

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/2101/P	Richard Simpson for Regent's Park CAAC	26/06/2024 12:05:51	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from The Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>3 June 2024</p> <p>10 Park Village West NW1 4AE 2024/2101/P + 2024/2204/L</p> <p>1. Acknowledging the refurbishment work undertaken in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, we are unable to advise on the internal alterations now proposed.</p> <p>Objection to the proposed conservatory/kitchen</p> <p>2. The applicant's 'Heritage statement', at p. 18 paras 4.18 + 4.19, acknowledges the importance of the contrast between the entrance front and the elevations to the 'L-shaped' plan to the side and rear:</p> <p>'Despite these changes, the composition works as Nash originally intended: the L-shaped plan remains clearly readable and still provides an intriguing contrast between the flat entrance front squarely aligned with the street and the more complex geometry of the south elevation glimpsed in dynamic oblique views through trees from the curving pavement. ...'</p> <p>3. The applicant's heritage assessment argues persuasively for recognition of the high significance of the exterior of the building.</p> <p>4. In this context we object strongly to the proposed conservatory. Noting the recognized high significance of the original L-shaped plan we advise that a conservatory in this location should be unambiguously subordinate to the original and surviving masonry enclosure. The current proposal is not sufficiently subordinate. It proposes a masonry structure with stucco finish to match the surviving building, with added stucco mouldings, fenestration which follows the traditional pattern of openings formed in a masonry enclosure, the addition of natural stone architraves to those openings (dwg no. 207 P2), and bronze spandrel panels. All these elements subvert the modest subordinate character of a conservatory appropriate in this location. The proposal is over-dominant and therefore seriously harmful of the highly significant surviving L-shaped form.</p> <p>5. We have no objection to the proposed use of a conservatory in this location as a kitchen and would be happy to review a revised proposal.</p> <p>Objection to the proposed garage</p> <p>6. It is well recognized that the balance of building to landscape in the Park Villages is of special, exceptional, significance – the use of 'Picturesque' landscape is one of Nash's major achievements in the design of Regent's Park. Camden's Regent's Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, formally adopted and current SPD, states at p. 20, of the Park Villages:</p> <p>'The buildings are unified by the setting, a picturesque landscape which largely survives. The balance of building to landscape is often visible in views between buildings and across intriguing sight lines and is a fundamental element in the special character of the Park Villages.'</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

7. In this context we object strongly to the proposed garage. The largely surviving picturesque landscape and its fundamental role in the special character of the Park Villages would be seriously harmed in this location by the proposed garage, which would disrupt the setting of the Listed Buildings in the Park Villages and neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

8. The grant of consent for the garage in the current context would set a precedent which would endanger the survival of the exceptional character and significance of the picturesque landscape. We note the claim by the current applicant that the consent granted for a garage in 1974 is a precedent for the current application (cited dwg. 100.1 P3). In fact this is not a valid precedent given the date of the statutory Listing of the building. The application referenced, CTP/K11/6/9/18567, was dated 26 March 1974, and thus precedes the statutory Listing of the property on 13 May 1974.

9. The Committee noted that air-source heat pumps were to be located immediately adjacent to the proposed garage and recognized that an alternative location would have to be found for them but given the scale of the units advised that this should be possible without visual intrusion. The RPCAAC welcomed the proposed installation of low-energy heat sources and PV panels in appropriate locations.

Objection to additional paving and hard landscape in the garden

10. Having regard for the importance of the Picturesque landscape in the setting of the Listed Buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area, we note that the Picturesque landscape is characterised by informal, soft landscape. The proposed addition of further hard paving and structures as stated on dwg 101.1 P3 would harm the special landscape character. We also note that while no balustrade or other safety measures are shown in the application they are likely to be required at changes of level including steps. Metal railings, which may be suited to front areas, and masonry balustrading, are not appropriate in this context and are harmful to the informality of the Picturesque landscape. Additional hard landscape would disrupt the setting of the Listed Building and neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

11. We also note that the abandonment of the garage and extended paving would enable the retention of trees T1, T3, T7, T8, T19 and G18 all of which contribute to the setting of the Listed Building and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Richard Simpson FSA  
Chair

---