

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/7195/P	Richard Simpson for Regent's Park CAAC	12A Manley Street London NW1 8LT NW1 8LT NW1 8LT	10/02/2016 11:04:02	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from REGENT'S PARK CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE 12A Manley Street London NW1 8LT</p> <p>1 February 2016</p> <p>28 Chester Terrace, London NW1 4ND: 2015/7195/P + 2016/0307/L</p> <p>Strong objections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Advisory Committee was dismayed at the approach of this application to the Listed Building. While it is acknowledged that much of the interior structure is a reconstruction, key elements, such as the plan form, proportions of internal spaces and volumes, and the hierarchy of these spaces and volumes in the building were retained, and constitute important elements of the significance of the Listed Building. It is important to recognize that the view that it was only the elevations of the main buildings surrounding the Park which mattered is an out-dated historical interpretation not accepted by more recent scholarship. We now accept a more comprehensive reading of the Park as a whole, acknowledging its importance as an innovative example of town planning, integrating service provision and a hierarchy of dwelling types. These dwelling types are characterized not only by the elevational treatments, but also by the internal plans. Even though these plans may not have been designed by Nash, they reflect and give physical form to the shared social assumptions of the time: they are witnesses to the understanding of social status and its expression in dwelling forms, and are thus key to the full significance of these Listed Buildings. 2. The destruction of the original plan layout at lower ground, ground, and first floor is unacceptable: it seriously harms the surviving plan form and its significance as set out above. 3. The introduction of a fireplace to the entrance hall is wholly inappropriate to the character of the house, introducing an alien element which seriously harms the contrast of the entrance hall and the reception rooms. The introduction of two pairs of doors in the partition wall is also harmful to the original scale and proportions balancing the separate front room and the hallway. The separation of the front and rear hall is harmful in terms of the original proportions of this space. The introduction of the lobby to the rear kitchen is seriously harmful to the contained volume of the stairwell – which should be recognized as one of the most important architectural volumes in houses of this period and so to its significance. 4. We object to the cumbersome detailing of the parquet flooring to the first floor front reception room. We acknowledge that the floor could – and, given its design, undoubtedly would – be removed at a later date, but the patterns used are harmful to the perceived proportions of the room. 5. We have accepted the form of roof proposed, but request a condition to ensure that no new construction is visible in long views across the Park, to ensure the consistent roofline of the unified Terrace.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

6. We object to the proposal to clutter the rear elevation with lamps as well as CCTV: the lamps are inappropriate – unobtrusive service lighting is available.

7. We would object to any surface treatment of the brickwork to the rear elevation, if that is what the note on the drawing ‘Brown brickwork external wall finish’ means. The rear of the houses, although rebuilt, are at least reasonably consistent in brick colour, type, and pointing.

8. We object strongly to the proposed air-conditioning: we must all take our responsibilities to minimize energy use seriously to ensure that the UK meets our energy-use targets. This installation has no stated justification when natural ventilation in these houses is effective.

Richard Simpson FSA
Chair RPCAAC
