

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,



Name:

Mrs Annette Ebsa

Address:

Clevedon Mansions Lissenden

Lissenden Gardens

16A -

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,



Name: *IGA Lissenden*
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,

Name: SELVIZE
Address: 19 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,



Name: J&M
Address: 21 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,



THOMAS McQUILLAN

Name: MANDY MATTHEWS

Address: Clevedon Mansions

LISSENDEN MANSIONS -

25 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,



Name: GUY BLOUGHAM

Address: 26 Clevedon Mansions
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1QP

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,



Name: ROS CUNNEIL

Address: ~~Clevedon Mansions~~ 27 LISSENDEN MANS
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,



Name: PATRICIA TAYLOR
Address: 36 LISSENDEN
~~Cleveland 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: *Lynne WATTON*

Address: *45* 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,

Name: Roy Shaw
Address: 46A Clevedon Mansions
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1QP 

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,



Name: ROSIE JONES.
LISSENDEN
Address: ~~45~~ Clevedon Mansions
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1PR

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.



Name: *LOUIS RAYNES*
Address: *48B* Clevedon Mansions¹
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5

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: **FRANZ BORHO**

Address: **49a** 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,



Name: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ ANOR CRAIG

Address: ~~Clevedon Mansions~~ Lissenden
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,



Name: *Michelle Elver*

Address: ~~50 Clevedon Mansions~~ *LISSENDEN 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.



Name: JOHN EGAN
Address: 50A 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

I therefore respectfully request that this application is rejected.

Best regards,



Name: Peter Bale and Sasha Jespersen

Address: 5th Clevedon Mansions

Lissenden Gardens

London

NW5 1QP

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,



Name: *Elizabeth Adeyole*
Lissenden
Address: *53, 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.



Name: Kate Filer
Address: 53 ~~Clarendon Mansions~~ Parliament Hill Mansions
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1UB

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: **DESMOND QUILLER**

Address: ~~Clarendon Mansions~~ **54 PARLIAMENT HILL MANSIONS**
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1UB

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,

Name: FRASER STARK
55 PARLIAMENT HILL MANSION
Address: ~~Clarendon Mansions~~
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1NS Fraser Stark

57 Lissenden Mansions
London
NW5 1PR

16 December 2016

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 object to the proposed changes to The House, Lissenden Gardens (planning application 2016/6238/P). The proposed changes to the existing building will have a detrimental impact on the community of the Lissenden Gardens Estate and on my dwelling No.57 Lissenden Mansions.

I will lose light and view from the large bulk addition. I live on the ground floor of Lissenden Mansions. I am a pensioner with a disability and there are many other pensioners on the lower floors with disabilities, who spend much of their lives indoors. We will lose light, reflected light and openness. The loss of light and openness, will also impact on so many people walking through the estate to the Heath.

One of the guiding principles behind the original planning permission was that the House should not exceed the original Victorian cottage it replaced. This application is proposing that the new build will be higher by two meters above the ridge of the original cottage. A three storey building would have been rejected in 2006 and should therefore be rejected now as there have been no new circumstances to merit a different analysis.

The plan has disregarded the residents of Lissenden Mansions.

I request that this application is rejected.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

Ms Nell Keddie

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



Name: *CAROL BUTLER*
Address: *39 LISSENDEN*
Cleveland Mansions
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5

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: KARIMA ELOBBADI
LISSENDEN
Address: 64 ~~Cleveland~~ 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



Name: L JACOBS
Address: ~~Cleveland Mansions~~
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1NB

65B, Parliament Hill Mans

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,



Name: LUCY CHEETHAM


Address: ~~68 Parliament Mansions~~ 68 PARLIAMENT HILL MANSIONS,
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1NB .

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: *Marina Avetisyan*

Address: ~~Clevedon Mansions~~
Lissenden Gardens *69 Parliament*
London *Hill Mansions*
NW5 *1NB*

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,



Name: *MR GEE*
Address: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ *71 PH M*
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



RONAN ELLIS

Name:

Address: ~~Cleveland Mansions~~
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1WB

73 PARLIAMENT HILL MANS

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: Samia Begum
Address: ~~Belvedere Mansions~~ Parliament Hill Mansions
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1NB

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 1WB

8/10/18 PHS, Parliament Hill Marshic ->

Laura Hazelton

Planning and Built Environment

London Borough of Camden

5 Pancras Square

7000 Street

London WC1H 9JE.

Clare Mansford
92 Parliament Hill Mansions

NW5 1NB

14 Dec 16.

Re Planning Application - 2016/6238/P
Re objection.

Dear Laura

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

It will have a detrimental impact on
the community of the Lissenden Gardens

Estate and on my dwelling No 92
Parliament Hill Mansions. I am on

the ground floor and the architectural
relationship between my flat and
Clarendon Mansions will be blocked by

the substantial new extension. Also

the light impact of the application

has not been sufficiently assessed by

the applicant particularly in relation to my flat

and the ground floor flats in Cleveland.
I am a pensioner and there are
many other pensioners on the lower floors
with disabilities like myself in doors a
great deal. We will lose light, reflected
light and openness. The shadow will be
increased thus going against the original
design of the estate which was to borrow
light into these flats.

As well as the loss of light and
openness for residents this impacts on
everyone walking through the estate to the
heath. The new floor which is an office
is inappropriate for this residential location.
The excess height and bulk will create
a sense of enclosure and overdevelopment.

This new building is not
appropriate for this site and the plan
has disregarded the residents of Listerden
Gardens. I will no longer feel so much
proud of this estate. I will be looking
dubiously onto what feels like a modern
office building.

I request please that the application is
rejected. ^{Thank you,}
Yours sincerely Clare Mansford.

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.

Impact on my flat

I live in 93 Parliament Hill Mansions, the front of my house directly faces The House. I am on the North End of Parliament Hill Mansions in the block comprising flats 91-100. the block most affected by the proposed development.

From photographs that I am sending in you will see that the front of my house looks directly into JJ's existing office. My flat is dark, I get extra light when the sun shines on the windows of Clevedon Mansions and is reflected back into the front of my flat. This is part of the design of 'borrowing light' into these dark flats. With an extra floor on The House I will no longer get light into the front of my flat except early in the morning.

I will also no longer be able to feel part of this Victorian Estate, rather, the front of my flat will be looking directly onto the mass bulk of a modern House. In addition to the above I have come together with concerned neighbours and our collective objections as an estate are outlined below.

Negative impact of increased height for all residents of the Lissenden Gardens Estate (part of *Dartmouth Park Conservation Area*)

- The applicant states that the impact of the construction is mitigated because there is an existing skylight (Design & Access Statement, page 8). This argument is misleading as (1) the skylight is not visible from the ground level as it constitutes only a small portion of the roof (approximately 20%); and (2) the existing skylight is transparent so has little visual impact, unlike the density of the new storey that is proposed. The Council should reject this argument and should instead evaluate the proposal on the basis of its true impact, which is a height increase of approximately 2.8 - 3 metres.
- The applicant states that the Parliament Hill School (PHS) building is higher than the proposed extension (Design & Access Statement, page 8). This argument is misleading and incorrect as this assertion is based upon the old designs for the PHS building (planning application 2014/7683/P, document "Proposed Block Plan A-PHS-PL-X-PL-00-SI-0601-2"). The PHS building design underwent significant design changes resulting in a smaller footprint that will not flank The House to the North (planning application 2016/3512/P, document PHWES Overall Site Plan - Boundary Distances). The construction of an additional storey will actually reduce northern openness and sky that would otherwise have been gained from the demolition of the existing school structure, negatively impact residential and public outlook and amenity from Clevedon Mansions and the approach to The House from the south on Lissenden Gardens.
- The proposed increase in the height and mass of The House will negatively change the dynamic and

relationship between the Clevedon Mansions and Parliament Hill Mansions at the north end of the Lissenden Garden Estate. The additional storey will effectively create a 3 storey barrier across the North End of the Estate and will block the architectural relationship between Clevedon Mansions and Parliament Hill Mansions, two of the anchor buildings of the North End part of the estate. This will negatively impact outlook as is evidenced by the submitted photos and blocks the sight lines to Clevedon Mansions, thereby cutting off two complementary buildings. This particularly impacts flats on the ground, 1st and 2nd floors.

- The addition of a new storey as proposed by the applicant will negatively impact the outlook of all Estate residents to the North towards the Heath reducing openness and sky views.
- When the House was originally approved for construction, it was a controversial decision that faced significant local opposition. As a result, there was extensive community consultation. To address those community concerns, we understand that one of the guiding principles behind the original planning permission was that the House should not exceed the height of the original Victorian cottage it replaced. Based on our calculations, the new storey would be approximately 2 meters above the ridge line of the original cottage. A three storey building would have been rejected in 2006 and should therefore be rejected now as there have been no new circumstances to merit a different analysis.

East side extension has a disproportionate adverse impact on Clevedon Mansions

The application dramatically increases the bulk and mass of The House on the East side of the House, which will have a significant negative impact on the outlook and amenity for those on the east side of Lissenden Gardens, particularly those who live in Clevedon Mansions.

The proposed application cannot be assessed in isolation, but should be evaluated in light of the approved redevelopment plans for Parliament Hill School (planning applications 2014/7683/P and 2016/3512/P). The new school development on the southern school boundary (also referred to as the "Ribbon Building") will have the impact of "boxing in" Clevedon Mansions on the North and West side. Now, the applicant proposes to also block the West side of Clevedon Mansions, which, in conjunction with the school redevelopment, will have the cumulative effect of creating walls around the entire North end of Clevedon Mansions. This cumulative over-development of a very small area should not be allowed to occur. 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.

In addition, the proposed application will have a significant negative impact on Clevedon Mansions for the following reasons:

- The proposed massing on the east side and rear garden and increase in height will form a wall for all residents of floors 1-3 of Clevedon Mansions. This will negatively impact outlook as is evidenced by the provided photos.
- The House is already situated very close to Clevedon Mansions at 18 metres. This is currently slightly offset by the 1st floor being set back a further 1.5 metres by the inclusion of an East side balcony. The proposed brick extension over the east side balcony will effectively bring the full mass of a 3 storey building 1.5 metres closer to Clevedon Mansions in what is already a small and over-developed plot.
- The proposed East side brick extension is of poor design, lacks visual detail and the solid-to-void ratio of the mansion blocks. It is worth noting that the original application for The House (planning application 2006/0611/P) contemplated a similar approach on the ground floor western side but was rejected by the Council for this reason. This will impact both outlook from Clevedon Mansions and the public view approaching from east side of the tennis court.
- The light impact of the proposed application has not been sufficiently assessed by the applicant, particularly with respect to the ground floor flats in Clevedon & Parliament Hill Mansions. Having reviewed the potential impact on loss of light, the impact of the new storey will dissect 25 degrees and impact light levels. This will particularly impact the ground floor flats in Clevedon Mansions as

- Last year, the applicant submitted an application to cut down a large, mature tree that faces Clevedon Mansions. This application was withdrawn due to local opposition. While this application suggests that the tree will be maintained, the proximity of the roots to the proposed rear extension raises concerns that the tree may be damaged, thereby giving the applicant an indirect way to eliminate the tree or replace it with a smaller tree that will take generations to grow. Given Camden's commitment to greener spaces, the application should be rejected if the tree is not provided sufficient protection.

Finally, the East side extension breaches a number of Camden's planning guidelines as the proposed brick extension over the East side balcony will breach the height of the porch. When considering that from Clevedon Mansions that east side also acts as the front of the building, the extension over the balcony and additional storey also breaches planning guidance in terms of extending outwards to the east and not being set back from the main building as is currently the case. Please refer to Camden Planning Guidance, section 4.16 and section 4 figure 3.

Rear extension breaches Camden planning guidelines

The proposed rear extension should not be approved for the following reasons:

- The height of the rear extension will be one storey higher than the neighbouring communal estate garage. The scale and size of the extension in relation to its proximity to Clevedon Mansions will cause a sense of enclosure for those living on the ground, 1st and 2nd floors (which is against Camden planning guidance, section 4.10)
- In terms of siting, scale, location and design the rear extension is not subordinate to the host garden and will have a negative visual impact (which is against Camden planning guidance, section 4.24)
- The rear extension will effectively infill the gap between The House and the school boundary fence that is viewable from Clevedon Mansions and the path that joins Hampstead Heath and Lissenden Gardens (see Camden planning guidance, section 4.17). The resulting infill will negatively impact sky view from number 42 and 44 Clevedon Mansions.
- If the rear extension is approved, the public's initial view of Lissenden Gardens when using the path from Hampstead Heath will diminish with the rear extension blocking views of trees and Clevedon Mansions to the East. The public first views will therefore be of a modern House as opposed to a grand Victorian mansion block estate as envisaged by the founding Estate architects.

Sense of openness will be adversely impacted by the planning application

- The new storey and design changes will result in the House becoming the focal point when approaching from the South and will overpower and detract from the historic architecture of the estate, as opposed to providing a complementary juxtaposition.
- The plot of land on which The House is situated was never intended to be used for a building of the size and mass of that which has now been proposed. Instead, the space was intended to provide residents with a sense of openness and sky at the North end to offset South, East and West estate density. Rather than promote a sense of openness the proposed changes will have the opposite effect and create a sense of enclosure at the North end of the estate.

Use of property does not necessitate proposed changes

- The House was designed with a four person family in mind and the family size remains the same. Although we appreciate that families often require additional space, the House is already a large four bedroom property and the owners already use a spare bedroom as an office.
- The property also uniquely benefits from an adjoining garage. The garage appears to be rarely used for car parking and so could be converted to increase usable space within the current footprint without negatively impacting the other residents of Lissenden Gardens. The conversion of the

garage.

- The justification of the proposed development is to provide an office. When considering the size of the roof extension it is clear that an office of this size is substantially larger than a typical work from home office (which the applicant already has). This therefore raises the question of whether the proposed changes warrant a change of use to commercial use. This should be investigated further and if this is a possibility, the application should be subject to the additional oversight required for a change of use.
- The proposed use of the rear extension as a music room also raises noise concerns given its proximity to the Clevedon Mansions and Camden's inability to control its use by future residents.


Overall, this application intends to alter and expand the footprint of The House from multiple aspects and is clearly beyond what could be considered a standard and permissible roof extension. If granted, the proposed changes will have a detrimental effect not only on the lives of dozens of immediate residents but also the wider Lissenden Gardens Estate and the amenity of the public who frequent Lissenden Gardens to access Hampstead Heath.

We therefore respectfully request that this application is rejected.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about the above or require further information.

Thank you for your due attention to this matter.

Yours sincerely,



Name: Ms M L McClew


Address: 93 Parliament Hill Mansions
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5

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: CHRISTINE PERRE

Address:

Lissenden Gardens

London

NW5 1NB

~~Cleveland Mansions~~ 96 PARLIAMENT HILL

MANSIONS

LISSENDEN GARDENS NW5 1NB

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,

Name: Ana Santos and Waldo Carvalho
Address: ~~██████████~~ 99 Parliament Hill Mansions
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1NSB

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,



Name: *Esther Cofei*
Address: ~~61, Parliament Hill~~
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,



Name: *STEVE WHITTINGHAM.*

Address: ~~Cleveland Mansions~~
Lissenden Gardens
London
NW5 1UB