

**Roger L Low  
30 Park Village East  
London NW1 7PZ**



6 February 2018

Ms. Catherine Bond  
Planning Department  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London WC1H 9JE

Planning Application No: 2017/6942/L

34 Park Village East, NW1 7PZ

Application for Listed Building Consent for alteration, extension, or demolition of a listed building.  
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

In the normal course of events, Camden's Planning Department would not be concerned with the effectiveness of applications to it, merely that the application not breach relevant statutes. However, in this case, the Planning Dept would not even consider an application, such as this one, which runs roughshod over all Heritage considerations and the Act. The only reason you are considering the application is that it purports to make a house liveable during a period of a decade, or two, that the applicant proposes blighting the property. Therefore, if the application does not, effectively, mitigate the blight, there is no point in making the application and there is, certainly, no point in approving the application.  
I object to the application, above.

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 are not due to make their plans known until later in 2018. 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, at number 7, states that neighbours have been consulted about the proposal. I live two doors from the applicant premises and I can confirm that I have NOT BEEN consulted about the proposal

3. The application refers to the "temporary" effects of the planned works. In fact, according to the Design Statement accompanying this application, the works are planned to last "approximately 15 years." on Park Village East. Now, a decade and a half 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 15+ years may well be my remaining lifetime 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.

4. As you well know, the property is a Grade II\* listed building. The property is in the Regent's Park Conservation Area. The proposed alterations will be clearly visible from the street. The proposed alterations

be in keeping with the prospect and the surrounding buildings.

5. In any event, the application is only one-third of an application. The application is only for the east (front) elevation. In order to provide effective noise insulation against the levels of noise implied in the Environmental Statement, noise insulation would need to be installed on the south and west elevations, as well. The windows on the south face down the tracks to Euston Station and over the DB shed, which is early on the list for noisy demolition. The west elevation faces two hard, tall, brick constructions, that of the buildings in Albany Street Barracks and that of the wall surrounding the barracks. The effect of these constructions, given the wide space between nos. 34 and 36 is to allow the sound to go from the front of the house and bounce the sound back onto the rear of no. 34, (and other residences on Park Village East). Residents in some of those homes have been told that they will receive noise insulation on their rear windows. No. 34 should be no different. The fact that the applicant will not live in this house means that the applicant is more interested in doing SOMETHING than in truly insulating against the noise the applicant, itself, is creating.

6. Without noise insulation on each elevation, the house will be blighted by noise. With noise insulation on each elevation, the noise MAY be mitigated (see 1, above) but the house will be blighted by heat, in summer. In either event, the house will not be habitable during periods when both noise AND heat are present. Air conditioning must be provided to the residents. It is not enough to ventilate the space between the two sets of proposed windows. That does nothing for the residents, who would normally open windows, at back and front, for through ventilation but who will be unable so to do on noisy summer days—for 15 years.

7. I am not an architect, so I rely upon and support the comments made by members of the Noise Insulation Working Group and their Specialist Conservation Architect in their objections to the previous application and to the objections which have been verbally related to me to this application.

8. The current application is, effectively, the same application [2017/3593/L](#) as was withdrawn, merely with the addition of colour copies of old maps. The potted history of Regent's Park, John Nash, and the Park Village, which is included, only serves to point out why these houses are Grade II\* Listed, not why the developer's plans are, in any way, improved over the last doomed lot.

9. 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.

For each of the above reasons, this application should be refused.

Please advise me of the Committee date so that I may speak, if necessary. Email address is above.

Sincerely,

