

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3593/L	Salvador Moncada	16 Park Village East	26/09/2017 20:50:38	COMMNT	The proposal is unsuited for and detracts from a listed building, Grade II, and harms the Regent's Park Conservation Area. Because of this the proposal should not be approved. Furthermore, since we don't know the final design of HS2 or the changes being considered that may impact on Park Village East, we don't know the final noise levels and therefore what insulation will be needed.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3593/L	Roger Low	30 Park Village East London NW1 7PZ	25/09/2017 22:16:32	COMMEM AIL	<p>Planning Application No: 2017/3593/L 34 Park Village East, NW1 7PZ</p> <p>I object to the application, above.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The application is made before the needs for the mitigation have been finalised. HS2 has not made their final plans for construction methods. Indeed, HS2 has left that in the hands of contractors who have only just received outline instructions. Therefore, no one knows what the construction method on Park Village East will entail. Not knowing the method means that no one knows how much noise will be made. If no one knows the type nor the volume of construction noise, it is impossible to adequately mitigate against that noise. The application should not be approved until, at least, such time as the Council knows what the applicant is mitigating against. 2. The application refers to the “temporary” effects of the planned works. In fact, by HS2’s own published schedule, the works are planned to last a decade, on Park Village East. Now, a decade may not be very long, in the history of the world, but in the lifetime of a resident on Park Village East, who is a child or a pensioner (as am I), a decade is a very long time and should not be considered “temporary.” The planned works should be considered as being permanent, by the Council, albeit, they must be reversed, at the end. 3. The property is a Grade II* listed building. It was assigned to the architect, John Nash, in 1824. The property is in the Regent’s Park Conservation Area. The proposed alterations will be clearly visible from the street. The proposed alterations will have a jarring and detrimental effect on the Listed Building and the Conservation Area. The proposed window treatments will involve fixing shutters in place in this building. (And, presumably, on other buildings on the street, as further applications are made.) The result will not be in keeping with the prospect and the surrounding buildings. 4. As noted, above, the plan for installation of secondary glazing involves permanently fixing shutters open. This will affect the closing of the shutters which need to be shut, for security reasons. Indeed, our insurers require that. Thus, permission should not be granted for #34, whose ultimate residents will certainly face the same requirement from insurers. 5. I support the comments made by members of the Noise Insulation Working Group and their Specialist Conservation Architect in their objections to this application. 6. This proposal would never even be considered for Listed Building Consent were it not for the problems arising from HS2 construction and the same restrictions on inappropriate alterations, temporary or otherwise, ought to apply to this application. If it would be an unacceptable alteration to a Grade II* Listed Building by Nash, in the absence of HS2 construction, it is equally objectionable on Listed Building grounds, now, and this application should be refused. <p>For the above reasons, this application should be refused.</p>