

| Application N     | Consultees Name                              | Recipient Address                                     | Received            | Comment | Response  |
|-------------------|--|---|---------------------|---------|---|
| 2025/1627/HS<br>2 | Richard Simpson<br>for Regent's Park<br>CAAC | 12A Manley Street<br>London<br><br>NW1 8LT<br>NW1 8LT | 19/05/2025 11:27:37 | COMMNT  | <p>ADVICE from The Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee<br/>12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>12 May 2025</p> <p>24 Park Village East, NW1 7PZ                      2025/1627/HS2</p> <p>1. The Committee noted that this was the seventh 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.</p> <p>2. We are concerned that the reference here (5.3.16), as in other HAMS, to contrasts between the ES and the Phase 3 GMA demonstrates that in this case the 'latest design' – we take it to be of the tunnels -- produces more severe impacts on the buildings than anticipated in the ES (5.3.14, 5.3.15). We question the statement at 5.3.17. As the individual HAMS are published, and as the tunnel design has developed, knowledge of historical ground movement has grown, and understanding of the structures of the Listed Buildings been refined, we urge that a comprehensive view of the whole group of Listed Buildings in Park Village East is required to ensure that changes in assessment are appropriately evaluated and mitigation provided for both individually and across the group of Listed houses, and the individual HAMS updated.</p> <p>3. The Committee noted the objective set at 1.2: we have no objection of principle.</p> <p>4. The Committee welcomed the statement at 1.2.2 that SCSjv will 'use monitoring information to manage timely responses to building movement and undertake conservation repair works at 24 Park Village East in co-ordination with tunnel construction (our italics).' We request that the phrase working 'in co-ordination with tunnel construction' be added to statements on timings of visual inspections at 8.1.1, 8.1.3, and 8.1.4.</p> <p>5. The Committee noted the description of the historic development of the house, with the adjoining 22 Park Village East (with a separate HAMS), in its context at 4.1 sqq, war damage and repair (4.2.9), description (4.3) and history of subsidence and underpinning and associated alterations (4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.11): we especially note the importance of the underpinned no. 24 and the non-underpinned no. 22. We noted the importance of the garden and its structures (4.3.9). Post-war alterations listed at 4.3.10, 4.3.11, 4.3.13 were noted.</p> <p>6. The Committee noted and welcomed the recognition of the importance of the setting of the villas at 4.4.</p> <p>7. The Committee noted the comments on the physical condition of the building at 4.5.</p> <p>8. The Committee noted and generally welcomed the assessment of significance at 4.6, and agrees the assessment at 4.6.8 that 'a dual aspect design of stuccoed façades contributes to an</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response   |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|---------|--|
|               |                 |                   |          |         | <p>experience and appreciation of Nash's vision of the 'picturesque' by responding to differences in landscape design associated with the east and west facades' and related comment.</p> <p>9. In the GM assessment at 5, we note the important acknowledgement of historic ground movement at 5.2.2, 5.2.3: we acknowledge the recognition (for nos 22 and 24) that the appropriate Building Damage Category is 4, severe (5.3.2).</p> <p>10. We note with serious concern the assessed significant risk of loss of building serviceability and/or stability for both nos 22 and 24 PVE (5.3.5). Our serious concern is reinforced by the acknowledgement that 'In summary, the magnitude of heritage impact is potentially high' (5.3.9). We also note the existence of 'live' movement related to the different foundation structures at nos 22 and 24 PVE (5.3.4).</p> <p>11. Given the recognition, which we acknowledge, that the impact anticipated in the ES was 'medium scale' (5.3.15) and the Phase 3 GMA now demonstrates a Building Damage Category 4, or severe, and the heritage sensitivity score presents a potential high magnitude heritage impact (5.3.16), we seriously question whether the proposed response (5.3.10, 5.3.11) is adequate and urge specific reassurance that enhanced mitigation and preventative measures have been identified and are provided for to address the extra risk identified in respect of nos 24 and 22 Park Village East. We note as an example that the proposed 'risk-based Asset Action Plan' (6.3.1) should form part of the HAMS before the HAMS is approved.</p> <p>12. We agree that the monitoring of nos 22 and 24 PVE should be combined (5.3.11).</p> <p>13 We welcome the undertaking to review ground movement and asset specific data, including recalibration of trigger values and timing of monitoring (7.3.4). We urge that this undertaking apply to earlier HAMS.</p> <p>14. We object to the proposed monthly schedule for visual inspections (8.1.1). The Committee urges strongly that the timing of visual inspections be more frequent than monthly: especially during tunnelling in the area inspections should be at a minimum of weekly. We urge that visual inspections are at a frequency determined 'in co-ordination with tunnel construction' (see our para 4 on 1.2.2). We welcome the statement at 7.5.3 Table 4 Monitoring system p. 40 and urge that it be adopted for all monitoring: 'All frequencies to be adjusted according to progress of works and movement trends.' We further urge the addition, from HAMS 28 Park Village East 7.4 Table 3 at p. 38 of the sentence 'Frequencies may need to be increased to daily or hourly during critical stages of the works.'</p> <p>15. We note the reduced trigger values for crack widths (8.2.2): we seek reassurance that they are sufficiently sensitive for stucco-finished buildings.</p> <p>16. 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.</p> |

| Application N | Consultees Name | Recipient Address | Received | Comment | Response   |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|---------|--|
|               |                 |                   |          |         | 17. The Committee questions what further measures of protection need to be undertaken should the house be unoccupied for any period. |
|               |                 |                   |          |         | Richard Simpson FSA<br>Chair RPCAAC  |

---