

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/6033/P	Richard Simpson for Regent's Park CAAC	27/02/2020 18:24:17	OBJ	ADVICE from The Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT

17 February 2020

10 Park Village West NW1 4AE 2019/6033/P + 2020/0704/L

External alterations including installation of lift shaft on side elevation and installation of rooflight on side roof slope.

Strong objections.

We note that the Advisory Committee was not consulted pre-application, as the NPPF advises.

Park Village West is part of the last area of Regent's Park to have been built from designs by John Nash, from 1823 to 1834, the work continued after 1834 by James Pennethorne. Nash had responded to the challenge of the peripheral site in 1823 by designing houses 'scattered about in an irregular manner as Cottages with plantations between'. While the Park Village villas shared the stucco finish with the grand terraces, their scale and forms fitted within the smaller measure of their Picturesque landscape setting, more intimate than the broad sweeps of parkland. Predominantly at 2-storeys, with some 3-storey elements, including turrets, towers, gables and finials, the villas essentially sat within the landscape, contained by the tree-line. Long recognized as playing an important part in the development of the middle-class suburb, their exceptional significance has been identified by a recent commentator who saw them as 'perhaps the most original contribution of nineteenth-century London to urban civilisation' (Geoffrey Tyack, *Sir James Pennethorne and the making of Victorian London* (CUP, 1992) p. 24).

Key to the achievement of a Picturesque design at no 10 Park Village West is the plan form, where the mass of the original and surviving building was divided into two blocks, forming an 'L' plan. This footprint created the informal, divided mass which was characteristic of the Picturesque. The roofs are also of special importance in the Picturesque design. Here the overhanging eaves give the hipped roofs extra visual importance in the perception of the building's proportions and scale. The applicant's Fig 22 shows the importance of the two blocks of original building and the roof and eaves in achieving the Picturesque appearance of the villa which is at its most significant in the side and rear elevations.

Yet it is these two elevations which the proposals would most harm.

The proposed lift shaft would interrupt the distinctive clarity of the two inter-related blocks of the original building, while the juxtaposition of the shaft with the eaves is clumsy and seriously harms the clarity and line – including the shadow line – which is key to the design function of the roof. The shaft is an intrusion which substantially harms the original and surviving design of the villa. It does not appear subservient to the building in the two respects identified here (plan form and roof with eaves).

The proposals would seriously harm the special significance of the Listed Building. They would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Regent's Park conservation area, where glimpses of the rear and sides of the villas are available across the original Canal, emphasising the importance of

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

design respecting the unity of the heritage assets both as individual buildings but also as an ensemble of buildings within the landscape.

We note that this is a further attempt to install a lift in this building: domestic platform lifts which cause minimum disruption to the plan of the building, can be consented as personal for removal when no longer required, and are indeed reversible, might provide a more acceptable solution.

We object to the form of the proposed replacement conservatory. While we welcome high-quality contemporary design, the scale of the glazing panels and crude form of the framing are harmful to the Listed Building. The Park Villages were designed to be 'country in the city', and continue to be of considerable ecological value. Light pollution is already a problem in the area and the proposed glazed box would be a major source of light pollution.

The proposals would substantially harm the Listed Building and the character and appearance of the conservation area: there is no public benefit which outweighs this harm.

Richard Simpson FSA
Chair
