

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0477/HS2	Richard Simpson for Regent's Park CAAC	07/03/2025 10:29:29	COMMNT	<p>ADVICE from The Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>03 March 2025</p> <p>16 Park Village East, NW1 7PX                      2025/0477/HS2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Committee noted that this was the sixth HAMS agreement on monitoring and conservation management of ground movements due to below ground construction affecting Listed Buildings in Park Village East which the Committee had reviewed. The Committee had been briefed on the technical issues and processes involved earlier in 2024 by members of the HS2 team responsible for the HAMS proposals.</li> <li>2. The Committee noted the objective set at 1.2: we have no objection of principle.</li> <li>3. The Committee noted the description of the historic development of the house in its context at 4.1, 4.2, including the railway cutting of 1900-1905 and associated work to the east of Park Village East. We would challenge the argument (4.2.6) that the villas to the east of the cutting 'applied a similar design code to that used by Nash' in Park Village East.</li> <li>4. We also note the Crown Estate's determination that 16 Park Village East was 'seriously damaged but reparable at cost' in the London Blitz (4.2.11), assumed post war reconstruction, and substantial modifications and additions including work after Listing (1974) (4.2.12, 4.2.13, 4.3.7, 4.3.8).</li> <li>5. The Committee noted and welcomed the recognition of the importance of the setting of the villas at 4.4 and 4.6.</li> <li>6. The Committee noted the comments on the physical condition of the building, including that the original primary east (street) façade 'appears largely unaltered since construction' while the 'west (garden) façade retains its original features including ground floor iron railed balcony' (4.5.1). Interior and exterior survivals of fabric are also noted at 4.6.12 and 4.6.13.</li> <li>7. While the Committee recognizes the methodological value of the definition of damage categories (5.3.2 and 5.3.3) we strongly urge the explicit acknowledgment in the document of the recognition and understanding of the building as a whole, and a comprehension of the integrity of the visual appearance with function and structure.</li> <li>8. While the building has substantial modern additions, and may have been reconstructed post-war, we question 'the assumption that there are no significant existing structural defects' (5.3.4).</li> <li>9. We urge that the statement at 5.3.10 'In the case of 16 Park Village East superficial cracking is manageable but needs to be carefully considered where it affects heritage features that are sensitive or susceptible to harm.' be amended to read 'In the case of 16 Park Village East superficial cracking is manageable but needs to be carefully investigated and acted upon where it affects heritage features that are sensitive or susceptible to harm.'</li> </ol>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

10. We note the completion of revetment works (5.3.21).

11. The Committee urges strongly that the assessment and selection of cracks to be monitored (7.5 with Table 3) include not only the contractor and visual inspection engineer but also an expert in historic buildings nominated by the LB Camden.

12. The Committee urges strongly that the timing of visual inspections (8.1.3) be both more frequent than monthly – we request at most two-weekly – but also related to the progress of the tunnelling machines and other underground works. The Committee strongly urges that the statement at 8.1.5 ‘The frequency of visual inspections may increase in response to Monitoring Trigger Levels.’ be revised to state ‘The frequency of visual inspections shall increase in response to Monitoring Trigger Levels.’

13. The Committee urges strongly that the trigger values for crack widths (8.2) be considerably reduced, and, further, related to the different elements (masonry, render, glazing for example) of which the building is composed.

14. The Committee questions how contractors, building users, the community, will be informed about the state of vulnerability of the house: clear visible notices should be required on each property.

15 The Committee questions what further measures of protection need to be undertaken should the house be unoccupied for any period.

16. The Committee strongly urges that the Monitoring Action Plan should be prepared and submitted as part of this HAMS, and not, as stated, as a mere intention (8.3.1).

17. The Committee strongly urges that monitoring actions (8.3.2) be more effective. For example, the statement ‘Red – increase frequency of visual inspections. Review specific cracks and assess stability of building. Introduce temporary works if necessary.’ Should be reworded ‘Red – increase frequency of visual inspections. Review specific cracks and assess stability of building. Expedite temporary works.’

Richard Simpson FSA  
Chair

---