ADVICE from The Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT 24 And NW1 8LT 25 And November 2024 25 Park Village East 2024/4745/HS2 1. The Committee noted that this was the second HAMS submitted in the Regent's Park CA in relation to ground movement, the first having been for 10 Park Village East, on which we submitted advice dated 3 June 2024. Following this application that RPCAAC chair had had a meeting with members of the HS2 team responsible, who had helpfully explained the various issues and processes involved. This had been fed-back to the Committee 2. The Committee acknowledged the careful work involved in the current HAMS application, and welcomed the transparency of the process. 3. The Committee raised a number of concerns, as follows: 3.1 Section 6.3.2 works of underpinning, which we recognize as an important aspect of mitigation, should be detailed and not excluded from this method statement, it would be both a key element in the larger mitigation strategy while also proving important endered or this ground conditions. 3.2 Section 6.3.3 'Emergency works will be undertaken if predictions are exceeded'. We would want to see more specific details on what this means. 3.3 Section 7.2.4 We are concerned that the persent Method Statement has been developed without movement data for the rear of the house or within the garden. Given that the garden includes the former canal excavation this would seem to be critically important. 3.4 Section 8 Conservation management – monthly visits seem too infrequent. We would seek provision for a weekly programme which could be reactioned in frequency if not required. 3.5 An effective process of feedback to the community, including the RPCAAC, as both investigative and mitigation work, and the tunnelling itself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This must be recognized as a period of great anxiety for residents.	Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
22 Park Village East 2024/4745/HS2 1. The Committee noted that this was the second HAMS submitted in the Regent's Park CA in relation to ground movement, the first having been for 10 Park Village East, on which we submitted advice dated 3 June 2024. Following this application the RPCAAC chair had had a meeting with members of the HS2 team responsible, who had helpfully explained the various issues and processes involved. This had been fed-back to the Committee. 2. The Committee acknowledged the careful work involved in the current HAMS application, and welcomed the transparency of the process. 3. The Committee raised a number of concerns, as follows: 3.1 Section 6.3.2 works of underpinning, which we recognize as an important aspect of mitigation, should be detailed and not excluded from this method statement. It would be both a key element in the larger mitigation strategy while also providing important evidence of the ground conditions. 3.2 Section 6.3.3 'Emergency works will be undertaken if predictions are exceeded'. We would want to see more specific details on what this means. 3.3 Section 7.2.4 We are concerned that the present Method Statement has been developed without movement data for the rear of the house or within the garden. Given that the garden includes the former canal excavation this would seem to be critically important. 3.4 Section 8 Conservation management — monthly visits seem too infrequent. We would seek provision for a weekly programme which could be reduced in frequency if not required. 3.5 An effective process of feedback to the community, including the RPCAAC, as both investigative and mitigation work, and the tunnelling litself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This must be recognized as a period of great anxiety for residents. We would be happy to review further details as requested.	2024/4745/HS2	for Regent's Park	11/11/2024 11:00:09	COMMNT	
 The Committee noted that this was the second HAMS submitted in the Regent's Park CA in relation to ground movement, the first having been for 10 Park Village East, on which we submitted advice dated 3 June 2024. Following this application the RPCAAC chair had had a meeting with members of the HSZ team responsible, who had helpfully explained the various issues and processes involved. This had been fed-back to the Committee. The Committee acknowledged the careful work involved in the current HAMS application, and welcomed the transparency of the process. The Committee raised a number of concerns, as follows: Section 6.3.2 works of underpinning, which we recognize as an important aspect of mitigation, should be detailed and not excluded from this method statement. It would be both a key element in the larger mitigation strategy while also providing important evidence of the ground conditions. Section 6.3.3 'Emergency works will be undertaken if predictions are exceeded'. We would want to see more specific details on what this means. Section 7.2.4 We are concerned that the present Method Statement has been developed without movement data for the rear of the house or within the garden. Given that the garden includes the former canal excavation this would seem to be critically important. Section 8 Conservation management – monthly visits seem too infrequent. We would seek provision for a weekly programme which could be reduced in frequency if not required. An effective process of feedback to the community, including the RPCAAC, as both investigative and mitigation work, and the tunnelling itself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This must be recognized as a period of great anxiety for residents. We would be happy to review further details as requested. 					04 November 2024
ground movement, the first having been for 10 Park Village East, on which we submitted advice dated 3 June 2024. Following this application the RPCAAC chair had had a meeting with members of the HS2 team responsible, who had helpfully explained the various issues and processes involved. This had been fed-back to the Committee. 2. The Committee acknowledged the careful work involved in the current HAMS application, and welcomed the transparency of the process. 3. The Committee raised a number of concerns, as follows: 3.1 Section 6.3.2 works of underpinning, which we recognize as an important aspect of mitigation, should be detailed and not excluded from this method statement. It would be both a key element in the larger mitigation strategy while also providing important evidence of the ground conditions. 3.2 Section 6.3.3 'Emergency works will be undertaken if predictions are exceeded'. We would want to see more specific details on what this means. 3.3 Section 7.2.4 We are concerned that the present Method Statement has been developed without movement data for the rear of the house or within the garden. Given that the garden includes the former canal excavation this would seem to be critically important. 3.4 Section 8 Conservation management – monthly visits seem to infrequent. We would seek provision for a weekly programme which could be reduced in frequency if not required. 3.5 An effective process of feedback to the community, including the RPCAAC, as both investigative and mitigation work, and the tunnelling itself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This must be recognized as a period of great anxiety for residents. We would be happy to review further details as requested.					22 Park Village East 2024/4745/HS2
the transparency of the process. 3. The Committee raised a number of concerns, as follows: 3.1 Section 6.3.2 works of underpinning, which we recognize as an important aspect of mitigation, should be detailed and not excluded from this method statement. It would be both a key element in the larger mitigation strategy while also providing important evidence of the ground conditions. 3.2 Section 6.3.3 'Emergency works will be undertaken if predictions are exceeded'. We would want to see more specific details on what this means. 3.3 Section 7.2.4 We are concerned that the present Method Statement has been developed without movement data for the rear of the house or within the garden. Given that the garden includes the former canal excavation this would seem to be critically important. 3.4 Section 8 Conservation management – monthly visits seem too infrequent. We would seek provision for a weekly programme which could be reduced in frequency if not required. 3.5 An effective process of feedback to the community, including the RPCAAC, as both investigative and mitigation work, and the tunnelling itself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This must be recognized as a period of great anxiety for residents. We would be happy to review further details as requested. Richard Simpson FSA					ground movement, the first having been for 10 Park Village East, on which we submitted advice dated 3 June 2024. Following this application the RPCAAC chair had had a meeting with members of the HS2 team responsible, who had helpfully explained the various issues and processes involved. This had been fed-back
 3.1 Section 6.3.2 works of underpinning, which we recognize as an important aspect of mitigation, should be detailed and not excluded from this method statement. It would be both a key element in the larger mitigation strategy while also providing important evidence of the ground conditions. 3.2 Section 6.3.3 'Emergency works will be undertaken if predictions are exceeded'. We would want to see more specific details on what this means. 3.3 Section 7.2.4 We are concerned that the present Method Statement has been developed without movement data for the rear of the house or within the garden. Given that the garden includes the former canal excavation this would seem to be critically important. 3.4 Section 8 Conservation management – monthly visits seem too infrequent. We would seek provision for a weekly programme which could be reduced in frequency if not required. 3.5 An effective process of feedback to the community, including the RPCAAC, as both investigative and mitigation work, and the tunnelling itself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This must be recognized as a period of great anxiety for residents. We would be happy to review further details as requested. Richard Simpson FSA 					
detailed and not excluded from this method statement. It would be both a key element in the larger mitigation strategy while also providing important evidence of the ground conditions. 3.2 Section 6.3.3 'Emergency works will be undertaken if predictions are exceeded'. We would want to see more specific details on what this means. 3.3 Section 7.2.4 We are concerned that the present Method Statement has been developed without movement data for the rear of the house or within the garden. Given that the garden includes the former canal excavation this would seem to be critically important. 3.4 Section 8 Conservation management – monthly visits seem too infrequent. We would seek provision for a weekly programme which could be reduced in frequency if not required. 3.5 An effective process of feedback to the community, including the RPCAAC, as both investigative and mitigation work, and the tunnelling itself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This must be recognized as a period of great anxiety for residents. We would be happy to review further details as requested. Richard Simpson FSA					3. The Committee raised a number of concerns, as follows:
more specific details on what this means. 3.3 Section 7.2.4 We are concerned that the present Method Statement has been developed without movement data for the rear of the house or within the garden. Given that the garden includes the former canal excavation this would seem to be critically important. 3.4 Section 8 Conservation management — monthly visits seem too infrequent. We would seek provision for a weekly programme which could be reduced in frequency if not required. 3.5 An effective process of feedback to the community, including the RPCAAC, as both investigative and mitigation work, and the tunnelling itself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This must be recognized as a period of great anxiety for residents. We would be happy to review further details as requested. Richard Simpson FSA					detailed and not excluded from this method statement. It would be both a key element in the larger mitigation
movement data for the rear of the house or within the garden. Given that the garden includes the former canal excavation this would seem to be critically important. 3.4 Section 8 Conservation management – monthly visits seem too infrequent. We would seek provision for a weekly programme which could be reduced in frequency if not required. 3.5 An effective process of feedback to the community, including the RPCAAC, as both investigative and mitigation work, and the tunnelling itself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This must be recognized as a period of great anxiety for residents. We would be happy to review further details as requested. Richard Simpson FSA					- ·
weekly programme which could be reduced in frequency if not required. 3.5 An effective process of feedback to the community, including the RPCAAC, as both investigative and mitigation work, and the tunnelling itself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This must be recognized as a period of great anxiety for residents. We would be happy to review further details as requested. Richard Simpson FSA					movement data for the rear of the house or within the garden. Given that the garden includes the former canal
mitigation work, and the tunnelling itself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This must be recognized as a period of great anxiety for residents. We would be happy to review further details as requested. Richard Simpson FSA					
Richard Simpson FSA					mitigation work, and the tunnelling itself, proceed, is required. A timetable of works would be important. This
·					We would be happy to review further details as requested.
					·

Printed on: 12/11/2024

09:10:07