

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6942/L	Mr nick carn	4 Park Village East london NW1 7PX NW1 7PX	12/02/2018 15:36:02	COMMNT	I oppose the application on the basis of;  1 Damage to appearance listed property in conservation area and consequent loss of aesthetic utility for its neighbours.  2 That the application fails to achieve its intended aim to effectively soundproof the property during the 15 years of construction work by HS2.
2017/6942/L	Mr nick carn	4 Park Village East london NW1 7PX NW1 7PX	12/02/2018 15:36:06	COMMNT	I oppose the application on the basis of;  1 Damage to appearance listed property in conservation area and consequent loss of aesthetic utility for its neighbours.  2 That the application fails to achieve its intended aim to effectively soundproof the property during the 15 years of construction work by HS2.
2017/6942/L	Mr nick carn	4 Park Village East london NW1 7PX NW1 7PX	12/02/2018 15:36:16	COMMNT	I oppose the application on the basis of;  1 Damage to appearance listed property in conservation area and consequent loss of aesthetic utility for its neighbours.  2 That the application fails to achieve its intended aim to effectively soundproof the property during the 15 years of construction work by HS2.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6942/L	David Auger	52A Mornington Terrace London NW1 7RT	12/02/2018 10:26:46	COMNOT	<p>Interior of the House:</p> <p>The impact of the proposed internal secondary glazing on the special architectural and historic interest of the interior of this Grade II* listed building has not been assessed adequately in the application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no mention of the plan form, spatial quality and architectural character of the interiors that are affected, and the Schedule of Significant Elements only comments on the fabric of the surrounding walls. Specifically there is no assessment of the impact of the siting and design of the secondary glazing on the wider internal character of the room, besides a reference to the 'lightness' of a full height glazed option on the ground and first floors.</li> <li>• These full height glazed screens, however, change the floor plate of the rooms and cause significant visual intrusion both through the proposed heavy fanlight framing (which is much wider than the existing fanlight framing and will thus obscure that detail and the glazing above it), and the fact that the framing of the internal floor-mounted horizontal sliders visually subdivides the full width joinery panel underneath the casement window (thus fundamentally changing the relationship of vertical subdivision to horizontal panelling).</li> <li>• The full encasement of the window architrave behind glass with additional framing around the architrave itself, substantially alters the relationship of the deep set windows with their simple joinery shutters and panelling to the rest of the room. Within the relatively plain small-scale rooms these elements are significant to the understanding of the house as a historic asset.</li> <li>• The argument that the proposed glazing solution does not have a significant effect is thus not fully considered.</li> </ul> <p>External Context:</p> <p>The substantial changes to the setting of the Listed Building have not been adequately described and taken into account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The setting of the building will be severely compromised for a long period during construction works. The plantation that was provided during the last railway expansion to mitigate damage to the original picturesque arrangement of the villas has been removed, and the other side of the road will be hoarded off; there will also be continuous construction activity immediately adjacent to the house. The "rus in urbe" character of the locality will thus be significantly altered by the forthcoming works and as a consequence the justification for impactful secondary glazing internally to preserve</li> </ul>

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

the external appearance of the house is misconstrued.

- The "less than substantial harm" to the external appearance of the building is caused by the lengthy construction work itself, and the damage which will be caused by the external acoustic environment which the internal glazing is being proposed to mitigate.
- The public benefit in preserving the exterior appearance of the house has thus been given too much weight considering that these other compromises are already being imposed on the house, and this weight should be substantially reduced as a result.

Viability of Use:

At the same time the "less than substantial harm" that the internal noise insulation imposes has not been weighed against the mental health of the occupants of the interior, through being a constant reminder of the work that is taking place outside on the doorstep, noting that the optimum viability of use is that where the building continues to be occupied during the works. Occupants who can enjoy the house inside are more likely to stay resident and thus continue to look after the property without void periods.

This property is owned by HS2 who have a conflict of interest in the possible use of this application as a precedent. Any approval should clearly state this to ensure other residents' rights are respected.

Made on behalf of the residents attending HS2 NIWG, CHARGE and Camden Cutting Group.

---