

# EXAMINATION OF THE EUSTON AREA PLAN

## MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR THE HEARING SESSIONS (ISSUE 2: 15 JUNE)

Day One – Tuesday, 1<sup>st</sup> July, 2014

OPENING OF HEARING SESSIONS

MATTER 1 – LEGAL COMPLIANCE

Duty to Co-operate Statement

- Does the EAP effectively address the issues which have cross boundary impacts, notably on matters concerning The London Plan 2011 (GLA), the Proposed Further Alterations to The London Plan (GLA) and Westminster City Council?

Westminster City Council have not confirmed their acceptance of the 3D modelling exercise undertaken regarding the impacts of taller buildings. Are the proposed consultative arrangements in the Plan for dealing with taller buildings adequate? (EAP Team)

- What mechanisms will be put in place to ensure that effective ongoing consultation and co-operation takes place between all the parties with responsibility for delivering the Plan's proposals?

Should the Plan (particularly at Sections 5.3 and 5.4) contain a more specific Delivery Framework for the major projects identified, and the key partners involved? (EAP Team)

Should the proposed future arrangements for the Euston Area Plan Management Board and Strategic Board be set out more fully at Section 5.2 of the Plan? (EAP Team)

Public Consultation

- How has the Plan reflected the priorities and concerns of local people and stakeholders as expressed at the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations, notably on matters concerning Euston Station, the North Euston Cutting, open space strategy and public realm?

How has the Plan sought to reflect the comment made at the Stage 1 consultation that "there is a unique opportunity to give the Euston area an identity"? (EAP Team)

The Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations both showed a need to consider the enhancement of "research and academia" and "knowledge-based, science and creative industries" in the area. Does the Plan's aspiration for approximately 30% potential new commercial floorspace (Section 3.2, p39) meet the need identified in the consultation responses? (EAP Team)

## Sustainability Appraisal

- How does the Plan seek to address and mitigate the potential cumulative impacts (c.f. Table X, pp49/50 of the Submission SA) that have been identified outside of the Camden LDF?

The SA Strategic Objectives Appraisal (pp 66-94) generally shows “Likely large positive ++” and “likely positive +” impacts. However, Sustainability Objective 14 – Improve air quality does demonstrate “Likely positive and negative impacts”. How does the Plan address the potential negative impacts? (EAP Team)

The SA states that the proposed Ultra Low Emissions Zone may help to mitigate the generation of traffic emissions. How does the Plan seek to ensure that the ULEZ will deliver positive air quality improvements? (EAP Team)

### PARTICIPANTS:

L.B. Camden, GLA, TfL,

## MATTER 2 – THE VISION FOR THE EUSTON AREA

- How does the Plan translate the designation of the Euston Opportunity Area in the London Plan into effective and deliverable proposals for new homes, new business and retail floorspace and public transport improvements?

Do the Plan’s ten objectives appropriately reflect the Plan’s Vision (Section 1.2), and in particular the statement that “a comprehensive redevelopment of Euston Station will best help to achieve this vision and the plan objectives”? (EAP Team)

Should the Plan contain a specific objective for Euston Station and its immediate environs (to guide Development Principle EAP1)? (EAP Team)

Sydney and London Properties Limited (Representation 024) state that the “Submission Draft Plan is not ambitious enough as far as the station is concerned”. Should the Plan’s Vision identify the scope for greater redevelopment potential at Euston Station? (Sydney and London)

Sydney and London Properties Limited’s Hearing Statement describes the concept of a “new high density Metropolitan Town Centre of national importance at Euston and King’s Cross”. Should the Plan recognise this wider opportunity? (Sydney and London)

- Can the Plan’s vision for the Euston Area in 2031 deliver the rejuvenation of the area as both a local hub of activity and a gateway to London in partnership between L.B. Camden, the GLA, TfL and other key stakeholders?

The Plan contains flexibility in certain areas, for example to allow for different station designs at Euston to come forward. Does this flexibility

potentially inhibit the delivery of key elements of the Plan's vision? (EAP Team)

Will the approach outlined in Section 5 of the Plan (Monitoring and next steps) provide sufficient clarity and certainty to enable all partner bodies to deliver the Plan's Vision and Objectives? (EAP Team)

#### PARTICIPANTS

L.B. Camden, GLA, TfL, Sydney and London Properties Limited

#### MATTER 3 – DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

- Does Strategic Principle EAP1 (Land Use Strategy) appropriately embody the aspirations of all key stakeholders for the Plan area, with particular regard to the delivery of new homes, new business floorspace and the enhancement of Euston's role in the medical research, knowledge, innovation and creative industry sectors?

Should Strategic Principle EAP1 be more specific about the development parameters for the Euston Station site, for example in terms of quanta of floorspace for retail and employment development? (Sydney and London)

Should the Plan recognise the Government's recent request to HS2 Ltd. to investigate a level deck scheme at Euston Station by setting development parameters specifically for such a scheme, where those parameters fall within the purview of the Euston Area Plan? (EAP Team)

- Does Strategic Principle EAP1 adequately address the need for Social Infrastructure in the Plan area, notably in relation to Health and Education requirements?

Is Part E of Strategic Principle EAP 1 sufficiently clear and robust about the need to provide education, health and other community facilities? (EAP Team)

As referred to at Matter 1, should the Plan contain a more specific Delivery Framework for Social Infrastructure? (EAP Team)

#### PARTICIPANTS

L.B. Camden, GLA, TfL, High Speed Two (HS2) Limited/Network Rail, Sydney and London Properties Limited

#### MATTER 4 – EUSTON STATION

- How will the Plan deliver its stated vision of a world class transport interchange at Euston Station in the context of the various proposals contained within the Plan (particularly Strategic Principle EAP3 and Development Principle EAP1), the HS2 Bill and the planning regime for the construction of HS2?

Does Development Principle EAP1 provide appropriate clarity for any redevelopment proposals at Euston Station? For example, should it address public transport interchange requirements, public realm requirements and pedestrian/cycling links (c.f. Figure 4.1). (EAP Team)

Should the Plan provide greater detail on the key aspirations of planning policy for the Euston Station redevelopment. For example, should the Plan provide definition to “a world class station” (c.f. DP EAP1, SP EAP3, and elsewhere), “world class station design” (c.f. SP EAP2, and p73) and “an integrated transport solution at the station of the highest quality” (c.f. p56). (EAP Team)

- Does the Plan provide sufficient guidance for the enhancement of Bus facilities at Euston Station?

Do Figures 3.5 and 3.6 and the text at 4.1 and 4.2 contain sufficient guidance to ensure that high quality Bus facilities will be provided? (EAP Team)

Should the Plan contain greater detail on the option of a “linear bus street”? (EAP Team)

- Does the Plan provide sufficient guidance for the pedestrian and cycle routes to/from Euston Station and within the Station environs?

Should the Plan’s intended strategy for new pedestrian links and cycle improvements in the Euston Station area be specified more clearly, for example within Strategic Principle EAP3 and/or Development Principle EAP1? (EAP Team)

## PARTICIPANTS

L.B. Camden, GLA, TfL, High Speed Two (HS2) Limited/Network Rail, Sydney and London Properties Limited

## Day Two – Wednesday, July 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2014

### MATTER 5 – COMMUNITY REGENERATION

- Does the Plan effectively meet its first Objective of 'Prioritising local people's needs' and in particular by ensuring that homes, businesses, schools, community facilities and open space lost or displaced by HS2 are successfully reprovided?

Should the Plan provide a more specific phasing and delivery programme for the replacement of housing lost as a result of HS2? (HS2 Euston Action Group)

Should the Housing Trajectory for the delivery of new housing in the Euston area be included in Section 5 of the Plan? (EAP Team)

Should the Plan identify more specific measures to mitigate the impact of HS2 and other redevelopment proposals upon local businesses? (HS2 Euston Action Group)

- How will the Plan secure the delivery of major new social infrastructure assets that are identified to meet the needs of new and existing communities?

Does Strategic Principle EAP1 (E) (Social Infrastructure) and the subsequent Development Principles in the Plan provide sufficient guidance for the delivery of new education, health and community infrastructure, and should the Plan (at Section 5) contain a more specific Delivery Framework for the delivery of this infrastructure? (EAP Team)

#### North Euston Cutting

- Does Development Principle EAP3 and the accompanying illustrative masterplan at Figure 4.4 provide the right framework for the regeneration of this area, in the context of its location between two Conservation Areas?

Does Section 4.3 of the Plan adequately address the requirements for the future planning of the North Euston Cutting area? (Camden Cutting Group)

Should Development Principle EAP3 set more specific development parameters for future proposals in the North Euston Cutting area? (EAP Team)

#### Drummond Street and Hampstead Road

- Does Development Principle EAP4 and the accompanying illustrative masterplan at Figure 4.5 secure the protection and enhancement of this area as a neighbourhood centre?

Does Section 4.4 of the Plan adequately address the requirements for the future planning of the Drummond Street and Hampstead Road area? (HS2 Euston Action Group)

Should Development Principle EAP4 contain more specific development guidance to provide greater certainty for the future vitality and vibrancy of the Drummond Street and Hampstead Road area? (EAP Team)

#### Regent's Park Estate

- Does Development Principle EAP5 and the accompanying illustrative masterplan at Figure 4.6 successfully address the impact of HS2 construction upon this area, including the provision and re-provision of social infrastructure?

Does Section 4.5 of the Plan adequately address the requirements for the future planning and regeneration of the Regent's Park Estate? (HS2 Euston Action Group)

Should the Plan contain greater clarity on an estate-wide open space strategy, to provide certainty on the delivery of new/improved open spaces? (EAP Team)

#### Amphill and Mornington Crescent Station

- Does Development Principle EAP6 and the accompanying illustrative masterplan at Figure 4.7 provide the right framework for development in this area particularly in the context of identifying sites for short term development?

Does Section 4.6 of the Plan provide sufficient clarity to guide future development proposals in the Amphill and Mornington Crescent Station area? (Amphill Square TRA)

Should Development Principle EAP6 set more specific development parameters for future proposals in the Amphill and Mornington Crescent Station area, including environmental improvements at Eversholt Street and Harrington Square? (EAP Team)

#### West Somers Town

- Does Development Principle EAP7 and the accompanying illustrative masterplan at Figure 4.8 provide the right framework for development in this area, particularly in respect of the renewal/intensification of the Churchway Estate and the enhancement of Eversholt Street?

Does Section 4.7 of the Plan provide sufficient guidance for the regeneration and environmental enhancement of the West Somers Town area? (Ms Dorothea Hackman)

Should Development Principle EAP7 provide more specific guidance for future development proposals in the West Somers Town area, including environmental improvements at Eversholt Street? (EAP Team)

#### PARTICIPANTS

L.B. Camden, GLA, TfL, High Speed Two (HS2) Limited/Network Rail, London Forum of Civic & Amenity Societies, Ms Dorothea Hackman, Netley Primary School Governing Body, St. Pancras Parish Church – Parochial Church Council, Camden Cutting Group, HS2 Euston Action Group, Amphill Square TRA.

## MATTER 6 – HERITAGE

- How have English Heritage helped shape the Plan’s proposals affecting the listed buildings, structures and spaces across the Plan area?

With the exception of concerns regarding building height and tall buildings (see below), are English Heritage satisfied that the Plan contains sufficient guidance to address issues affecting the historic environment (heritage assets, listed buildings, Conservation Areas, historic routes) across the Plan area? (English Heritage)

- How realistic is the Plan’s approach to the potential reinstatement of the Euston Arch?

What is the current position regarding the Plan’s aspiration to rebuild the Euston Arch in the vicinity of its original location (c.f. Section 4.1)? (EAP Team)

Should the proposal to rebuild the Euston Arch be given greater weight within the Plan, for example as part of Development Principle EAP1? (EAP Team)

- Does the Plan successfully address the issue of building height and tall buildings in the context of the London View Management Framework (LVMF), and with particular regard to Figure 3.4 and Appendix 3 of the Background Report?

What Modifications to the Plan may be necessary to address English Heritage’s (and possibly Westminster City Council’s) concerns regarding taller buildings in the Plan area? (English Heritage) (see also Matter 1 – Duty to Co-operate)

- How will the Plan secure the enhancement of the following heritage assets:

Church of St Pancras

Euston Fire Station

Euston Square Gardens

Important assets in the North Euston Cutting area and within the Regents Park and Camden Town Conservation Areas

Should the Plan contain more specific guidance for the protection and enhancement of the above heritage assets, together with other assets identified in the Representations and Hearing Statements submitted by English Heritage, the Bloomsbury CAAC, the Railway Heritage Trust and other Participants? (Bloomsbury CAAC)

Should the Plan address the importance of protecting and enhancing heritage assets more prominently, for example within the Vision and Objectives (Section 1)? (EAP Team)

## PARTICIPANTS

L.B. Camden, GLA, TfL, English Heritage, St. Pancras Parish Church – Parochial Church Council, The Railway Heritage Trust, Camden Cutting Group, Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee

## MATTER 7 – ENVIRONMENT, OPEN SPACE AND PUBLIC REALM

- How will the Plan deliver the principles contained in Strategic Principle EAP4 in the context of the overall Development Strategy and the planning regime for the construction of HS2?

Are the principles set out in Strategic Principle EAP4 translated with sufficient clarity into Development Principles EAP1-EAP7 and the Plan's delivery framework (Section 5), noting the comments made within the Hearing Statement submitted by HS2 Ltd.? (EAP Team)

- How does the Plan address the significant permeability and public realm issues across the Plan area, and should the Plan set out a more conspicuous and cohesive Public Realm Strategy for the whole Plan area?

Are the Plan's proposed measures to improve permeability and the public realm sufficiently cohesive, noting that it "is a thread that runs through the whole EAP" and is an element of Strategic Principles EAP2-EAP4 and Development Principles EAP1-EAP7, again noting the comments being made within the Hearing Statement submitted by HS2 Ltd.? (EAP Team)

- How will the Plan deliver the significant pedestrian, cycle and green link improvements illustrated on Figures 3.5 and 3.6?

Should the Plan's proposals to deliver new and enhanced pedestrian, cycle and green link improvements be set out within a more specific Delivery Framework (at Section 5), noting the comments made within the Hearing Statement submitted by HS2 Ltd.? (EAP Team)

- Is the proposed Euston Station Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) supported by all key stakeholders?

What is the current timetable for consultation and prospective implementation of the Central London ULEZ, and which parts of the Plan area are potentially within the ULEZ? (EAP Team)

## PARTICIPANTS

L.B. Camden, GLA, TfL, High Speed Two (HS2) Limited/Network Rail