

**ADVICE from THE REGENT'S PARK CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT**

02 December 2024

10 Park Village West NW1 4AE ref 2024/4917/P + 2024/4930/L

Strong objections

**Proposed plant room, car port/ pergola, ASHPs**

1. The Advisory Committee at its meeting on 2 December 2024 considered the proposals in the light of the withdrawal of the garage proposal from applications 2024/2101/P + 2024/2204/L. The Advisory Committee reviewed the advice we had given in June 2024 on applications 2024/2101/P + 2024/2204/L to assess whether the current application proposals addressed our concerns.

2. We noted that we had argued in June 2024:

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:

'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.'

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.

3. We agreed in December that the current proposals would, like the garage proposal, also seriously harm the largely surviving picturesque landscape and its fundamental role in the special character of the Park Villages.

4. While lower than the proposed garage, the current proposals consist of three parts – the car port/pergola, the plant room itself, and the fence which is proposed to mitigate the impact of the noise of the ASHPs. Creation of these three distinct elements adds to the disruptive character of the proposals in the interruption of the Picturesque landscape.

5. While lower than the proposed garage, the currently proposed cluster of structures 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.

6. In June we also argued:

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.

7. We fully endorse this concern in respect of the current application.

#### **Proposed fencing**

8. We strongly object to the proposed fencing, which at 1.8m high and densely patterned would be profoundly disruptive of the unity of the landscape of 10 Park Village West and fundamentally undermining of the Nash landscape which Listing and designation as a conservation area seek to preserve.

9. We note that the applicant (Design and Access statement) 4.3.3 acknowledges 'the very open nature' of the construction of the existing fence, emphasizing the inappropriate nature of the proposed replacement in the historic context.

10. We further note that the proposed fence is justified as an acoustic barrier in the applicant's acoustic report. But there is no assessment of alternative forms of mitigation of the kind more normally proposed to meet the requirements of Camden's Local Plan policies A1 and A4 and associated provisions. The present application does not conclusively justify the proposed fence as the sole solution to necessary acoustic mitigation.

#### **Proposed pv panels**

11. While we welcome the installation of low-energy plant it should respect the forms and details of the Listed Buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area in which views are of such significance. We note the assertions (DAS 5.3 with image 03) that the panels to each slope of the central valley to the main house would be invisible from the street, but this is not demonstrated by the applicant's image 03 to DAS 5.3. We seek the production of verified CGIs to ensure that the proposed PV panels would in fact be invisible in views from the public realm in the Park Villages. The uptake of such equipment will be discouraged if it proves to harm the Listed Buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

We would be happy to review a revised application.



Richard Simpson FSA  
Chair