

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6942/L	Phebe and Richard Robinow	28 Park Village East London NW1 7PZ	11/02/2018 12:27:08	OBJLETT ER	We are the occupants of 28 Park Village East where we have lived for nearly 40 years. We object to the current application for listed building consent in respect of 34 Park Village East.

As the application makes clear, the proposed modifications are to address the impact of the HS2 construction works. As such, and as the application acknowledges, they will be temporary and will be removed at the conclusion of the HS2 works.

We have had four visits to 28 Park Village East from glazing contractors appointed by HS2. It is clear from our discussions that noise insulation to our house will only be effective if the side flank and back, as well as the front, windows are insulated. That is because of the gap between our house and 30 Park Village East (we abut no 26). Sound waves can penetrate between our house and no 30 and then reverberate off the back wall in our garden, enhanced by the dip that represents the former canal. The situation at no 34 is similar. What is proposed for no 34 is therefore inadequate as it does not address the side and rear walls.

The Heritage Statement accompanying the application suggests that the temporary modifications would remain in situ for a period of 15 years (see 4.24(a)(iv) '... the duration of the temporary installation – approximately 15 years'). When we petitioned the House of Commons Select Committee in connection with the HS2 enabling bill, we were informed by HS2 that the impact of the works on our house would be limited to 7 years (see relevant Select Committee exhibits). Since our house is close to 34 Park Village East, it is likely that the period of noise impact on no 34 will be similar. Indeed, we have been informed by HS2 that the proposals in the last published Environmental Statement may be modified but that the noise and other adverse impacts of any modified scheme will be no worse and are likely to be better than those expected in the Environmental Statement.

The Heritage Statement contains a several page history of John Nash's work and from that draws conclusions as to the importance of the setting of 34 Park Village East as a house within the Regent's Park development and the latter's 'suburban picturesque'. This eulogistic history is grossly misleading as it contains absolutely no description of the setting of no 34 during the period of the HS2 works, when Park Village East is expected to become the scene of one of the largest building sites in Europe. If, during this period, no 34 is visible at all to the public (the view may well be obscured by hoardings for which HS2 and its contractors will require no listed building consent), it will be seen against the background of massive cranes, pile drivers, trucks and other construction equipment. Such a view cannot be termed 'picturesque'.

Our objection is focused upon the contention that internal secondary glazing is preferable to external glazing in this case and in so far as a similar solution may be applied to our property. Given the point made in the preceding paragraph, the argument about setting is irrelevant and an external secondary glazing solution for some windows is likely to be much less intrusive for those living in the Park Village East houses than secondary internal glazing.

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

The Heritage Statement comments (in the arguments against external secondary glazing) on the importance of so called "original" stucco are difficult to accept. In our own case, our house was partially destroyed and seriously damaged by fire in 1980 and there is very little original rendering. Many other houses in Park Village East have been substantially re-rendered during the time that we have lived here. The idea that our living conditions should be seriously compromised by a concern (Heritage Statement 4.24(b)(v)) that between 4 and 6 holes in window reveals will leave permanent indentations because of the build up of historic paint layers is entirely unreasonable.

We therefore urge that the application be refused due to the following:

(a) The application fails to make an adequate assessment of the impact of the proposed internal secondary glazing on the special architectural or historic interest of the interior of this Grade II* listed building. The Schedule of Significant Elements on pages 10-13 contains no mention of the plan form, spatial quality or architectural character of the affected internal spaces and is restricted to comments regarding the fabric to the surrounding walls. The Heritage Statement refers to the physical impact of the secondary glazing and its fixings upon historic window joinery and the relative impact of siting the glazing either immediately behind the windows or, as proposed, across the entire bay at ground and 1st floor levels. However, besides a reference to the 'lightness' of a full height glazed option and the ability to stand between the glazing and the original windows, there is no assessment of the impact of the siting and design of the secondary glazing on the wider internal character, plan form or spatial quality of the affected rooms. The consideration of alternative proposals cites two advantages to the alternative of external secondary glazing but qualifies the comment that this option would avoid reducing the internal room size/floor plan by concluding that the proposed internal glazing has only a 'minimal impact on floor area'. Whilst the absolute floor space lost may be relatively small, the assessment fails to address the significant visual intrusion of the full height glazing panels and their siting, as well as the harm caused to the shape of the affected rooms, the appreciation of the windows and their associated joinery and the wider coherent architectural and historic character of the interior of the building.

(b) In its assessment of the impact of an external secondary glazing solution the Heritage Statement places significant weight upon the 'harm' that would be caused to the external appearance and picturesque setting of the listed building and the wider group of Nash houses. It refers to the sense of quietness along Park Village East despite its metropolitan surroundings (see 3.9). However, the Statement fails to make any reference to the nature and magnitude of change to this setting which will occur as a result of the construction of HS2. During this unique period of upheaval, the external appearance of the individual houses, their visual inter-relationship and the wider setting of the group will be completely altered. Within this context, the relative weight which should be given to any harm to the external appearance or setting of the listed building must be significantly reduced.

(c) The application is misleading in its portrayal of the time period over which the works

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

need to remain in place, thus giving additional but inaccurate weight to the 'harm' to the external appearance and setting of the listed building which would derive from an external glazing solution.

(d) Clearly, neither the proposed internal solution nor an alternative external solution would be acceptable under normal circumstances and would both cause harm to the significance of the listed building. However, in failing to adequately describe the fundamentally altered setting and external context to the buildings during the construction period, too great a weight is placed upon the 'public benefits' that would accrue in relation to the proposed internal scheme.

Phebe Robinow
Richard Robinow
