

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
11 - Natural England	General - Protected Species and Wildlife	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England does not consider that the proposed modifications pose any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment¹ for which we would otherwise provide a more detailed consultation response and so does not wish to make specific comment on the details of this consultation.</p> <p>The lack of case specific comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may make comments that will help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of the environmental value of this site in the decision making process.</p> <p>In particular, we would expect the LPA to assess and consider the possible impacts resulting from this proposal on the following when determining this application:</p> <p>Protected species</p> <p>Where there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being present and affected by the proposed development, the LPA should request survey information from the applicant before determining the application (Paragraph 99 Circular 06/05)².</p> <p>Natural England has produced standing advice, which is available on our website Natural England Standing Advice to help local planning authorities to better understand the impact of particular developments on protected or BAP species should they be identified as an issue. The standing advice also sets out when, following receipt of survey information, local planning authorities should undertake further consultation with Natural England.</p> <p>Local wildlife sites</p> <p>If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local wildlife site, e.g. Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>proposal on the local wildlife site, and the importance of this in relation to development plan policies, before it determines the application.</p> <p>If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.</p> <p>1 Cases which might affect a SSSI, Natura 2000 site, National Park, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or a large population of a protected species and/or cases or generic issues which affect a large suite of sites or may set a precedent and thereby affect a significant quantity of habitat across the country</p> <p>2 Paragraph 98 and 99 of ODPM Circular 06/2005.</p>
<p>16-20 & 22 - Camden Cutting Group, Camden Town CAAC, Euston HS2 Action Group, Netley Primary School Governing Body, St Pancras Parish Church Parochial Church Council, Tenants and Residents Associations of Ampthill, Luisa Auletta and Dorothea Hackman</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Response to the proposed main modifications from: Camden Cutting Group, Camden Town CAAC, Euston HS2 Action Group, Netley Primary School Governing Body, St Pancras Parish Church Parochial Church Council, Tenants and Residents Associations of Ampthill and Luisa Auletta and Dorothea Hackman as individuals.</p> <p>The fundamental problem with the EAP remains the circularity of it accommodating whatever the current HS2 plans are, but then being hopelessly compromised by having done just that. We are all pretty much agreed that the station building itself needs redeveloping, as could the underused land immediately around it, and also rail infrastructure improved. But the monstrous plan of HS2 is to grab land currently occupied by our Euston communities, and the EAP cannot be considered in isolation from the HS2 proposals.</p> <p>It is unacceptable that "main modifications" have been used as a mechanism for a fundamental shift in the plan. The move is from a mean little proposal to grab land to the west of the station and decant the present community by demolishing their homes. It moves to a multi-billion pound profit opportunity for developers under the guise of "regeneration". We have seen what regeneration looks like these last 30 years in Regent Place, and it is sterile and unfriendly, the only evening life is young professionals' bars, with new luxury residents in gated enclaves and the social housing facing the busiest streets or</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>masquerading as office blocks at the back of the site.</p> <p>High Speed 2 is not about speed, nor even about capacity, it is about profits for developers and the Euston plan is playing right into that trap. HS2 is over-engineering the station: it has not evidenced at all that we need double the number of platforms at Euston – on the contrary, passengers will be getting off the train earlier up the line to change to Crossrail and other connections. The trains coming into Euston do not need straightened tracks in the Cutting to achieve speeds of 200mph – they will be going nowhere near those speeds when they are so close to stopping at the station.</p> <p>All the evidence points to the HS2 plan being intended to break up our communities to decant them and instead bring in rich investors for the luxury flats being built. All the open green spaces and playgrounds are being seized as construction compounds and to build infill housing. This will undermine the quality of life and impact on the health of children in particular. Any “mitigation” is pushed away from the plan into the petitioning process to the parliamentary Select Committee for the HS2 Hybrid Bill, and the supposed consultations and community engagement result in no changes.</p> <p>The “level decks” over the station are bases for offices and shops that will kill the heart of Euston leaving it dead at night: The decking over the tracks all the way up the Camden Cutting to Parkway is for luxury new homes to be sold for profit, and a school and open spaces for those new families. Meanwhile the families left on the Regents Park Estate lose the open spaces between the eleven story blocks that give the estate its design, balance and humanity. This is what HS2 mean by “regeneration” – rapacious land-grab and developer profiteering.</p> <p>There is mention in the EAP now of the need for a world class design for the new Euston station, without due regard for how that can be shoehorned into an existing densely populated urban context. HS2 expects to keep the train services running while construction goes on which means the communities suffer night work for many years, in fact decades. Nor is pollution adequately addressed – eliminating the worst polluting vehicles is hardly going to help the children whose life expectancies are already curtailed by the current levels of pollution, to which are going to be added 300-400 lorries a day carrying away spoil dug out to put the station below ground level for the current “level deck” proposals.</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
MM25 - Transport for London	General	<p>I write in response to Camden Council’s public consultation on the proposed Main Modifications to the Euston Area Plan (EAP).</p> <p>TfL has been working closely with Camden Council and the GLA on the development of the EAP and has provided input to the proposed Main Modifications which take into account concerns raised at previous stages in the process.</p> <p>As such it is satisfied with the transport strategy which has been developed to accommodate the demand, and mitigate the impacts generated by HS2 if it were to proceed, facilitate the scale and nature of the development proposed by the EAP, and improve the local connections for existing communities whilst reducing the negative impacts of transport on those communities and the environment.</p> <p>In summary, TfL is supportive of the proposed Main Modifications to the EAP and looks forward to continuing to work with the London Borough of Camden over the coming years to help deliver it.</p>
MM27 - Jackson Toms-Limb	General/Camden Cutting	<p>Exec Summary xi – notes that LD design gives more development opportunities, but that existing footprint designs would reduce demolition and mitigation. It does not make clear how the EAP balances / chooses between these priorities</p> <p>EAP reads in such a way that the current HS2 (hybrid bill) scheme is unacceptable, but that the Higgins proposal would be ok – Higgins proposal is even worse for local community</p> <p>Will EAP be updated (and consulted upon) again when Euston design is released?</p> <p>Page 4 key objectives – 5 – why is boosting the wider London and national economy a priority for the Euston Area Plan? Why are local current residents being sacrificed for needs of nation?</p> <p>Page 5 1.3 purpose of plan – plan takes Euston to 2031, but by current understanding of HS2 plans it will not be finished by then?!</p> <p>Page 32 3.1 – Why is the NATIONAL economy a priority for the EUSTON AREA</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>plan?!</p> <p>Page 36 Homes – replacement homes for those who lose their homes because of HS2 should not be provided by infill of existing estates – the current layouts of the estates is already dense enough – any infill will drastically reduce the quality of life of all who would then live there – further spreading the impact of HS2 into the region.</p> <p>Pages 50-51 Figure 3.4 implies housing blocks in Camden Cutting of 7-8 and 9-10 storeys. In “Protecting the amenity of residents” it quotes: The amenity of existing and future residents will form another important consideration in assessing the layout and scale of development. As required under policy DP26 of the Camden Development Policies, development should not harm the amenity of occupiers and neighbours, including in relation to noise, air quality, sunlight and daylight, overshadowing and outlook, and visual privacy and overlooking. As the existing residential blocks of Camden Cutting are no taller than 5 storeys, any development CANNOT be taller than this, without impacting the current residents, in a way the quoted text says would not be allowed.</p> <p>Page 52 Transport Principle B states the need for CrossRail 2 – as data has proven, Euston cannot cope with the HS2-forecast passenger number increases. Therefore Camden should only support any plan that expands Euston to this capacity, if CrossRail 2 has also been agreed to by National Government.</p> <p>Page 53 shows taxi drop off provision on Hampstead Road. This is an already busy and often congested road; any taxi drop-off must allow suitable waiting area OFF the main road so that traffic (and requisite pollution and noise impact) does not extend along Hampstead Road and affect surrounding neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Page 65 details the plan for green and open spaces. This misses the fact that open space can also refer to open air spaces, not just green areas – i.e. the OSD planned in the Cutting further reduces open space by taking away the open space with it’s air, light and lack of further development currently offered.</p> <p>Page 65-67 say that a comprehensive approach is to be taken to reprovion of green space – i.e. that the overall provision will meet requirements not</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>necessarily in the proximity normally required in an area. Provision of green space needs to be in close proximity and evenly spaced throughout the area to be satisfactory. Further, the Camden Cutting community have concerns that decking over will, if it is even technically feasible, too costly to allow any of this area to be used for anything other than high-value residential property. The plans on pages 65-67 stress the need for the north-cutting green space as part of the overall provision. Therefore if decking over does indeed prove as costly as we fear (and therefore no green space would be provided), it should not be allowed to proceed in any of the Cutting.</p> <p>Page 66 Figure 3.8 implies small green spaces throughout the OSD. It is important that these are genuine green spaces for public use as a play area, not just a small patch of landscaped grass which people cannot walk on. Also, these areas must be publically accessible not just for the use of the new residents of these blocks. Finally, safety provisions must be made to ensure these areas do not become a no go zone at night.</p> <p>Page 95 relating to the height of new buildings: As the existing residential blocks of Camden Cutting are no taller than 5 storeys, any development CANNOT be taller than this, without impacting the current residents. The wording needs to be this clear to ensure enforceability during the development planning.</p> <p>Page 97 states that "Additional funding may be required to provide the large area of open space in the northern half of the cutting." However, elsewhere in the EAP it states that this open space is required to meet the loss of green space elsewhere in the development. Development of the southern part of Camden Cutting should only be undertaken if the decking over in the northern Cutting for provision of green space only (i.e. not further residential blocks) is guaranteed also.</p>
MM29 - Jane Hirst Miller	General/Camden Cutting	<p>I presently live in a flat in 1 Mornington Crescent. We will be seriously affected by HS2 (the works on Hampstead road, Granby Terrace and on the train lines in Camden Cutting). As you well know the works are scheduled to last for 10 years 24/7. I am now alarmed to read in your report that you plan to deck over the railway in Camden Cutting. This will mean that as well as having our neighbourhood permanently changed (one which at present is very special and unique) and more years of 24/7 noise. disruption and pollution with the end result of a permanent blight.</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>My property is now blighted by HS2 and your proposals. It will be unsaleable, I am 50 years old - at this rate I will be spending the rest of my life in a building site.</p> <p>My children will be living in an unhealthy environment of noise and pollution. I am worried the noise and disturbance will affect their GCSE and A level studies and results.</p> <p>If this does go ahead the government or council should buy the properties of those so adversely affected by this project. We are as a result unable to move on with our lives. We are being punished by the Government's and Camden Councils ill conceived plans.</p>
MM32 - Iain Dewar	Camden Cutting	<p>In response to the Euston Area Plan, my main concern is regarding the Camden Cutting. I do not welcome the idea of new residential development on the decked area over the cutting between Clarkson Row and Park Village East.</p> <p>1) This development would obscure views to the south and block light from the south despite assurances of block height.</p> <p>2) I am worried about the quality and nature of design of the proposed development and its effect on the conservation area as a whole to its north.</p> <p>3) The deck over the cutting could help deal with increased noise from the tracks and green space would be the best use of the new decked area. However it would be more welcome if it stretched all the way south to Granby Terrace and Hampstead Road. The worst scenario would be for the new residential units to be built with no new green space or further deck to the north due to budget constraints.</p> <p>4) The proposed residential development would mean hugely increased traffic use of Mornington Terrace, Clarkson Row and the other nearby streets. Currently these streets are quiet at all times with next to no through traffic. This is true of the whole area to the east of the cutting between Mornington Terrace and Camden High Street. The peaceful nature of this conservation area would be completely changed.</p> <p>5) The Camden Cutting Area will already bear the worst of the HS2 building</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		work with work taking place at weekends and throughout the night for years. We have been offered no compensation whatsoever for what will be very serious blight over a decade. Once HS2 is finally finished, we would have to live with yet more major building work beginning on these new residential blocks.
MM33 - Jason Oddi and Kim Walsh	Camden Cutting	We the residents of 65 Mornington street Nw1 7qa by the names of Jason Oddi and Kim Walsh wholly oppose the new plans to build on the Camden cutting. This extra building will add further years of disruption, air, noise and light pollution and congestion due to detouring of roads plus other aspects already set out in our appeal provision that is awaiting presentation to the select committee. The council has the freehold on this block and our property and we demand that you oppose this extra work or seek fair compensation on our behalf.
06 - London Forum of Civic & Amenity Societies	MM1	I would ask that the words "which would better meet the EAP objectives" be deleted and the sentence ended, followed by a new sentence "These proposals more fully realize the potential transformational benefits, but the unacceptable land-take at Euston is greater."
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM1	<p>MM1 needs now to state slippage to after election and HS2's latest timescale for opening Euston Station – namely 2034. If this date is not included in the Bill, the whole EAP is formulated on a false premise.</p> <p>The timescale for the presentation of the HS2 level deck plans has slipped from December 2014 to after the May 2015 elections. Nor does the EAP reflect HS2's latest timescale for opening Euston Station – namely 2034.</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM2	<p>MM2 introduces the London Mayor's "Med City" vision about which we have no further information and on which there has been no consultation.</p> <p>Much more needs to be known about these intentions before they can be accommodated in the EAP. This is a significant new element in respect of which there needs to be proper consultation.</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM3	MM3 the new introduction clearly states the circularity of the EAP accommodating HS2 which in turn claims congruence with the EAP

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		Clearly the accommodation of the current HS2 plans, while pragmatic, necessarily compromises the independence of the EAP, which thereby fails to put the best interests of the communities first, or even take them into account in preferring to safeguard the interests of business and developers.
MM27 - Jackson Toms-Limb	MM3	<p>EAP reads in such a way that the current HS2 (hybrid bill) scheme is unacceptable, but that the Higgins proposal would be ok – Higgins proposal is even worse for local community</p> <p>Will EAP be updated (and consulted upon) again when Euston design is released?</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM4	<p>MM4 tells us about the Medical Quarter concept from the Major of London, about which Camden is now keen. They need to consult people first.</p> <p>Much more needs to be known about these intentions before they can be accommodated in the EAP, and consultation conducted.</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM5	<p>MM5 introduces the concept of “world class” for the station design in advance of the design being produced, and without defining what is meant by the term or how it is achieved.</p> <p>“World class” is defined to mean..... Building such a station will need to take into account that it is being shoehorned into a densely populated urban areas and that this needs to be done with the smallest possible land-grab and with the least possible damage to the flourishing communities currently living there.</p>
MM27 - Jackson Toms-Limb	MM5	<p>Page 4 key objectives – 5 – why is boosting the wider London and national economy a priority for the Euston Area Plan? Why are local current residents being sacrificed for needs of nation?</p> <p>Page 5 1.3 purpose of plan – plan takes Euston to 2031, but by current understanding of HS2 plans it will not be finished by then?!</p> <p>Page 32 3.1 – Why is the NATIONAL economy a priority for the EUSTON AREA plan?!</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
06 - London Forum of Civic & Amenity Societies	MM6	This should include a statement that Camden will seek to persuade parliament that the objectives of HS2 can be better met without running into Euston.
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM6	<p>MM6 tells us that mitigation of the negative impacts of HS2 on the Euston communities must be addressed through petitions to the parliamentary select committee for the HS2 Hybrid bill. We are concerned that mitigation will not be adequately addressed in this forum. The EAP should include provision for backup mitigation.</p> <p>Petitioners will have a chance to redraft their petitions at no extra cost in response to the new HS2 level deck proposals in six months time, or longer.</p> <p>Not stated as an MM, but note in 2.4 Key issues- heritage – that 215 homes are lost to HS2.</p>
06 - London Forum of Civic & Amenity Societies	MM7	(3) Redevelopment on the existing station footprint The words "Euston station element of the" should be inserted before "HS2 proposal", to make it clear that Camden's opposition to HS2 is concerned with the station not the project as a whole.
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM7	<p>MM7 is where we find the explanation of the HS2 concept of regeneration – the eradication through decanting of existing communities to be replaced with business developments and luxury housing for foreign investment. Here also it is stated that the EAP favours level deck – whereas the same footprint development for Euston station – which is all that can be genuinely justified – would have the least negative impact on the communities that live here.</p> <p>It is suggested that a more comprehensive redevelopment would enable the provision of new open spaces. This is not correct. More open spaces currently enjoyed by those living on the Regents Park Estate would be lost. These would not be reprovided until 2034. Even then, they would be in the new urban city, nor for those on the RP Estate.</p> <p>What are “new at-grade streets”?</p> <p>The community groups reject the HS2 concept of regeneration, which is to grab many times more than the land that can be justified to redevelop the station.</p> <p>HS2 would decant the people who live in the surrounding communities from</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>the city centre which is to be levelled and handed over to developers to turn into a desolate commercial area of offices, shops and luxury housing.</p> <p>The EAP suggests that new open spaces would be provided which is at best misleading. Open spaces on the Regents Park and Churchway estates are lost and there is no reprovision before 2034, and even then it will be in a different locality.</p> <p>We need an explanation of "new at-grade streets" as well as a definition. If this is a commitment for new development to be at the same grade as existing architecture, then it needs to say so.</p>
MM34 - eustonDesign	MM7	<p>I am formally commenting on your latest modifications to the Euston Area Plan on behalf of eustonDesign .</p> <p>Your modifications include references to redevelopment within the existing station footprint as the third of three options for station development. eustonDesign is author of such an option (aka DDD2 and DDD2+) which has been discussed by Euston Station Alternatives Working Group. Though EAP have reviewed two drawings of DDD2, it has not appraised the scheme more than this to our knowledge.</p> <p>Our current design is known as DDD2* and this design has been finetuned to address all previous concerns raised about DDD2 and DDD2+. It has not however been opened to scrutiny of the EAP team.</p> <p>In order to comment on your EAP modifications we quote your key passage as follows (in blue):-</p> <p><i>"3: Redevelopment on existing station footprint</i> <i>The redevelopment of Euston could be progressed within the existing station footprint, in the event that the HS2 project is not progressed, or with alternative design solutions such as the community led Double Deck Down station design, with High Speed Two platforms and tracks at a lower level and Network Rail tracks at ground level. These options would reduce the required demolition of homes, business premises and open spaces and mitigation requirements associated with proposals on an expanded station footprint. Therefore illustrations of how the principles for station design could be applied to the existing station footprint are also provided.</i></p> <p>Comparison <i>The EAP Sustainability Appraisal which has been prepared alongside the EAP highlights the sustainability benefits of lowering the track and platforms and</i></p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p><i>redeveloping the station to allow for the creation of new streets, open space and buildings above. The appraisal also highlights the benefits of a comprehensive approach to redeveloping the station area, even where the existing basic station infrastructure is fundamentally retained, but clearly shows the most benefits for the area can be secured through a scheme similar to the baseline station design which lowers platforms and tracks. Options to redevelop Euston Station on the existing station footprint would bring benefits in terms of avoiding demolitions and associated mitigation requirements, although such approaches would reduce the ability to provide new at-grade streets, open spaces and building entrances."</i></p> <p>Our comments are as follows Our current proposal for a station within the existing footprint (known as DDD2*) has not been the subject of the EAP Sustainability Appraisal. Therefore the two yellow highlighted assertions must be incorrect - ie it is clear to eustonDesign that the most benefits can be secured through a scheme within the existing footprint (and not through a scheme similar to the baseline). The second assertion that redevelopment within the existing footprint <i>"would reduce the ability to provide at grade streets, open spaces and building entrances"</i>.is incorrect because the grading of east west streets over the platforms (to provide permeability) can be accommodated (within wide transitional commercial development zones each side of the much narrower platform footprint within the existing station footprint). And the level of the streets can be tailored to provide acceptable street gradients. Moreover our proposed classic station concourse provides an east west pedestrian street within the station envelope, at Eversholt Street Level. Also access to the overdeck streets from the north is at grade. Furthermore the Baseline scheme extinguishes Melton/Cardington Street. Our current station design within the existing footprint however transforms Melton/Cardingtin Street into a key strategic cycle superhighway - with cycle underpasses under Hampstead Road and Euston Road (the former as part of the Hampstead Road Bridge solution - the latter adjoining the pedestrian link to Euston Square LUL station). Such a cycle superhighway would be the only safe north-south link to the west end. Baseline cannot provide this.</p> <p>Also it is clear from the rest of the EAP modifications that the document is tailored incorporate and legitimize to the extensive environmental impact of the Baseline Scheme - at the same time it ignores the opportunities Baseline extinguishes.. This involves extinguishing existing opportunities outside the</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>existing operating footprint. For example the current opportunities of existing properties below ground are given exclusively to HS2 in the Baseline scheme. Also the existing redundant rail freight depot known as Pert Arthur is extinguished. Our station within the existing footprint employs this depot for construction railfreight during the work and after completion it is available at track level as a railfreight depot once more (ie a source of jobs). We understand that this would be viable for a commercial transshipment facility.</p> <p>In order to sustain your highlighted assertions (above) Camden will need to appraise our design. We would be happy to explore with you how this can be achieved. Otherwise Camden should withdraw this assertion.</p> <p>We will be publicising DDD2* shortly</p>
12 - Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee	MM8	<p>4.2 Euston Road, p.86, Context - change 'partly covered by the Bloomsbury Conservation Area' to 'largely covered by the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.'</p> <p>also p. 86. Add after 'of architectural and heritage importance': 'Other buildings of importance are 194 Euston Road (1932), WH Gunton, all classical; and next door on Euston Road, Art Deco office; St. Pancras Church (1819-22), HW & W. Inwood; the Fire Station (1901-2),LCC; the Lutyens style office building at 16 Upper Woburn Place and 163 Euston Road; and the Neo-Georgian 165-167 Euston Road'.</p> <p>Note: heritage buildings in and around Euston Square Gardens include: Wellcome Building (1931-2), Septimus Warwick; 1-9 Melton Street (1907), Beresford Pite; 194 Euston Road (1932), WH Gunton, all classical; and next door on Euston Road, Art Deco office; Friends' House (1925-7), H. Lidbetter ("classical, in deference to the spirit of the first Euston Station" (Buildings of England, North); St. Pancras Church (1819-22), HW & W. Inwood; the Fire Station (1901-2),LCC; the Lutyens style office building at 16 Upper Woburn Place and 163 Euston Road; Neo-Georgian 165-167 Euston Road. Just to the north of the area, Georgian Grade II listed terrace 14-15 Melton Street, rare survivors of early development around Euston Square; former Euston Underground Station, Melton Street, Leslie Green. Nearby, Camden Town Hall, Euston Road (1934-7), AJ Thomas; Euston House, 24 Eversholt Street (1934). Nearby traditional buildings in Somers Town include: Georgian roads north of Euston Road in Somers Town: Charrington Street, Platt Street, Medburn Street, Goldington Crescent.</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>Note: Euston Square Gardens are in the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. Bloomsbury's streets and squares are early examples of town planning of national and international importance. Famous architects include Nicholas Barbon, Jacob Leroux, Robert Adam, George Dance the Younger, Thomas Leverton, James Burton, S.P. Cockerell, Joseph Kay, Thomas Cubitt, John Nash, Humphrey Repton, Sir Robert and Sydney Smirke and Sir John Burnet. There is a huge density of listed buildings in this part of Bloomsbury bordering Euston Road.</p>
<p>16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups</p>	<p>MM8</p>	<p>MM8 describes the major new economic hub to be created under the HS2 regeneration plans with 2,800-3,800 new homes. We oppose the amendment to locate the residential accommodation "to the north of the station". The suggestion is that if we want social housing, it will only be provided by decking over Camden Cutting. Social housing should be provided in the areas where homes are to be lost. Every home that is lost, must be replaced within the new development as part of the reparation expected of HS2. The new reference to "a new piece of city" (MM21). AEP 1: "Development above the station and tracks should seek to accommodate the majority of the development for the plan area and seek to exceed the targets set below provided it meets wider policies in this plan, the London Plan and Camden's Local Development Framework Plans." Requiring targets to be exceeded makes them meaningless – they should not be exceeded. Higher density is to pay for the new proposed decking.</p> <p>Building these new homes as infill on the estates is described as regeneration, even though it worsens the quality of life by eliminating the green open spaces and creating enclaves of rich housing.</p> <p>Delete the amendment to locate the residential accommodation "to the north of the station". Social housing will be provided in the areas where homes are to be lost, without loss of open spaces.</p> <p>"a new piece of city" needs to be defined at this point as it is mentioned here. Student housing is already well provided for in Camden Town and to the South cashing in on the lucrative overseas market, with more in the pipeline. The area does not need further student housing which will disrupt the potential for stable communities to form in the new housing provided.</p> <p>Development should NOT exceed the targets set out in the plan which must be the absolute maximum permissible on the site</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM9	<p>MM9 is about the aspirations for a knowledge quarter/med city At p.31 of the EAP, there is an important commitment to the provision of affordable social housing. Which the plan must highlight. However, this "strategic priority" seems to have been compromised by many of the amendments to the plan. Is Camden intending to down grade this strategic priority? If so, this should be stated. If not, the importance of this strategic objective should be emphasised.</p> <p>Much more needs to be known about these intentions before they can be accommodated in the EAP.</p> <p>The EAP needs to state clearly that the provision of social housing is a commitment and a priority, that is unaffected by the new concepts of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge quarter • Medical city • Regeneration • campus
23 - University College London (UCL)	MM9 and MM20	<p>On behalf of my client, University College London (UCL), I am writing in support of the main modifications version of the Euston Area Plan (EAP), which has been published for consultation until 20th October 2014.</p> <p>University College London</p> <p>UCL is London's leading multidisciplinary university, with over 11,000 staff and nearly 28,000 students. It was ranked fifth in the QS World University Rankings 2012/13 and provides excellence and leadership in teaching and research. UCL's main Bloomsbury campus is located immediately to the south of Euston Station. Euston is one of the main public transport hubs for travel to/from the university and a gateway to its core campus.</p> <p>The university is embarking on an ambitious programme of renovation and redevelopment of its Bloomsbury campus. An estate-wide masterplan (http://www.ucl.ac.uk/masterplan) sets out a vision for the long term development and improvement of the core campus over the next ten to fifteen years, with expected investment of well over £500 million. The masterplan identifies a range of projects to deliver this vision and the best possible teaching and learning environment for its students.</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>Previous representations on the Publication Version EAP</p> <p>UCL has a keen interest in the future regeneration and growth of the Euston area and supports the overall policy direction and vision set out in the Publication Version EAP, which was published in January 2014. UCL submitted representations in support of the Publication Version EAP and welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Schedule of Main Modifications.</p> <p>High Speed 2</p> <p>UCL welcomes the proposed changes to the Plan to ensure that it is up to date on HS2 and emerging new station design work being undertaken by HS2 and Network Rail, as requested by the Secretary of State in March 2014. UCL does, however, hold significant concerns regarding the implications for the University if Euston Station improvements and related highways, transportation and utility works were constructed as outlined in the Environmental Statement and other documentation which accompanied the High Speed Rail (London to West Midlands) Bill. UCL is concerned at the breadth of powers sought under the Bill as published and not at all reassured by the Environmental Minimum Requirements, Code of Construction Practice or Mitigation measures published with the Bill.</p> <p>UCL is one of the largest landowners and occupiers within Camden generally and in the Euston area in particular and stands to be significantly and seriously affected by the construction of HS2 unless appropriate controls and assurances are put in place. UCL has submitted a petition in relation to the Bill setting out its grave concerns about the potential land acquisition and construction impacts of the new railway and Euston Station redevelopment.</p> <p>Creating a Knowledge Quarter</p> <p>UCL supports the Council's objectives to create a knowledge quarter in the area, which could include medical uses as promoted by the Mayor of London's 'MedCity' vision, as well new commercial, scientific and creative industries, strengthening the role of the area's existing cluster of academic and research uses.</p> <p>Main Modifications 9 and 20 (and Delivery Plan 4.1) state that the EAP will seek approximately 30% of new commercial floorspace (at least 50,000 sq m</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>to 70,000 sq m) as knowledge-based, scientific, research and creative sector uses, including supporting educational facilities. UCL considers that in order to ensure that this vision is achieved this should be amended to at least 30% of new commercial floorspace as knowledge based, science, research and creative sector uses. UCL is identified a delivery partner for the Knowledge Quarter in Delivery Plan 4.1.</p> <p>World-class station design</p> <p>Subject to the concerns outlined above and in its petition in relation to the Bill, UCL supports in principle the EAP vision for the creation of a new world-class transport interchange at Euston with integrated and well-designed over station development which capitalises on the potential to create a knowledge hub of international significance, maximising the regeneration potential of the station and wider area. UCL does not, however, consider that such an interchange or HS2 would have a beneficial effect on the value of land owned by the University allowing for the surge in interest in the Euston Area brought about, irrespective of the HS2 proposals by matters such as the activities of the University itself, the Europe-connected HS1 Station at St Pancras, development of the Francis Crick Institute and the already good transportation connections enjoyed by the Euston area.</p> <p>Local connections</p> <p>UCL welcomes the additional detail and clarity provided on the pedestrian and cycle links proposed in Figure 3.5 and Delivery Plan 4.2, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to existing, or the provision of new, pedestrian crossings and de-cluttered footways across and along Euston Road, in order to significantly enhance pedestrian movement; • Through traffic restriction on Gordon Street, and a new entrance to Euston Underground Station south of Euston Road and a significantly enhanced surface crossing point north from Gordon Street across Euston Road; • An improved north/south pedestrian and cycle route via Gordon Street; and • A new underground link between Euston Station and Euston Square

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>London Underground stations.</p> <p>The improvement of the public realm and walking and cycling routes along Gordon Street are strategic objectives of the University. UCL will work with LB Camden and TfL to deliver these objectives and considers that they should be progressed irrespective of progress in relation to wider Euston Station proposals or the Bill. It is perhaps unfortunate that they are delayed whilst being considered alongside the redevelopment of Euston Station.</p> <p>Prevention of disruption during period of construction of plan proposals UCL's concerns as to potential disruption and consequent adverse effects during the construction of HS2 proposals are applicable also to the major and lengthy development proposals contemplated by the EAP as proposed to be modified. The University asks that the Plan should include a notation emphasising the importance, of construction programmes, methodologies and activities being planned and controlled sensitively in a manner which enables existing occupiers and employers in the Euston area to continue to function no less effectively than before development works commenced.</p>
06 - London Forum of Civic & Amenity Societies	MM10	This amendment moves in the right direction, but the text should acknowledge that there is already a housing shortage in this part of Camden and a level of "concealed homelessness" which is not discernable from the data available.
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM10	<p>MM10 is about the issue of losing open spaces on the estates and decking over the cutting. Neither of these is respectful of the present grain of the architecture, nor the communities that live here.</p> <p>However. We can welcome proposals for opportunities for apprenticeships, a replacement for the Silverdale tenants hall, and sensible relocation for Maria Fidelis lower school away from the main HS2 construction compound. (even though you might have thought these count as mitigations.)</p> <p>The loss of open spaces on the estates and excessive decking of the tracks must be avoided. Much more needs to be known about these "meanwhile uses" intentions before they can be accommodated in the EAP.</p>
MM27 - Jackson Toms-Limb	MM10	Page 36 Homes – replacement homes for those who lose their homes because of HS2 should not be provided by infill of existing estates – the current layouts of the estates is already dense enough – any infill will drastically reduce the quality of life of all who would then live there – further spreading the impact of

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		HS2 into the region.
08 - English Heritage	MM11	<p>Tall buildings</p> <p>English Heritage raised strong concerns about the impact of proposed towers on the setting of the grade I Registered Park and Garden Regent’s Park and grade I listed Chester Terrace, some of the most important heritage assets in Camden, with potential impacts also on the neighbouring City of Westminster. This was because of the particular significance of these assets, their national/international importance, and the clear and harmful impact tall buildings could have.</p> <p>Before the examination the EAP team made some modifications to the Plan and the background document (Appendix 3) to take account of some of these concerns.</p> <p>However, these failed to satisfy all of our concerns. Prior to the examination, and at the hearing session, English Heritage tabled several options for amendments to the Plan, relating to page 49 of the EAP. During the examination discussion, the EAP team agreed to one of these options, modifying the text to better balance growth aspirations with environmental considerations. This change is reflected in Document ID6 Schedule of Proposed Modifications issued on 8 July after the examination.</p> <p>Following the examination, this text was modified further by the EAP team, in consultation with English Heritage, to add technical details relating to AOD levels. English Heritage has agreed that clarification is necessary, and that the modification explains the LVMF tolerances better. In accepting this, we would wish to record we have not agreed that satisfying the LVMF height requirement alone is sufficient in respect of the potential for a taller building north east of Euston.</p> <p>While we continue to have concerns that the Plan offers encouragement for tall buildings in locations that could cause harm to the historic environment, potentially contrary to the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, we consider that the Plan now clearly signposts the importance of the setting of the heritage assets mentioned above. With the proposed modifications, the Plan highlights the heritage considerations any developer will need to address when putting forward development proposals.</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM11	<p>MM11 relates to the new Background document appendix 3 that sets out maps and diagrams for the possible tall buildings and lines of sight required by London View Management Network (LVMN)</p> <p>Whilst this information is welcomed there are various issues with the proposals see our comments on the Appendix 3 Background Document</p> <p>The Background report appendix 3 – mainly new – must be monitored - move this section to MM11 Diagrams and maps of the heights of buildings and lines of sight, and assessments of the possible impact of tall buildings at different locations on conservation areas.</p> <p>Intro – 1st Para Definition of tall building in the report is greater than 36m (10 – 12 stories which means greater than 12 storeys) But the ‘normal’ definition of a tall building is more than 30 m. This report should utilize the ‘normal’ definition. Intro – 1st Para Thei report should utilize the ‘normal’ definition of a tall building as more than 30 m..</p> <p>View 13 - misnamed</p> <p>View 13 is misnamed as being Mornington Street/Delancey Street junction and should be labelled correctly at Mornington Terrace/Delancey Street. View 24 - why does this Background Report continue to include Location B as a possible site for a 60m tall building when this view is so compromised? View 24 – the encroachment of Chester Terrace is noted as not acceptable. The height of Building B so that it is not visible should be given. Any building taller than this is not acceptable as this is a key historic view. Therefore the whole premise of a 60m tall building at Location B is untenable.</p> <p>View 25 – has already been compromised by the construction of the Heron Tower and the other Regents Place towers. The photograph and the visualisation do not match up so it is impossible to see the real effect of Building A on the view from the pavement. From View 26 it seems likely that Building A will visually block in the final piece of sky at the end of the road to the left of the other two towers. This should not be acceptable in view of the</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>Grade 1 listing. NB as the photos all show the views with heavy summer foliage on the trees, and it is now Autumn it should be a requirement to re-photograph the views in November to enable the true winter impact to be assessed visually.</p> <p>View 25 – has already been compromised by the construction of the Heron Tower and the other Regents Place towers. The photograph and the visualisation do not match up so it is impossible to see the real effect of Building A on the view from the pavement. From View 26 it seems likely that Building A will visually block in the final piece of sky at the end of the road to the left of the other two towers. This should not be acceptable in view of the Grade 1 listing. NB as the photos all show the views with heavy summer foliage on the trees, and it is now Autumn it should be a requirement to re-photograph the views in November to enable the true winter impact to be assessed visually.</p>
MM27 - Jackson Toms-Limb	MM11	<p>Pages 50-51 Figure 3.4 implies housing blocks in Camden Cutting of 7-8 and 9-10 storeys. In "Protecting the amenity of residents" it quotes: The amenity of existing and future residents will form another important consideration in assessing the layout and scale of development. As required under policy DP26 of the Camden Development Policies, development should not harm the amenity of occupiers and neighbours, including in relation to noise, air quality, sunlight and daylight, overshadowing and outlook, and visual privacy and overlooking. As the existing residential blocks of Camden Cutting are no taller than 5 storeys, any development CANNOT be taller than this, without impacting the current residents, in a way the quoted text says would not be allowed</p>
MM28 - City of London	MM11 (pages 49-50)	<p>The second paragraph states that "the general heights shown would allow development that does not encroach into background or foreground assessment areas identified in the LVMF". It would be useful to elaborate on the foreground assessment areas and in particular, to the Viewing Corridors from Protected Vistas 2A.2, 2B.1 (Parliament Hill to the Palace of Westminster) and 4A.1 (Primrose Hill to St. Paul's Cathedral). These are detailed in Figure 3.4 but not referred to in the text. This is important as, even though (in the Primrose Hill Protected Vista, for example) the development threshold plane is higher than the wider setting consultation area (background) consultation threshold plane for Greenwich Park and Blackheath Point, any development that is proposed above the Viewing Corridor development threshold plane</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>would be refused in accordance with in accordance with London Plan policies 7.11 and 7.12. Therefore the text should refer somewhere to the development threshold planes relating to the Viewing Corridors of the three Protected Vistas (2A.2, 2B.1 and 4A.1) for clarity and consistency. It is important that the distinction between Viewing Corridors and Wider Setting Consultation Areas is made clear.</p> <p>The third paragraph should be amended as follows for consistency with LVMF terminology: "The background assessment area <u>wider setting consultation area (background)</u> of View 5A.2 and 6A.1..." On a similar theme, the key in Figure 3.4 relating to LVMF Views should be amended so that "Foreground assessment area" reads "Viewing Corridor"; "Lateral assessment area" should read "Wider Setting Consultation Area (Foreground); and "Background assessment area" should read "Wider Setting Consultation Area (Background)".</p> <p>The third paragraph refers to the LVMF indicating a height threshold of between 53–54.2m AOD within the Greenwich Park and Blackheath Point Protected Vistas, depending on the ground level which varies across the plan area. Has this height threshold range been calculated using the LVMF dimensions and geometry (as outlined in Appendix B and Appendix D of the LVMF)? We are interested to see how this has been calculated as the City Corporation has its own system of calculating the development threshold plane and consultation threshold plane heights at a given location / site.</p> <p>Figure 3.4 does show that within parts of the Viewing Corridors of Protected Vistas 2B.1 and 4A.1, building heights are shown as 27–30 metres (the highest allocated in this diagram). This could be misleading to potential developers as these locations may have an impact on the Viewing Corridor development threshold plane (and therefore be subject to refusal, not consultation). Therefore the Plan should consider that the areas that fall within the Viewing Corridors of these Protected Vistas should allow for lower building heights than prescribed in Figure 3.4, or at least show the maximum height that can be built without exceeding the Viewing Corridor development threshold plane.</p> <p>With this in mind, to help ensure that maximum building heights proposed conform to the height limitations set out in the LVMF, it would be useful to include some indicative photomontages / 3D modelling from the Protected Vistas shown in Figure 3.4 (2A.2, 2B.1, 4A.1, 5A.2 and 6A.1). These would show how the "Taller Building" locations in the shadow of St. Paul's Cathedral</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		(the blue ellipses) would appear in reality, as well as the areas marked as 9–10 storeys (the tallest sites marked in dark red). While we welcome the additional wording provided in the fourth paragraph relating to the use of Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs), it would be useful to see some indicative wireline images that could show how maximum heights of buildings relate to the specified locations in Figure 3.4 as well as threshold planes in the LVMF.
MM31 - The Regent's Park CAAC	MM11	MM11: we welcome and endorse the recognition that a taller building to the north east of the station would need to be less than 60m tall not to affect the setting of the views of nationally important heritage assets in Regent's Park.
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM12	<p>MM12 has walking routes, and cycling routes including an improved north/south route via Gordon Street.</p> <p>Even without decking over; a green cycle route from Euston to Camden Town must be provided. This should be added into the blue additional text at the end of this section. This section should include a note to say that whatever the delivery funding constraints it will not be acceptable to locate housing to the North of the new Mornington Place Westerly extension.</p> <p>Re cycle routes – a much better quiet route between Camden Town and Euston must be provided, continuing towards central London via the Gordon Street link. Even if it is not possible to fully deck the cutting a quiet 2-way cycleway should be provided along the cutting's length, from Euston to Camden Town. There are already too many east-west links giving too much permeability that is not reflected in the longer blocks of the Camden Town Conservation Area to the East. The grain of the existing fabric must be respected. The proposed east-west pedestrian/cycling route is therefore removed.</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM14	<p>MM14 tells us taxis will have zero emissions by 2018</p> <p>We need to know where the taxi ranks will be located, the community must be safeguarded. Locating them to the rear of the station will not achieve such safeguarding even if they are zero emission vehicles because the presence of a long line of taxis causes severance.</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM15	<p>MM15 asserts the concern in the EAP for open spaces and preserving trees where possible.</p> <p>A definition of enhanced or improved open spaces should contain reference to increased planting and vegetation so that for instance it is not considered</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>acceptable to "improve" an open space by tarmacking over it to make a new sports pitch.</p> <p>A definition of enhanced or improved open spaces must contain guarantee increased planting and vegetation. It is not sufficient to send money on hardstanding, as that does not create new green open spaces. Planting a new tree is no replacement for mature trees which are particularly valued in an urban streetscape. The EAP must undertake to abide by the stringent Local Authority safeguarding of trees, and not allow HS2 to wantonly fell mature Euston trees to make way development</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM16	<p>MM16 asserts an Ultra Low Emission Zone ULEZ – though how this is squared with the decades of construction is unclear</p> <p>The later introduction of an ULEZ is no substitute for safeguarding the health of the community during the decades of construction that are about to commence. Currently the life expectancy of a child on these estates is on average 8 months shorter than the national under the current levels of pollution. Adequate measures must be taken now to prevent any increase in pollution to deliver the EAP, as well as HS2 which enables it.</p>
24 - Sydney & London Properties and The Related Compani	Euston Station - MM16, 17, 21 and 21	<p>Atkins Limited has been asked to review the proposed modifications to the Euston Area Plan on behalf of our clients, Sydney and London Properties Limited. Sydney and London Properties are project managing the Euston Vision Masterplan and response to the High Speed 2 proposals, on behalf of Euston Estate (GP) Limited who have a long lease on the Euston Estate. The Euston Estate consists of the properties between Euston Station and Euston Road: One Euston Square (formerly 40 Melton Street), and One Eversholt Street, including the tower and the podium above the current bus station. Grant Thornton House, also forms part of the Euston Estate, the long lease of which belongs to Balfe Limited. Grant Thornton House is also project managed by Sydney and London Properties. Sydney and London Properties and The Related Companies have jointly entered into the Euston Regeneration Partnership to prepare development proposals for these buildings.</p> <p>We note and welcome the greater emphasis placed on the aspiration for the development of Euston station to be world class and "a nationally important high quality transport interchange with integrated and well designed development".</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>As Sir Terry Farrell indicated on our behalf at the examination we broadly welcome increased levels of development proposed for the Euston area but we are still concerned that the quantum of development set out in the Proposed Modifications is not ambitious enough as far as the redevelopment of the station is concerned, particularly if the economic benefit from the commercial development is intended to provide finance for the station redevelopment. We consider the overall development quantum should be appropriate for the size, location and strategic importance of the Euston Area Plan area. We are of the view that, rather than being too prescriptive at this stage, the development quantum should be the subject of assessments which would accompany planning applications for a detailed schemes on the sites concerned.</p> <p>We also note that specific building heights thresholds have been included in the proposed modifications. We consider this is likely to prove too prescriptive and that the impact of any proposed tall buildings on non-protected views should be the subject of detailed studies to accompany planning applications for a detailed schemes on the sites concerned.</p> <p>We support the proposals for comprehensive development of Euston station but remain concerned that the aspirations of the submission draft Euston Area Plan as currently framed will not allow sufficient value to be achieved from the proposal to facilitate a comprehensive development of Euston station as a world class terminal for a 21st century railway.</p> <p>We trust that these comments are of use and we would be happy to discuss these points further once they have been received.</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM17	<p>MM17 tells of the additional open spaces on the decking over the Cutting – though this and the new primary school are for the new families in the new housing, it would be too far away to replace the open spaces lost by infill on the estates.</p> <p>There must be a proper investigation into the health and safety issues of decking over, with consultation. Furthermore there needs to be a clear undertaking that overtrack decking will not continue north of Mornington Place unless it is only for the provision of Open green space/park.</p> <p>The plan needs to state that if it not possible to provide park to the North of the Cutting then it must be accommodated further South to ensure that the</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		lack of open-space provision is compensated adequately
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM18	<p>MM18 expresses a pious hope about the ULEZ and improving air quality by removing the most polluting vehicles.</p> <p>The ULEZ needs to take account of the hundreds of extra lorries daily removing spoil for a decade, whose fumes will hang in the air even if they don't actually drive around at lunchtime. It also needs to ensure that polluting vehicles are not displaced into surrounding residential areas as they try to avoid the ULEZ.</p>
MM26 - Claire Lazenby	MM19 - Camden Cutting/Drummond Street	<p>I am a law graduate, and a registered trade mark attorney, in my mid-40's. I am the owner-occupier [a leaseholder and share of the freehold] of a one bedroom flat on the ground floor at 28 Mornington Terrace, Camden Town London NW1 7RS.</p> <p>Mornington Terrace runs parallel to the railway, and faces directly into the Camden Cutting. It is home to some two-three hundred people. We hear the railway, but we do not see it. What we hear on a day to day basis from the trains is very little. In the summer months, with our windows open, the birds make more noise than the trains. And our view is not a city view – we on the terrace look across the Nash-nominated houses of the village he planned for the eastern approach to Regent's Park, with nothing higher than the trees of Regent's Park behind them. Anyone not familiar with this part of London would think it impossible to have this quality of life only ten minutes' walk from the mainline station at Euston. But we do; it is a very peaceful enclave.</p> <p>This has been my home – I have no other – for 22 years. I do not aspire to anything else. I did not buy it to be on the property ladder.</p> <p>I am registered partially-sighted. This is another reason for living here, as it is 30 minutes to the Moorfields Eye Hospital. I work from home on days when I need do only paperwork, as the light here is kinder to my eyes than an office, and it avoids the stress of the tube. The Cutting lets in the perfect amount of natural light for me. All my other day to day needs are made entirely on foot. I am completely independent in Camden (an independence which further out from London, where the car is king, I would not have). I will be hard pressed to find anywhere else which gives me the quality of life I have here.</p> <p>I am self-employed. My income the first year of the recession was 40% less</p>

Representor ID and Name**MM No or part of Plan****Text of representations**

		<p>than my income in the year immediately preceding the recession, and has yet to return to pre-recession levels.</p> <p>I am not a "nimby"; when I bought into this street, I accepted of course that from time to time there would be invasive noise from railway maintenance works. But the EAP is not about the railway. It is about the construction of new housing and shops to "re generate" the area around the railway.</p> <p>I filed a petition during the second of the Bill (my petition number is 1776). In paragraph 59 of my petition, I objected to clause 47 of the Bill, which is the clause permitting a new residential, business and retail complex over the railway cutting under the powers enshrined in clause 47. I stated "Your Petitioner submits that as the railway cutting is the source of all her pleasure in the view, air and light she enjoys at Mornington Terrace, she is concerned that clause 47 is a wide power with the potential to destroy rather than preserve the unique qualities enjoyed at Mornington Terrace. Your Petitioner wishes clause 47 to be removed from the Bill".</p> <p>I do not need more shops. Camden has plenty of shops already. I need light. And the proposal could well destroy the qualities of the light here in the Cutting which makes it perfect for me.</p> <p>I do not need more density of housing; this will prolong the construction works here in the Cutting, and if financial or medical disaster should strike me during the build, I will lose much if not all of the financial security my home currently affords me.</p> <p>I do not need my area "re-generated"; it is beautiful now. a perfect balance of sky, air, light and greenery. The EAP will ruin it.</p> <p>The area around Euston Station, in particular Drummond Street, is also not in need of "re-generation". It is a vibrant little street, thriving with some of the best Indian food London has to offer, a little Brick Lane for us locals, and so reasonably priced that it is within anyone's ability to pay. Why replace that with Mr McGloughin's wish to get a cup of tea from Fortnums, for only the people who can afford Fortnum's prices (see his comments in the Independent on Saturday yesterday, on page 21) . And it is a has a little park nearby which, if the EAP is to go ahead, will be built over. Now, how do you "re-generate" an area when a) you remove the open space and b) you destroy unique shops and</p>
--	--	---

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>restaurants and replace with them with only the shops in national chains, because they are the only ones who can afford the rent? And c) price out the locals?</p> <p>In the event that the EAP is adopted in its current form, I will be filing a petition, in addition to the one which I have already filed this year.</p>
MM30 - Ossulston Tenants & Residents Association	MM19	<p>Following the July 2014 Euston Area Plan Examination Public Hearing, we are now responding to the current consultation by commenting on the amendments / main modifications prepared by the Inspector, in the light of public representations, discussions and interventions made at the last hearing sessions on the Euston Area Plan (EAP).</p> <p>The Ossulston Tenants & Residents Association "Ossulston TRA" is requesting the Inspector to consider our comments on the proposed modifications made, before the Examination ends.</p> <p>We are aware that the Euston Area Plan (EAP) has been jointly prepared with the Greater London Authority (GLA) and Transport for London (TfL). In the proposed plan for consultation and under Section MM1 (viii) it's clearly stated that we must make sure that the plan is updated on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HS2 Context and - Emerging new station design works by HS2 and by Network Rail <p>Under Section MM2 (viii) the following is specified in the proposed (EAP) plan:</p> <p>"The Mayor of London wants to make sure that the prepared plan reflects a wider Vision of London" We add: "The plan should reflect mainly Euston and the surrounding immediate local areas".</p> <p>Contrary to Chapter 5 of the Euston Area Plan (EAP) – Delivery of the whole plan in Overall Strategy (EAP1) – with ref to Relevant Objectives under First priority the following is specified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local people's needs followed by 2. Making the best use of new space and 3. Providing jobs and boosting the Local economy

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>Main Modifications "MM19" Add two Introductory Plans at the beginning of SECTION 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Show the existing railway lines with proposed development across the area overlaid Fig 4.1 - To provide the boundaries for each sub-area on a single area wide plan – Places Fig 4.2 <p>Section 4 – MM19 Policy. Section 4 sets out the proposals for each of the 7 character areas. For each area the context is summarised and then an overarching Development Principle to guide proposals in the area, is set out. Development Principles in terms of a) land use, b) design, c) transport, d) public realm and e) the environment.</p> <p>KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY PRIORITY: "There is a potential for 170.000 to 270.000 square of employment floor space which includes the re provision of existing commercial floor space above the. ." It is added: "to support the creative of a knowledge cluster in the Euston Road... Corridor". We believed that not only the Euston road should be supported with the Knowledge Cluster but also the local area including the St Pancras & Somers Town ward.</p> <p>Under Section MM3 (viii) also Knowledge Economy is mentioned as a priority to maximise the area by creating a Mayor's emerging "Midi-City" Vision once again, in the corridors of Euston road. We said that to complement this "Medi City" Vision this, also must be applicable to the surrounding local area and very populated wards like the one of the St Pancras & Somers Town ward from where the largest Medical Research Centre of Europe / World will be established and operating within few month time, when a mayor and new Economic hub of Commercial and Science Knowledge based will develop in this local area and linking to the rest of the educational institutions, other research institutes and universities in existence in our local area constituting the "Medi City" hub, for the promotion of London.</p> <p>HELPING TO ACHIEVE CAMDEN COUNCIL'S "KNOWLEDGE QUARTER" ASPIRATION FOR THE LOCAL AREA.</p> <p>Within the Long Term Aspirations (Years 2024 + to 2044) is for the Ossulston "TRA" is the Better links between EUSTON Station and the ST PANCRAS INTERNATIONAL Station.</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>With reference to this the Ossulston TRA on behalf of Ossulston Estate has responded to several consultations stating that residents object a link with other areas /sites / buildings through creation of new roads or pathways. (Through our courtyards and or children play areas). A new road will be built from Midland Road (St Pancras International Station through to the Crick Institute Medical Research Centre) to (Ossulston Street) by the end of next year. Camden Council has responded NO to the continuation of this road through the courtyards of our Housing estate.</p> <p>PATHS THROUGH RESIDENTIAL AREAS: (Medium Term Aspiration years 2019 – 2024) There are three paths wrongly marked as paths in existence. These are not official way through, people who visit our area or passengers coming from the stations only used as a “short cut” way through. Sometime doors / gates are closed but not lockable and they are opened by the public. Residents, for safety reasons object all the paths used currently and for time-to-time, by people from outside the housing estate “Public”. Residents are expecting that Local Authority should take action on securing the gates “lockable gates” for Ossulston Estate as it has been promised to us. Residents do object the pedestrian and cyclists way through the courtyards and children play areas, in our housing estate.</p> <p>Finally, please correct under 4.7 Section: WEST SOMERS TOWN (Second paragraph), the name of the street is Chalton street, without “r”.</p>
06 - London Forum of Civic & Amenity Societies	MM21	The paragraph on Functionality is particularly welcome.
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM21	<p>MM21 ...high architectural and material quality for the station final design....and “vibrant”</p> <p>Even though the case has not been made for the landgrab and its massive extent, nor for so little regard for the existing communities – though it admits that a same footprint solution like DDD would be less destructive for the community. Under social infrastructure we have mention of the new primary school on the Camden Cutting.</p> <p>The inclusion in the amendment of “a new piece of city” is worrying. Existing communities are going to lose facilities. This must be reprovided for the existing communities and not hived off for the benefit of the inhabitants of “the</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>new city”.</p> <p>The justification for land-grab on such an extensive scale has yet to be evidenced. The House of Lords Committee is examining the business case for HS2 and will uncover the multiple overcounting of passengers that therefore does not support doubling the number of platforms. A same footprint station redevelopment is not only is less destructive for the community, it is kinder to the environment and is all that is required to meet the needs of rail travel. There is infrastructure such as in-cabin signalling that would immensely improve safety for the railways, as well as countless local projects in the north that would better support economic growth there. Definition of “the new city” is required, and commitment to re-providing facilities for existing communities reiterated.</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM22	<p>MM22 the Euston Arch – they have failed to include the community view that rebuilding the arch would take up a massive amount of space that we can no longer afford with HS2 gobbling up our open spaces, plus the Arch has no logic or locus as it is not archeologically interesting as a reconstruction, nor of any relevance to the current or future station design. In the poor remnants of the Euston Square gardens, so much is lost currently to buses that it would be a crime to lose more to a propyleum.</p> <p>Rebuilding the Euston Arch would take up a massive amount of public open space that we can no longer afford, as well as being architecturally irrelevant in the current context.</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM23	<p>MM23 building heights limited to 10 stories mostly, and heritage assets safeguarded</p> <p>The EAP unequivocally undertakes to limit the heights and character of buildings to the grain of their setting and surrounds. All heritage assets will be preserved, not just those that HS2 do not find inconvenient. 8 – 10 storeys is too high if adjacent to Listed buildings of only 4 storeys.</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM24	<p>MM24 proposals for a linear bus street instead of the bus station – much talk of walls of buses – presumably now along Euston Road instead of Euston Square. Consultation is needed.</p> <p>A linear bus street would be like Oxford Street. The Euston Road already</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		constitutes a significant barrier between south and north, but this could seem preferable to the loss of much of north Euston Square Gardens to the bus station as it is currently arranged. We will be able to comment when we learn more about the proposals.
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM25	<p>MM25 there needs to be respect for buried people as well as the living – but St James Gardens is just treated as if it is an open space like the Hampstead Rd open space – both are to be reprovided – possibly somehow by the open space above the Cutting, although this is not in easy walking distance for children. We need a large green inner city oasis preserved both out of respect, and according to the original intention of purchasing the disused burial grounds – to provide respite for local people.</p> <p>The present St James Gardens should not only be safeguarded out of respect for the 35,000 people buried in its consecrated grounds, but also for the open space and green lung it provides for inner city dwellers. The acre that was taken for the last station expansion should be restored, and the present site of the Maria Fidelis Lower School, previously Starcross Primary, should be used to make this “open space” even larger.</p>
06 - London Forum of Civic & Amenity Societies	MM27	MM27 should include medium and long term phasing in the event that HS2 does not proceed into Euston.
08 - English Heritage	Other Heritage Issues - MM28 - MM30	<p>During the examination discussion, a number of representors raised heritage concerns that related to specific assets including the Church of St Pancras, the Stephenson Statue, the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and the areas bordering the Camden Cutting. The Inspector asked English Heritage to discuss these issues with the EAP team, which has happened since the examination. English Heritage considers that the additional references and points of clarification improve the document. They signal policy considerations and add helpful emphasis for the historic environment that was seen to be lacking in the pre-examination draft, without being burdensome or unnecessarily complicated. For these reasons we welcome these modifications.</p>
02 - Railway Heritage Trust	MM29	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this.</p> <p>We are pleased to see the inclusion of reference to replacing the Stephenson statue at or near its original location. Apart from this we have no other comments.</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM30/31	<p>MM30/31 Camden Cutting – “renaming” the cutting, rather than correcting the previous misnomer....they admit the need to scale any new build to the existing heights, but it is still too tall.</p> <p>The number of homes should be restricted to NOT MORE than 1,400 in view of the potential pressures of increasing the density to pay for the decking. This is mentioned in several places in the EAP: e.g. page xi "Key Principles for the character areas in the plan are": Camden Cutting: At least 1,400 new homes, open space, community facilities and improved pedestrian and cycle links above the existing railway tracks to the north of Hampstead Road."</p> <p>This should read "Up to 1,400 new homes" etc.</p> <p>[NB Kings Cross is only providing 1,700 homes in total across the entire site (see page 14) - yet is a much larger site.]</p> <p>New east-west links: too much permeability that is not reflected in the longer blocks of the Camden Town Conservation Area to the East. The grain of the existing fabric is not being respected. The new pedestrian/cycling only East West link should be removed – see MM12.</p> <p>The building heights are still too tall to be able to state that they are scaled to "reflect the cutting's historic setting". Whilst the Mornington Crescent houses (the tallest Listed dwellings in the Camden Cutting area adjacent to the new decked development) are 5 storeys this includes a full basement, and the four storeys above ground level are not 3m tall each. The use of 3m height storeys means that a new 4 - 6 storey height building will be considerably taller than an existing 4 storey one (plus basement) and therefore not in context or scale. And the 30 metre buildings on Hampstead Road will certainly not be in context (9-10 storeys).</p> <p>The Cutting which earlier versions of the EAP was described as “North Euston” is now designated by the name in local use “Camden Cutting.</p> <p>The new school and open space above the Cutting would be for the people in the thousands of new homes on the decking that are to make the developers rich. When the housing aspirations are scaled to a reasonable human</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>dimension, we will not require decking so far north up the track, and the open space could well be provided on the decking at the Hampstead Bridge.</p> <p>Not more than 1400 homes - the absolute limit.</p> <p>Open space must be provided in the Cutting and if not to the North of Mornington Place then to the South instead of additional homes which otherwise there won't be adequate open space reprovided near Euston.</p> <p>Whatever the delivery funding constraints it will not be acceptable to locate housing to the North of the new Mornington Place Westerly extension.</p> <p>Active frontages along Hampstead Road: Remove reference to providing street level vibrancy for residential areas. Residential areas do not need vibrancy at street level. Overlooking by windows to ensure safety and ownership of spaces but not vibrancy. Residents need peace and quiet and respite from all the vibrancy around them in town centres etc.</p> <p>Historic Character and Scale</p> <p>Building heights are to be restricted to the actual height of the buildings they will stand beside. Therefor in Mornington Crescent it will be closer to 10m than 12-18m. Buildings on Eversholt Street will also need to be significantly reduced from 30m.</p>
MM31 - The Regent's Park CAAC	MM31	MM31: we welcome and endorse recognition that ground levels on each side of the Cutting are different, and that 'new development should be scaled to reflect the cutting's historic setting'.
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM35/36	<p>MM35/36 Regent Park Estate – number of homes lost amended to 188 with additional 153 close to construction, and 160 homes to be built as infill on open spaces (they need to mention they now have 70 luxury flats in the Netley £45M purchase)</p> <p>With the purchase of 70 luxury flats in the Netley development, the need for replacement homes for those to be demolished by HS2 is reduced to 90. It is expected that these could be built on the site of the Albany Street Police Station, for which LBC owns the Freehold, with no need then to build on the desperately important green spaces on the estate.</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM37-42	<p>MM37/38/39/40/41/42 Ampthill Estate – welcome the deletion of trying to build replacement housing and spurious historic walkways.</p> <p>The height of the building on Eversholt Street is unwarranted and unwelcome. The illustrations appear to give an impression of far less intrusion. The building would tower over nearby properties and is likely to impact quite significantly on the micro-climate and impact negatively on direct sun and light to Stockbeck and Beckfoot on Ampthill Square Estate.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd’s plans to grab so much of our treasured green spaces and play areas is of particular concern which is amplified by the intention to ‘regenerate’. LBC may have to sell off some land to developers to fund any new social housing, but this increases density and reduces vital open space. There should be a guaranteed open space/ play space for existing communities. One of the most wonderful things about Camden is that there are a myriad of small green oases amid the cold greyness of urban living. These green spaces are irreplaceable and contribute to quality of life most especially for those who are short of cash. Affordable housing. This label is deliberately misleading despite the promise of a larger percentage of ‘affordable’ homes in the development mix, and it does not mean social housing which is the only genuine affordable housing for the vast majority of families growing up locally, It means comparatively wealthy people being offered slightly less than market priced ownership/part ownership. This is clearly a reference to the drive for 80% of market rents which would be around £1500 per month for a two bed flat. Very few local people are able to afford such rents, it is a great concern that this could well spell the end of genuinely affordable homes.</p> <p>‘Regeneration’ is a euphemism for benefits for the developers at the expense of local communities. It is a convenient tool to accelerate social cleansing with working class people being squeezed out of localities with only a decreasing percentage being accommodated in the ‘regenerated’ complex.</p> <p>The proposed height of the building on Eversholt Street is unwarranted and unwelcome and must be restricted to human proportions. To protect the micro-climate, and light to Stockbeck and Beckfoot on Ampthill Square Estate.</p> <p>Open space/ play space for existing communities is safeguarded and guaranteed by the EAP. Replacement open space must not be for new</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>communities only, it must be guaranteed for existing communities.</p> <p>The EAP must reiterate its commitment to providing social housing that local people can afford, not the 80% of market rent model proposed by the Mayor of London.</p>
22 - (Amphill TRA)	Amphill Square and Estate - MM37 and MM40-42	<p>As far as the modifications made in relation to Amphill Square are concerned, both Louise, my colleague who attended with me, and I are very relieved and happy with the changes in relation to our estate. We are also delighted that the issue of trees has been highlighted, their environmental benefits and contribution to well-being specifically mentioned..</p> <p>In particular we are grateful to the Examiner for his patience and his willingness to revisit the plan and make sensible alterations. It is one of the few occasions when consultation has led to any meaningful changes for communities.</p> <p>We feel that our concerns have been heard, recognised as valid and acted upon. Our sincere thanks to all concerned</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM41	<p>MM41 There is something very disrespectful about proposing to commandeer Harrington Square for HS2 construction – are not the bodies of the people who were buried alive in the air-raid shelter direct hit still there? Previously there has been a memorial to 167 people who died too deep down in a disused part of the underground construction to be dug up again for burial</p> <p>The EAP undertakes to protect Harrington Square from becoming a HS2 construction compound, out of respect for the WW2 dead there, and the need of the local community for a quiet open space and the respite of a green lung.</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	MM43-46	<p>MM43/44/45/46 West Somers Town – Eversholt Street to become “vibrant”, Chalton St Market to be supported (good) BUT MM45 Churchway Estate playground to be lost to HS2 – outrageous!</p> <p>The EAP undertakes to safeguard the Churchway Estate playground from becoming a HS2 construction compound. This is to protect the health and well-being of children in West Somers Town.</p>
09 - Environment Agency	Mi37	Thank you for your consultation on the Euston Area Plan, Proposed

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>Modifications.</p> <p>Having reviewed the information on your website we are pleased to see our comments in relation to modification reference Mi37, page 62, policy/section 3.5 have been taken on board and included in the schedule of minor modifications.</p>
MM31 - The Regent's Park CAAC	General revisions requested/comments on minor mods	<p>The Advisory Committee formally considered the modifications to the EAP at its full meeting on 6 October 2014. The documents had been circulated to members for detailed consideration before the meeting, and this response expresses the Committee's agreed conclusions.</p> <p>This response is also supported by the Camden Town Conservation Area Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The Advisory Committee wanted to express its thanks to the Inspector, to you, and to the Camden team, for the work on the modifications.</p> <p>We have set out our response as 'comments', and 'requests'.</p> <p>1.0 General comments on policy issues</p> <p>1.1 The fundamental problem remains that the Plan repeatedly refers to the whole area as requiring regeneration, which is not true. The area generally is a lively inner city area with a successful economy which is integral to the life of the local communities. The main areas which do not fall into this category are areas like Regent's Place, now a desperately sterile ghetto, which is alien from local life. It provides a clear warning of what not to do in the Euston area.</p> <p>1.2 We are profoundly concerned that the intensification of uses implicit in the Plan will require the loss and significant diminution of open space in the area. The area has significant and highly valued green open space at present – in this it is in strong contrast to the sterility of Regent's Place, which again shows how nominal open space can be diminished in scale, character, and local value. The provision of green open space should be recognized as a clear determinant of the degree of intensification throughout the Plan area; see, for example, Minor Modifications Mi25.</p> <p>1.3 The replacement of existing open space should be a requirement, not merely a 'priority', see Minor Modifications Mi48.</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>1.4 We are seriously concerned by the lack of plans to address the problems of air pollution which currently exist, and which we can only see as getting worse before any new low emission zone is effectively implemented. The GLA and Mayor's record on this reinforces our anxieties.</p> <p>2.0 Background Report Appendix 3</p> <p>2.1 We welcome the further consideration of the major issues in this revised Appendix. The revisions do not, however, fully and clearly represent the factors which affect the realization of policy objectives, although those objectives are now more clearly stated.</p> <p>Support:</p> <p>2.2 We welcome and endorse the clear statements on the importance of local views.</p> <p>Revisions sought:</p> <p>2.3 We strongly disagree that 'foliage', and 'tree - cover' should have the weight they are given in assessing the impact of tall buildings on the identified local views. Tree - cover is obviously only present for part of the year: the views are just as important, perhaps more so, in the autumn and winter months, when there is no foliage.</p> <p>2.4 The Plan is also aimed at addressing a future period. No consideration has been taken of plans being considered by the authorities in Regent's Park for the opening up of historic views which have become obscured over the almost two centuries since the Park was originally conceived. Part of the statutory duty of 'enhancement' of the conservation area, these plans reinforce concern that 'tree - cover' is permanent in neither the seasonal sense nor the longer term.</p> <p>2.5 We request that it be stated that foliage and tree cover provide limited screening, which should not be relied upon to provide permanent or long - term mitigation of impacts or harm.</p> <p>2.6 It was clear from evidence given at the Examination that a taller building in location B would not merely have an 'impact' on the setting of Regent's Park</p>

		<p>and the Grade I listed Chester Terrace, but would have a negative impact: this should be amended. Similarly, it is stated that this taller building would 'affect' or have an 'impact' in Upper Woburn Place: it would be harm.</p> <p>2.7 We request that both terms should be replaced by 'harm'. This applies throughout the document: it is regrettable that the document is not paginated so that more precise references could be cited.</p> <p>2.8 View 12: we note that building A would harm the setting of the Grade II* Listed villas: the openness of Park Village (as shown in the photo here) is key to the appreciation of the significance of the picturesque landscape which is essential to their design. We request that this harm is recognized and stated in the text.</p> <p>2.9 Views 24 and 28: We request that the term 'parapet' should be replaced by 'roof': it is the clear roofline which is protected.</p> <p>2.10 In all these examples, we request that 'affect' should be replaced by 'harm', and the role of foliage/tree - cover modified as noted above.</p> <p>3.0 Main modifications proposed</p> <p>3.3 We request that the statement on building heights should more accurately reflect this understanding, by revising 'Building heights should be up to/in the region of 4-6 storeys (12-18 metres) to the north of the development parcel rising up to around 9-10 storeys ...' to read 'Building heights should <u>therefore be up to 3 storeys on the perimeter areas of the north of the development parcel, rising to 4-6 storeys,</u> and then to around 9-10 storeys ...'. This modification needs to be carried through in amending Fig 3.4.</p> <p>3.4 We also request that the character of the cutting itself be acknowledged, by adding in this Section (4.3): 'The Cutting itself is valued for its sense of openness within the urban development: proposals should retain this character, which also forms part of the setting of the Listed Buildings on both sides of the Cutting.</p> <p>3.5 We further request that the value of the planted open space adjacent to the existing Cutting wall in Park Village East be recognized in this Section (4.3) by adding: 'The planted strip of open space adjoining the Cutting wall in Park</p>
--	--	---

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>Village East contributes to the setting of the Listed Buildings, and should be retained and its biological sustainability protected in any proposals.'</p> <p>3.6 We are concerned that if 'viability' precludes the decking of the north of the Cutting and its use as open space, then the Cutting should remain open, that is, not be decked over, rather than decked and built upon.</p> <p>3.7 The dangerous possibility that the provision of open space on a deck to this northern section may be required in a planning consent for work in the south of the Area, but is then found to be unenforceable on the grounds of viability, needs to be addressed in the Plan. We request that an appropriate amendment be made.</p> <p>4.0 Minor modifications</p> <p>4.1 Mi15: we welcome this more complete statement of the historic context.</p>
12 - Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee	General additions requested	<p>The following amendments should be made:</p> <p>2. CONTEXT</p> <p>2.3. Character Areas, p. 18. Euston Road:</p> <p>Add: 'Euston Square Gardens are what remains of the historic Euston Square, built from 1811 as an extension of Bloomsbury, the origin of the Euston Area, and remains the basic template for planning, development, conservation and regeneration opportunities; Euston Square Gardens has a number of landmark buildings in classical and Greek Revival style on and around its boundaries'.</p> <p>2.4 Key Issues - heritage - second bullet point:</p> <p>Add: 'Euston Square Gardens are what remains of Euston Square, and traces of typical original low rise terraces remain in, for example, the Georgian Grade II listed houses at 14-15 Melton Street. In terms of building style, neoclassicism is still the characteristic feature of the Euston Road Character Area.'</p> <p>3. DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p>

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>3.3 Design Strategy</p> <p>Building heights, massing and scale, p. 49: add: 'The low rise nature of the existing station is its main merit in responding to the surrounding low rise townscape. The potentially harmful nature of high rise overdevelopment on the historic townscape of Bloomsbury must be acknowledged in new development. Bloomsbury is characterised by 18th and early 19th century garden squares of small scale terraces later supplemented by sympathetic development mainly in the classical manner'.</p> <p>Conserving and enhancing heritage assets, p. 51, 2nd para, final sentence, delete 'Where possible'</p> <p>World Class Station design, p. 51: 'The opportunity is presented for a station building of architectural merit in its own right, like St. Pancras and Kings Cross'.</p> <p>4. PLACES</p> <p>4.1, Euston Station and Tracks, p. 79, Design - Euston Arch: add: 'The still dominant neoclassical architecture of St. Pancras Church, the Wellcome Building, 1-9 Melton Street and the adjoining building (now 30 Euston Square), Friends' House ("classical, in deference to the spirit of the first Euston Station" (Buildings of England, North), the Lutyens style office building at 16 Upper Woburn Place and 163 Euston Road; Neo-Georgian 165-167 Euston Road, and other buildings in Euston Road and the Euston Area, presents a compelling justification for the Euston Arch and provides an appropriate setting for the reconstructed/restored arch.'</p> <p>Protecting and enhancing strategic views and assets, p. 79: add the words 'and the nationally important heritage assets in Bloomsbury' after 'Chester Terrace' and before 'outside the plan area'. Note: it is absurd that no mention is made of the international importance of Bloomsbury, characterised by the earliest garden squares developed in the English manner, and its 18th and early 19th century garden squares of small scale terraces supplemented by later larger scale but sympathetic development mainly in the classical manner.</p>
16-20 & 22 - D Hackman, L Auletta and various Groups	Additions	1. 7.4.10 about the 11 story slab blocks of Regents Park estate:

Representor ID and Name	MM No or part of Plan	Text of representations
		<p>add at the end: the housing blocks are designed to alternate with the green spaces in between – a balance that will be ruined by housing infill. Instead replacement housing for homes demolished by HS2 should be built on sites like the disused Albany St police station.</p> <p>2. 7.4.11 designates the Cutting as North Euston Cutting.</p> <p>Figure 7.3 designates both the Cutting and the north of the Regents Park estate as of low historic sensitivity. Upper Regents Park Estate is described as an “opportunity area” with particularly poor townscape qualities for which HS2 is a “catalyst for change” with 1,400 new homes planned above the Cutting north of the Hampstead Road.</p> <p>Camden Cutting Remove these value judgements which somehow seek to justify the destruction of the present architecture and character of the communities currently living there.</p>