

## Summary of London Borough of Camden's comments on the Euston Stations Masterplan

### *Background*

During 2017, HS2 Ltd undertook initial masterplan work on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport and Network Rail to understand the feasibility of development above and around the HS2 and Network Rail stations at Euston, known as the Landowners masterplan.

No formal decision making has taken place in relation to the Landowners masterplan. It has no official status and all proposals for development will be subject to the usual planning controls. The HS2 station is subject to the controls set out in the HS2 Act.

Following discussion at the December Euston Strategic Board (ESB), where Camden expressed high-level concerns with the issued masterplan report it was agreed that Camden Council would put forward points of clarification and corrections for inclusion in the final masterplan report.

HS2 reported at the April ESB that the comments would not be incorporated into the final report and instead would be issued as an appendix to the report. A summary of the Council's comments are provided below for information.

### *Summary of comments*

Throughout the production of the Masterplan, the Council expressed a number of concerns with the preferred option selected by the landowners. The key high-level points made by the Council in relation to the masterplan report are set out below.

#### **1) Process, comments and ownership of the masterplan**

This is the masterplan of the landowners – the option that is developed is the preferred option of the landowners. The report does not include the differing views of stakeholders on the various options and process are not reported or highlighted.

#### **2) The landowners masterplan should be viewed as a baseline for development**

Stakeholders including Camden Council and the GLA are in favour of a more ambitious scheme for the site and in particular have expressed a clear ambition to develop across the whole of the station, which the masterplan does not currently do. In response to these concerns, HS2 has repeatedly described the masterplan as a baseline to be developed, reading the masterplan report; this position is not expressed clearly.

#### **3) Euston Square Gardens**

Reference to Euston Square Gardens should reflect the commitment for the masterplan to be able to accommodate either a reinstated or a re-orientated

Euston Square Gardens. The landowners preferred masterplan option, with only periphery development, limited open space provision and an overall lack of emphasis on the place, does not demonstrate clear public benefits needed to justify the re-orientation of the gardens. The masterplan as drafted shows the gardens as re-orientated and the reinstated Gardens as a 'scheme variable' only. Both options should be referred to throughout the report and all references to buildings on the Gardens should caveat this and show the alternative scheme with the gardens reinstated.

#### **4) Planning policy compliance**

As the planning authority, Camden would like to see further information before we can comment fully on the planning policy compliance of the masterplan. In particular, it would be helpful to have more information about open space and affordable housing. From the information available to us, we have highlighted a number of areas where the masterplan does not comply with planning policy. We recommend further assessment of the scheme's planning policy compliance; with any future schemes seeking to address areas of concerns and request amendments to the masterplan report to recognise fully the associated risks.

Of particular concern is the limited contextual analysis, which results in the masterplan report, failing to justify the townscape, height, massing and architectural principles to which it alludes. As a result, many of the precedent and illustrative images are inappropriate for this context.

The appropriate form of developments is likely to vary depending on how comprehensively the site is developed. The proposal to restrict development to the station perimeter means that there is less opportunity to create a new urban quarter and therefore a greater need to respond to the existing surrounding character. It also means that the east west connections are unlikely to be the welcoming and attractive streets that the EAP demands.