

## EUSTON AREA PLAN EXAMINATION 1<sup>ST</sup> AND 2<sup>ND</sup> JULY 2014

### HIGH SPEED TWO (HS2) LTD STATEMENT

MATTER 5:-

1. Subject to the changes agreed with Camden Council and set out in the HS2 Ltd/Camden Council Statement of Common Ground HS2 Ltd is not seeking any changes to the Euston Area Plan (EAP) related to the matters set out below. The intent of this statement is to assist the Inspector with his consideration of the EAP.

#### 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?

2. Prior to responding to the question it is necessary for HS2 Ltd to point out a substantive error in the question. No schools will be lost or displaced by the High Speed Two (HS2) works at Euston. The Statement of Common Ground agreed by HS2 Ltd and Camden Council does not attribute the relocation of the school to the HS2 works.
3. The High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill (henceforth 'the Bill') seeks the powers necessary to construct and operate phase 1 of High Speed Two (HS2). It is the Parliamentary process that will settle the principles of mitigation (and that the detail of plans for that mitigation will be the subject of approval by the local planning authority where required), following consideration of petitions. It is not the role of the EAP to prescribe how HS2 should be mitigated or set requirements in this regard. HS2 has reported the significant environmental effects of the scheme in the HS2 Environmental Statement (ES), it is therefore neither

appropriate nor necessary for the EAP to provide an assessment of, or speculate on, the effects of HS2.

4. In addition to mitigation relating to replacement or re-provision, the nominated undertaker designing and constructing HS2 will be bound by various obligations relating to the mitigation of the significant environmental effects of HS2. Through the provisions of the Bill and other controls such as the HS2 Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) a comprehensive and binding range of controls will be imposed on the project.<sup>1</sup> These controls and requirements put in place the framework through which the environmental effects of HS2 will be mitigated and managed.
5. HS2 Ltd considers therefore that the role of the EAP in regard to mitigation should be to create a positive planning framework which will facilitate the delivery of mitigation where it requires permission under the Town and Country Planning Act or provide policy that will be material to the determination of requests for approval under Schedule 16 to the Bill insofar as it is material to the matter for approval and the relevant grounds.<sup>2</sup>
6. The EAP does this with planning policy supportive of the provision of the replacement housing for social rented flats that will be demolished to enable the construction of HS2 (Development Principle 5). This approach supports the statement in paragraph 5.4.48 in HS2 ES Community Forum Area report regarding the replacement of social housing in the Euston area. HS2 Ltd continues to work with Camden Council to achieve this replacement housing.
7. Similarly, the text on open space and the Old Tenants' Hall at Silverdale provide positive policy for the provision of mitigation. As stated above the nature and scope of that mitigation will be

---

<sup>2</sup> See HS2 Information Paper B1: THE MAIN PROVISIONS OF THE PLANNING REGIME ([http://assets.hs2.org.uk/sites/default/files/hb\\_pdf/B1-Main%20Provisions%20of%20the%20Planning.pdf](http://assets.hs2.org.uk/sites/default/files/hb_pdf/B1-Main%20Provisions%20of%20the%20Planning.pdf))

determined through the Parliamentary process. The HS2 EMRs referred to above include commitments in relation to open space and HS2's policy on the mitigation of significant effects on open space and community facilities is set out in HS2 Information Paper E6<sup>3</sup>. HS2 Ltd continues to work with Camden Council to achieve the implementation of appropriate mitigation, especially where the mitigation is outside Bill powers and is on Camden Council's land and/or may require planning permission from the Council.

8. With regard to effects on businesses the measures set out in the HS2 Code of Construction Practice will ensure that appropriate measures are taken during construction that will assist business continuity. These combined with the policies set out in the HS2 Information Papers such as C7 Business Relocation and D11 Maintaining access to residential and commercial property during construction, put in place the policies required to appropriately mitigate the effects of HS2 during construction. Further to this HS2 Ltd is continuing to discuss the local implementation of mitigation in the Euston Area with Camden Council.
  
9. HS2 therefore believes that the EAP provides policy that is supportive of mitigating the effects of HS2 and thereby supporting local communities while recognising the limitations of local planning policy in regard to HS2 (subject to the agreement of the changes agreed between HS2 Ltd and Camden Council and set out in the Statement of Common Ground). To make the plan more prescriptive would be to make it unsound as it would not be effective as it is not the role of an area action plan to set the mitigation requirements for a scheme authorised by a hybrid Bill, rather this role rests with Parliament as the planning authority for HS2.

---

<sup>3</sup> See HS2 Information Paper E6: MITIGATION OF SIGNIFICANT COMMUNITY EFFECTS ON PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES [http://assets.hs2.org.uk/sites/default/files/hb\\_pdf/E6-Mitigation%20of%20significant%20community%20effects%20on%20public%20open%20space%20and%20Community%20Facilities.pdf](http://assets.hs2.org.uk/sites/default/files/hb_pdf/E6-Mitigation%20of%20significant%20community%20effects%20on%20public%20open%20space%20and%20Community%20Facilities.pdf)

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?

10. HS2 Ltd has no comment to make on this question.

#### 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?

11. HS2 Ltd considers that Development Principle EAP 3 sets an appropriate framework for development over the cutting that contains the Euston Station approaches.
12. With regard to the statement on noise in this section of the plan "any decking over the tracks should be designed to assist in minimising noise from the trains below" HS2 Ltd wishes to make two points. Firstly HS2 assessed and reported the noise effects of the project in the HS2 Environmental Statement and has set out in the relevant HS2 Information Papers appropriate policies in regard to operational noise from the railway. In light of these HS2 considers that no further noise attenuation would be required. Also, any deck constructed using the powers in the Bill would require the necessary approvals from Camden Council under the planning regime established by Schedule 16 to the HS2 Bill referred to above.
13. The provisions of clause 2 of the Bill, subject to the relevant Bill limits and the requirements of clause 19 to the Bill, provide the powers to construct a deck to support development over the cutting. However such a deck does not form part of the HS2 proposals in the Euston Area as it is outside the remit of the project. Should such a deck be added to the HS2 proposals then Development Principle EAP 3 will provide appropriate guidance.

14. HS2 Ltd supports the recognition in the plan of the significant cost and technical constraints associated with decking over the railway.

#### 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?

15. HS2 Ltd has no comment to make on this question.

#### 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?

16. HS2 Ltd's overall position regarding how the plan addresses to the provision of replacement housing is set out above in paragraph 6 and regarding community facilities and open space in paragraph 7. HS2 welcomes the identification of sites for potential replacement housing in the plan as this will assist with the process of providing the housing which will be subject to the normal Town and Country Planning Act process.

#### AMPTHILL 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?

17. HS2 Ltd has no comment to make on this question.

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?

18. HS2 Ltd has no comment to make on this question.

Paul Gilfedder MRTPI,  
High Speed Two (HS2) Ltd,  
6 June 2014