applicant has already applied to Camden to fell this tree, last year, who Refused permission to fell, following many local objections.

THE PROPOSALS CAUSE EXTENSIVE LOSS OF LIGHT TO ADJACENT FLATS. These Mansion flats, lower floors, are a very “gloomy” deep plan, with small windows, and lights are needed on all day, and would be worsened by the proposal, despite its light angle. The proposal will dominate the sky-line, when, at present, the far away mansions are the sky-line.

Poet John Betjeman (born here) wrote:- *“the red brick gloom of Lissenden Mansions”*.

The original design of the Estate was 2 parallel terraces of mansion flats, 4 storeys with mansard, with a bright open North skyline, which relieves and opens up this side of square.

HISTORY:- The original, single-storey, no stairs, Gardener’s hut, was demolished for present applicants House, and was modest in view to North/school. It was designed as part of the Estate. It was a romantic, axial statement, set in communal gardens three sides, with greenhouse and potting shed, no sanitation, see conservation report: 2006/4779/P. Camden had done an inadequate conversion for an Estate caretaker, who sold it to applicant, who complained that *“it had numerous shortcomings, internal...head height, low eaves...”*. Applicant should have bought a house that suited needs, not over-developed this unsuitable site.

These 3 stories would certainly not have been permitted in the Town Planning decision for The House:- 2006/4779/P. Which stated that:- *“the proposed 2 stories would be no taller than the Gardener’s hut”*.

IT IS LISTED “OF LOCAL INTEREST” in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Character assessment. School proposals will have minimal enclosing effect to North end of Estate.

3) COMMERCIAL USE IS OVER-DEVELOPMENT & SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED IN THIS DOMESTIC HOUSING ESTATE.

“Change-of-Use application” is needed for commercial use of the proposed 3rd Floor, one quarter (about 79 +sq m , int.) of the building, as office. This office is too big to be classed as subsidiary to home use. This substantial office use would be detrimental in a residential Estate.

This could bring several customers and employees, with vehicles, into this difficult to park zone, who are employed at present by applicants’ businesses elsewhere, to work here or have meetings here.

Only the stairwell would be shared, making an independent office with the house. There are 4 toilets now, 2 in stairwell. A future owner may assume greater commercial use.

VEHICLE PARKING;- This commercial 3rd floor proposal should not be allowed, because it would breach Town Planning conditions for permission for The House (2006/4779/P), because there will be a substantially increased demand for vehicle parking, from customers and employees:- *“Condition 7: To ensure that the use of the premises does not add to parking pressures which would be contrary to policies SD6 and T7 of UDP 2006.”*

The applicant at present has a home office about 19sq m int. on 1st Floor.

In Lissenden Estate, while there are several, small, subsidiary, home offices in 3 bed, 100 sq m, flats, this substantial Commercial Use is unacceptable in this Residential Area.

4) DRAWING NO A 02, A 03 & DAS:-

- **“PRINCIPAL SOUTH ELEVATION” AND PERSPECTIVES, ARE NOT CORRECT.**
- **SITE PLAN LAND OWNERSHIP IS NOT CORRECT**

“The House” is wrongly drawn to appear insignificant, compared with the overshadowing bulk of the school proposed “Ribbon” building, behind.

The House now, with prominent skylight, not school proposal, blocks the view of bright sky, and encloses the end of Lissenden Estate, in a claustrophobic way. Sky will be even more substantially blocked, and enclosed, with the proposed 3rd Floor, with several skylights, added.

Drawings give an incorrect rendering, that there is a close, very high school building, stretching above, to left and to right behind “The House”, which should be resubmitted correctly.

This school “Ribbon” building drawn by applicant, does NOT exist, and is NOT proposed by school, whose current proposal is no longer seen behind existing House, when approaching from Clevedon or Parliament Hill Mansions. Is shorter, to East and moved further away to North.

It may never be built, because tenders were received too expensive, long before this application. Applicant attends community liaison exhibitions about the school application.

The “Ribbon” building is a lot further to East, and 47-70m to North in the current school proposals revision (see The House:- A 02 Principal Front Elevation). It could not be seen either now, with 2 storey House, or with 3 storey applicants drawings proposed, when approaching The House on pavements.

The “Ribbon” building is a storey lower than the existing “Heath building”, and positioned to North, beyond the large tree, 4 ½ storey high, evergreen. And, because of its substantial distance away, its height diminishes considerably more, in perspective, than shown.

When approaching on the West or East public pavements, “Ribbon” building does NOT appear behind “The House” which substantially dominates the view of sky to North, open side of Lissenden Estate.

4) THE SITE PLAN A 10 rev. 1, WRONGLY SHOWS APPLICANT OWNS CAMDEN’S Bulk Refuse Store, Caretakers Room, and access alley. These are owned by Camden for Estate use.

The application is an excessively big extension, and over-development, for such a small site. Proposed building footprint would occupy 71sq m, 46% of applicant’s owned area, based on Site Plan corrected area.

TOWN PLANNING REPORT LOCATION PLAN is also not correct, and shows site area considerably oversize, by about 50%, in applicants ownership. Red Line is shown:- to face of Clevedon and Parliament Hill Mansions, when ownership is about 20m narrower (E-W), and about 5 ½ m shorter (N-S).

This inaccurate site plan distorts what is acceptable on a small site area.