

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6942/L	Helen Bryan	30 Park Village East	06/02/2018 21:14:05	OBJLETT ER	Re: APPLICATION 2017/6942L Listed Building Consent Application for listed building consent for alterations, extension or demolition of a listed building

From: Helen Bryan
30 Park Village East
London NW1 7PZ

1. I object to this application, on the following grounds,:

(i) The proposed alteration for which Listed Building (LB) consent is sought would normally be considered unacceptable in a Grade II* Listed Nash building. The works for which Listed Building consent is sought are stated to be "temporary" and justifiable on the sole grounds of mitigating noise from the construction of HS2. They are not fit for the purpose for which permission is sought. They are based on faulty noise modelling, on no investigation of the way the property is currently impacted by noise, and a poor understanding of the acoustics in the neighborhood. In the premises the proposed works would provide at best a feeble and minimal level of protection against the currently predicted noise levels.

(ii) The proposed works will have an unacceptable impact on the interior and exterior historic features of this Grade II* Listed Building, and are not in keeping with the character and appearance of either the Listed Nash house or the Regents Park Conservation Area.

(iii) The application is premature. It is as yet unclear what noise levels are being insulated against. There is a revised scheme being developed for the Euston approach, which HS2 have stated will have a different impact on Park Village East than the scheme accompanied by AP3 and SES 2, on which residents petitioned to the House of Commons and House of Lords. To date residents have not been informed what the noise impacts will be of any revised scheme on Park Village East, because HS2 say these have not yet been assessed. They depend on the contractors' design, and to date neither the design nor the noise impacts are known. Therefore more or less noise insulation may be required and/or it may prove impossible to provide effective noise insulation at all and affected residents will need to be rehoused in accordance with the provisions of Information Paper E 23. Given the current uncertainty over noise levels, this application is somewhat hit-and-miss, puts the cart before the horse and is a waste of taxpayers' money.

(iv) Camden are not in possession of all material considerations relating to this application, namely a survey carried out by Atkins to investigate the potential for damp in these listed Nash buildings. The initial survey, carried out last summer at 30 Park Village East, contained so many errors it will be repeated for accuracy.

2. I note that the application has not been made by anyone who has ever lived in the property, or intends to live there or has the knowledge and experience of the house to know how it is impacted by noise in the surrounding area. Nor will anyone who hasn't lived in the house be familiar with the significant thermal gain from its east-west exposure during the warmer months. In the premises I assume that if not informed by direct experience of living at the property it prepared on the basis of computer modelling. If so, the computer

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

modelling is inadequate and wrong.

3, I am well acquainted with many of the Nash houses, and their characteristics., on Park Village East, but am particularly well acquainted with No 34, both internally and externally. Since 1980, my husband and I have lived two doors away from site address at No 30 Park Village East (PVE) in a similarly Grade II * Listed Building designed by John Nash. From 1980, when we bought No 30, until approximately 1995, when No 34's leaseholders moved, we were close friends with the family as they had children the same ages as our own. The two families were in and out of each other's houses on an almost daily basis for fifteen years and I know every room and every window of the site address, and am familiar with its historic features , many of which are similar to those at No 30. I am also acquainted with how hot the east-west facing rooms become in summer unless all the windows are open, as well as how the house is affected by noise bouncing off the barracks walls to the rear

PROPOSED NOISE INSULATION NOT FIT FOR PURPOSE

4. The proposed noise insulation is to be provided to the front of the building only, but this will be insufficient to render the house habitable , as anyone who lives between Nos 28 -36 and further south on Park Village East, including the block of flats at Silsoe house, can confirm. There are very large gaps between the detached and semi- detached properties, and at this end of the street all properties back directly onto the large brick buildings and multi-story brick and concrete parking lot of the Regents Park Barracks. Residents on Park Village East, most of whom have lived here for many years, have repeatedly tried to tell HS2 and their contractors that noise insulation cannot be achieved if rear windows and doors are not insulated.

5. We and other residents have emphasized to every HS2 person, every HS2 contractor, that from long experience we know that noise from anywhere in the street -a car alarm, a household burglar alarm or drilling in the street to give a few examples- produces a "surround sound" effect, with noise travelling through the large gaps between houses and reverberating off the barracks wall and high brick buildings. Such noise is as loud in the gardens at the back and sides of the properties as at the front . Both internally and externally, it is impossible to tell where the noise is coming from, it's everywhere.

6. We also know, after thirty-eight years of living here, that noise can carry up and down the north/south " corridor" provided by the gardens to the rear, and even a children's birthday party at the north end of PVE can, depending on conditions, be clearly heard at the southern end. We are unaware that HS2 have made any real attempts to assess the particular acoustics of Park Village East.

7. Like almost anything residents try to tell HS2, residents' attempts to point out this problem to them and their contractors have fallen on deaf ears as HS2/contractors prefer to rely on inadequate and inaccurate computer modelling, and in the case of No 34 propose only insulation at the front. This is odd, given that contractors have now admitted to the residents of other Nash properties on the street that the computer model was wrong about

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

the impact of noise from the rear.HS2 and its contractors have signally failed to share this information when the proposed noise insulation application was drafted.

8. The failure to provide NI to the rear of No 34 is oddly inconsistent with the installation of NI to a flat at the rear of Silsoe House, and inconsistent with the experience of residents living further north on Park Village East- and thus, oddly, at a greater distance from the Barracks- who have been told they are entitled to noise insulation at the rear of their properties. The ones of which I am aware are the residents of No 28, No 22 and the Nash House flats .

9. HS2 contractor Selectaglaze has visited our house at No 30 and confirmed to my husband and myself that NI would indeed be necessary at the rear of our house if it were to remain habitable during HS2 construction.

10 However, in the case of the current application there was no resident to point out the shortcomings of the application It appears that HS2 and its contractors are trying to rush through an inadequate avoidance scheme for an uninhabited to avoid the expense of a fully effective noise insulation scheme, and persuade Camden Council that HS2 is honoring its undertakings.

11. We believe the data on which the scheme has been designed is flawed. If this was a scheme based on an assessment by Steve Mitchell of ERM, as I believe it was, which showed the noise levels to the rear of the property as being low, Mr. Mitchell subsequently confirmed verbally to residents at No 36 and contractors Selectaglaze confirmed to residents of No 28 this was wrong, and that they had not appreciated the effect of sound being bounced back from the barracks to the rear of the properties.

12. The scheme for No 34 is inconsistent with the installation of NI in a rear flat at Silsoe House because of the noise that will be bounced back into her flat from the barracks.

THERMAL GAIN

13. . In relation to the proposed secondary glazing and the heat generated by the east/west exposure of the property, anyone who has spent time in No 34 on a sunny summer day can confirm, as I can, that the house gets very hot in full sun. With the proposed scheme, thermal gain seems likely to be intolerable, the slot ventilators are only intended to ventilate the gap between the window and the internal glazing. But with No 34, as with most of these houses that face east-west, to be habitable on hot days requires windows to be left front and back for a cross breeze from the garden. Since the application is not made by a resident who would know and be concerned by such things, I doubt that the applicants have any grasp of this problem.

UNACCEPTABLE IMPACT ON HISTORIC FEATURES OF THE BUILDING

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received: Comment: Response:

14. Externally: I do not agree that the sliding windows of the secondary glazing as proposed will not be noticeable from the street. While they will appear to line up with the casement windows to anyone standing immediately in front of them, they will be visible from the side and as the developer admitted, via their reflection.

15. Internally: The internal glazing proposal will reduce the floor area and alter the historic proportions of the rooms.

16. As for the claim that any negative or unsightly impacts on the historic character and features of No 34 are "temporary" -which the developers as fifteen year- it invites the question "temporary" in what context? An individual's entire existence on earth can be said to be "temporary" in terms of the passing of the ages. Given the tendency of construction projects to overrun in time, it may seem objectively "temporary" to HS2 but will hardly be "temporary" to residents nor "temporary" in terms of unacceptable impact on the building and its immediate environment. For many residents the installation of NI will last the remainder of their lives.

SURVEY BY ATKINS TO ASSESS POTENTIAL FOR DAMP IN LISTED NASH BUILDINGS NOT COMPLETED PRIOR TO SUBMISSION OF THE APPLICATION

17. Camden is not in possession of all material facts relevant to this application. Atkins is involved in carrying out a number of surveys on properties qualifying for NI in Camden to assess the potential for damp if noise insulation is installed. Our house at No 30 was, so far as I am aware, the only Nash house selected for such a test study on Park Village East, and I understood the surveys would have an input into the proposals for NI for all the Nash properties. A study was carried out at No. 30 last June but the report was so inaccurate and riddled with mistakes we refused to let it be shown to Camden and Atkins now accept the survey will be redone. A date for that is currently being agreed with Atkins .

It would be appropriate to withdraw the current application until such time as Atkins have re-surveyed the property, produced their report and it is known what the results are so they can be assessed with regard to the current application.

CONDITIONS

18. If the application is allowed I ask it is subject to the following conditions:

- (i) That it be made clear this scheme is not a blueprint for NI in other Nash properties on Park Village East. Individual houses have their own layouts, and No 34's layout, whilst similar to No 32's, is distinctive . The scheme subject of this application would be unsuitable, impossible, ineffective or all three in most other Nash properties on the street, and would render none of them habitable.
- (ii) That prior to approval, the applicant be required to carry out a test to demonstrate the "surround sound" effect. We have repeatedly asked HS2 and their contractors operate a

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

pneumatic drill in the street so they can experience the sound at the front, back and sides of the properties internally. This would demonstrate in an instant what all the residents know, how uninhabitable these houses will become with noise impacting them from all directions, and demonstrate the inadequacy of the proposed scheme. No one from HS2 or their contractors has carried out this test.

SUMMARY

19. This scheme would not normally receive listed building consent and the sole material consideration to justify approval is the mitigation of noise from HS2 to render affected properties habitable .

The current application as it stands does not satisfy the letter or the spirit of HS2's assurance to provide effective NI to affected properties. It is likely that no current leaseholder living in the property would find it acceptable once the works begin that require NI. . While we understand that the property has now been let short term, the scheme has not been referred to the new tenants prior to this application. They will not be familiar with the acoustics of the neighbourhood and thus in no position to press the applicants for a better scheme. .

The scheme is not fit for purpose and a waste of taxpayers' money.

Yours sincerely,

Helen Bryan

2017/6942/L	Roger Low	30 Park Village East London NW1 7PZ	06/02/2018 20:54:14	COMMLE TTER	Comments made by letter
-------------	-----------	---	---------------------	----------------	-------------------------
