Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications to the Euston Area Plan Update Proposed Submission Draft

October 2026

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
MM1	Strategic Principle EAP2 Design	Part B, bullet 4, Pg 67	Propose the following modification to Strategic Principle EAP2, Part B, bullet 4: Providing uses that create interest and activity along key streets to enliven streetscapes and make them attractive and safe routes**, it will be especially important to demonstrate how consideration for the needs and safety of vulnerable parts of the population are assured.**	For clarity
MM2	Strategic Principle EAP2 Design	Part E, page 68	Propose the following modification to Strategic Principle EAP2, Part E: E: The designated strategic viewing corridors will limit development heights in the Euston area. In accordance with the Camden Local Plan Submission Draft, tall buildings are defined as buildings which are over 40 metres in height in the Central Activities Zone and over 30 metres elsewhere. Locations appropriate for buildings above these thresholds are indicated in Figure 3.4, subject to design, heritage, policy and local view considerations. **Proposals should take account of, and avoid/ and or minimise harm to the significance of heritage assets and their**	To address Historic England (Responder ID: R31) comments , highlighting existing policy

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			settings. Proposals resulting in harm will require clear and convincing justification, and will be considered in accordance with National, London and Local Plan policies.	
MM3	Strategic Principle EAP2 Design	Supporting text Design, Pg. 73, paragraph 1	Propose the following modification to the supporting text of Strategic Principle EAP2 Design pg. 73: General heights that may be appropriate for new development **and potential locations for tall buildings** are illustrated in figure 3.4. and are based on an analysis of the surrounding built context and modelling. ~~The~~ **G**enerall**y** heights shown would allow development that does not encroach into Protected Vistas (Landmark Viewing Corridor and Wider Setting Consultation Areas) identified in the London View Management Framework **(LVMF)** SPG. ~~However, there may be impacts on local heritage assets, local views and context which would need to be addressed~~ **Development proposals should avoid and/or minimise harm to the significance of heritage assets and their settings in accordance with national, London Plan and Local Plan policies, this includes London Plan policy in relation to the LVMF. Development proposals, including**	To provide clarification and address Historic England (Responder ID: R31) comments, highlighting existing policy

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			those for tall buildings should not impact on the ability to recognise and appreciate relevant landmarks. Where there may be harmful impacts including on Protected Vistas, the **significance** of ~~local~~ heritage assets, local views and context, these will ~~which would~~ need to be **appropriately** ~~addressed~~ **assessed and avoided and/or minimised** (please see Appendix 3 of the EAP Background Report for further detail).	
MM4	Strategic Principle EAP2 Design	Supporting text Design (Pg. 73)	Propose the following modification to the supporting text of Strategic Principle EAP2 Design, pg. 73: Additional para proposed to be added to the end of page 73: **The proximity of the EAP area to the Primrose Hill viewpoint 4A1 means that development in the Plan area, particularly in the indicative locations for taller buildings (Figure 3.4), should be carefully designed to avoid harm to St Paul's and consideration should be given to the panorama as a whole. Development in the wider setting consultation area (and in the wider panorama) of Protected Vista 4A.1 will need to be carefully designed to avoid creating a canyon effect.**	To provide further detail and address Historic England (Responder ID: R31) comments and comments made by St Paul's Cathedral (Responder ID:R53)

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			Exceptional quality design, including variation in heights and shaped massing to avoid coalescence of massing in the townscape should be developed to avoid and/or minimise any harmful impacts.	
MM5	Strategic Principle EAP2 Design	Supporting text - Design Building heights, massing and scale, pg. 74 paragraph 4	Propose the following modification to the to the supporting text of Strategic Principle EAP2 Design, pg. 74, paragraph 4: A taller building to the north-east of the station (as shown in location B **and site allocation EA2** in figure 3.4) ~~would need to be less than 60 metres tall from approximate ground level (which equates to between 82 metres AOD and 84 metres AOD) to~~ will **need to fully assess and avoid and / or minimise any harm to** ~~not affect~~ the setting **and significance** of, ~~and views within and of,~~ nationally important heritage assets including **the Grade I** Regent's Park and **Grade I** Chester Terrace. Likewise, tall buildings in other areas identified in figure 3.4 (such as Regent's Park Estate and Maria Fidelis) would need to **assess and minimise** potential impacts on the setting of these heritage assets.	To provide clarity and respond to comments by Historic England (Responder ID: R31).

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
MM6	Strategic Principle EAP 3: Transport	Part C, Pg. 81	Propose the following modification to the Transport Strategy EAP3, part C: Where appropriate, developments will be required to contribute towards the measures set out above, in addition to those provided by HS2. **In accordance with Local Plan policy, major applications should be accompanied by a detailed Transport Assessment, supported by the relevant, up to date transport modelling.** In accordance with ~~draft~~ Local Plan policies, development will also be expected to be car-free although it may still generate some demand from private vehicles, including from visitors and freight.	To provide clarity and respond to comments from TfL (Responder ID: R27)
MM7	Strategic Principle EAP 3: Transport	Bullet 8, pg. 85	Propose the following modification to the supporting text of Transport Strategy EAP3, Bullet 8, pg. 85: Improvements to **public realm and** footways ~~around new underground entrance~~ on Gordon Street ~~(if it is delivered)~~ **to account for this key desire line, is needed with or without the new underground entrance** to accommodate increases in pedestrian numbers.	To provide clarity and respond to comments from TfL (Responder ID: R27)

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
MM8	Strategic Principle EAP 3: Transport	Clear, accessible and connected walking Routes Bullet 5 Pg. 85	Propose the following modification to the supporting text of Transport Strategy EAP3: Clear, accessible and connected walking Routes, Bullet 5 Pg. 85: There may be design limitations in Euston Station which result in fewer ~~over-station~~ routes being delivered. However, delivery of these routes remains an EAP aspiration and it is expected that **if not feasible, equivalent** alternative connections would be sought that are as direct as possible. **Where feasible, safeguarding for the future delivery of identified routes should be provided.** The connection between Robert Street and Phoenix Road is considered a priority for routes above the station **and where feasible** this should be delivered alongside the long-term development opportunity of the Network Rail parcel deck.	To provide clarity and respond to comments from TfL (Responder ID: R27)
MM09	Strategic Principle EAP 3: Transport	Paragraph 1, Pg. 86	Propose the following modification to the supporting text of Transport Strategy EAP3, Paragraph 1, Pg. 86: Insert following wording: **Where possible** these crossings **shall** ~~should~~ also accommodate cycle crossing movements if these are not catered to within redesigned junctions.	To provide clarity and respond to comments from TfL (Responder ID: R27)

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
MM10	Strategic Principle EAP 3: Transport	Pg. 94 - Bus facilities, bullet 6	Propose the following modification to the supporting text of Transport Strategy EAP3, Pg. 94 - Bus facilities, bullet 6: The overall design of bus facilities should demonstrate alignment with Camden's Road User Hierarchy and should ~~minimise impact on~~ **enhance/optimise** the wider transport network and Camden's transport objectives for the area.	To provide clarity and respond to comments from TfL (Responder ID: R27)
MM11	Strategic Principle EAP 4 Environment	Pg. 104, paragraph 3	Propose the following modification to the supporting text of Environment Strategy, Pg. 104, paragraph 3 ~~A cumulative impact area for construction should be introduced which requires coordination of construction activity to reduce the impact on the area.~~	For clarity. The Council's existing Construction Management Plan requirements are comprehensive and robust including cumulative impacts of construction.
MM12	Strategic Principle EAP 5: Open Space and Green Infrastructure	Pg. 108 & 109	Propose the following modification to the supporting text of Strategic Principle EAP5, Re-provision of open space and biodiversity value lost as a result of HS2, Pg. 108 & 109: The Council considers that the levels of open space re-provision shown in the Environmental Statement (ES) (**as amended)** accompanying the **High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands)** ~~2~~ Act	To respond to comments by HS2 (also submitted by landowners) – clarifying assurances. (Responder IDs: R33 and R35)

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			2017 ~~nd~~ ~~subsequent~~ ~~updates~~) "the HS2 Act") should be the **reference point for the** ~~minimum~~ quantum of open space ~~that can be~~ provided by **the** HS2 **scheme** as mitigation. As part of the assurances provided to the Council, HS2 Ltd states that its aims are to ensure that replacement and enhanced open space is at least equivalent to the open spaces to be lost in terms of quantity and quality, and is in a suitable location**, the commitment provided by the Secretary of State requires HS2 Ltd to "actively engage with the London Borough of Camden to ensure the provision of high quality permanent replacement open space and play space within the design for the authorised works in the London Borough of Camden in so far as is reasonably practicable within the limits of the Bill and without impacting the timely and economic delivery of the railway."**. At the time of the schedule 17 submission for the station, it will be important to understand how HS2 propose to mitigate, in perpetuity, the open space lost to the scheme. **The Council's expectation is that r**eplacement open space **should seek to meet the needs of local communities**, be provided as close to the original location as possible, **at grade, accessible and with appropriate landscaping.** The ES showed the bulk of the replacement open space being provided in an area to the north of the	

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			station, on newly created "land" above the railway tracks. These northern gardens, along with additional open space on the edge of railway land at Regents Park Estate and a pocket of open space close to the site of the Former National Temperance Hospital, combine to largely make up for the amount of open space lost at St James' Gardens. The ES also outlined the re-instatement of Euston Square Gardens following its use as a construction compound. Following subsequent design development and the need to find a more affordable HS2 station design, it is understood that the open space proposed in the area to the north of the station, on newly created land above the railway tracks is no longer part of **the** HS2~~'s~~ proposals. ~~An alternative location for re-provided open space will need to be found,~~ notwithstanding the reduction in available space and the Government's change in approach to funding the station at Euston**, the nominated undertaker will need to demonstrate that it has provided all reasonable mitigation for the effects of the HS2 scheme, including those on open space.** The site wide open space strategy should look to accommodate as much open space as is feasible in the context of the spaces lost, the commitments made by the Secretary of State, and site	

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			constraints, after which alternative locations will need to be explored. Indicative locations for open spaces are shown on Figure 3.12. Open Space network illustration and further detail is provided in Chapter 4, Places. Mitigation for the open spaces lost is considered to be a key strategic priority in planning for future open space provision in the area, and should be calculated separately to any requirements for open space and biodiversity provision generated by new development and replacement housing which should be delivered in line with Development Plan policies. Any requirements for open space and biodiversity provision generated by new development should be considered holistically alongside any HS2 **Act** mitigation requirements to provide open space to contribute toward the objectives of the EAP. ~~Replacement open space should be provided as close to the original location as possible Replacement open space must be **and be** at least equivalent to the open spaces to be lost in terms of quantity, quality and location and:~~ • ~~Should be on or around Euston Station site;~~ • ~~At least equivalent floor area to Environmental Statement provision; and~~	

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			• ~~At-grade, accessible, with appropriate landscaping.~~ To help mitigate the temporary loss of open space associated with the construction of HS2, support will be given to the positive use of any vacant spaces for temporary open space uses, such as food growing/ allotments, play space and temporary public open space.	
MM13	All site allocations	Infrastructure requirements	Propose the following modifications to all site allocations: Proposed to add following text to all site allocations in infrastructure section: **Contributions to open space should be made in accordance with open space policy in the Local Plan, with reference to the Open Space study which supports this Plan (noting identified shortfalls) and the illustrative masterplan in Figure 3.12.**	To provide clarification and respond to comments from the Somers Town Neighbourhood Forum (Responder ID: R51)
MM14	Strategic Principle EAP 5: Open Space and Green Infrastructure	Pg. 114 Supporting text: Open Space and Green Infrastructure Strategy and Management Plan	Propose the following modification to the supporting text of Strategic Principle EAP5 – Open Space Strategy, Open Space and Green Infrastructure Strategy and Management Plan, Pg. 114: The Strategy should detail the size, typology, character and function of the spaces, access routes, links between spaces and justify the appropriateness of relationship between public open spaces and adjacent built conditions and uses. It	To provide clarification and respond to comments from the Somer Town Neighbourhood Forum (Responder ID: R51)

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			should demonstrate how the open space proposal has identified user groups, and how the quanta, location and character of spaces meet the open space objectives detailed in this chapter. **It should look beyond land ownership and consider open spaces in the Plan area as appropriate.**	
MM15	Development Principle EAP 1: Euston Station and tracks	Pg. 131, Supporting text, paragraph 1	Propose the following modification to the supporting text of Development Principle EAP1 – Euston Station and Tracks, Pg. 131, paragraph 1: Massing should be stepped back, have variation presenting breaks, avoid coalescence of massing in the townscape, and stitch the development within the context, especially where height needs to be mitigated to avoid harm to the immediate surrounding neighbourhood or to **strategic and** local views **and the significance of heritage assets.**	To respond to comments from Historic England (Responder ID: R31)
MM16	Site Allocation EA1 'Euston Station and Tracks'	Potential location of taller buildings, Pg. 141 & 142	Propose the following modification to the Site Allocation EA1 – Euston Station and Tracks, Potential location of taller buildings, Pg. 141: Subject to design and testing, locations for taller buildings may be located in: • Location A (indicative heights 40-60m / 62-84m AOD) to the south-west of the station acting as a	To provide clarification and respond to comments from Historic England (Responder ID: R31) and comments made by St Paul's

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			marker for the major infrastructure, within the shadow of St Paul's; or similar or lower in height of, the now demolished, 1 Euston Square. Proposed height to take account of **and avoid and / or minimise any harm to** the setting **and significance** of heritage assets including the Royal College of General Practitioners (Grade II*) and key views from Bloomsbury Conservation Area. • and in location B to the north-east of the station (indicative height 40-60m / 66-86m AOD) within the shadow of St Paul's Cathedral. Proposed height to take account of **and avoid and / or minimise any harm to** the setting of heritage assets including Regent's Park and Chester Terrace and mitigate the impact on neighbouring residential amenities. • ~~Fuller guidance on heights for this site allocation is provided in the preceding section (Section 4.1)~~ • **Such development would need to be carefully sited to avoid harm and in line with London Plan policy, should seek to make a positive contribution to the strategic viewing corridors. Massing should be stepped back, have variation presenting breaks, avoid coalescence of massing in the townscape, and stitch the development within the context, especially where height needs to be mitigated to avoid harm to the immediate surrounding neighbourhood, strategic and**	Cathedral (Responder ID:R53)

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			local views and the setting and significance of heritage assets, including St Paul's Cathedral. • **Development in the wider setting consultation area of Protected Vista 4A.1 'Primrose Hill: the summit – looking toward St Paul's Cathedral' (and in the wider panorama), should be carefully designed to avoid creating a canyoning effect and to not detract from the panorama as a whole.** • The acceptability of particular tall building proposals, and their location within the site, will be assessed against relevant Development Plan policies including Tall Building policy. Any building which encroaches on the LVMF will be subject to consultation with the GLA. • **Proposals resulting in harm will require clear and convincing justification, and will be considered in accordance with National, London and Local Plan policies.** • Further guidance on tall building locations is provided in section 3.3 Design Strategy and **more detailed guidance on heights is provided** in the preceding section (Section 4.1)	
MM17	Site Allocation EA1 'Euston Station and Tracks'	Infrastructure Requirements Pg. 142	Propose the following modification to the Site Allocation EA1 – Euston Station and Tracks, Infrastructure Requirements Pg. 142: Add following wording: **In addition to the delivery of the main station interchange, the site will be ,**	To provide clarification and for completeness, including requirements from

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			expected to accommodate and contribute/ facilitate the delivery of infrastructure, including: Cycle facilities, highway improvements including new pedestrian crossings, public realm enhancements, improved bus and taxi facilities, new routes, open space and the provision of, or contributions towards, appropriate social infrastructure.	elsewhere in the plan in the site allocation – to respond to comments from TfL (Responder ID: R27)
MM18	Site Allocation EA1 (Euston Station and Tracks)	Other Considerations Pg. 142	Propose the following modification to the Site Allocation EA1 – Euston Station and Tracks, Other Considerations Pg. 142: **Developers should follow the risk management framework provided in the Environment Agency's Land Contamination: Risk Management guidance, which helps to identify and manage the risks of land contamination**	To provide clarification and respond to comments from the Environment Agency (Responder ID: R24)
MM19	Site Allocation EA1 (Euston Station and Tracks)	Other Considerations Pg. 142	Propose the following modifications to Site Allocation EA1 Euston Station and Tracks, in Other Considerations, Pg. 142: **The indicative capacity of this site assumes full demolition. Given this, only Part E of Policy CC2 (Prioritising the retention of existing buildings) of the Camden Local Plan will apply to schemes on this site.**	To align with the Main Modifications of the Camden Local Plan

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
MM20	Site Allocation EA2 (Royal Mail)	Potential location of taller buildings Pg. 144	Propose the following modification to the Site Allocation EA2 – Royal Mail, Potential location of taller buildings Pg. 144: • Subject to detailed design and testing, there may be opportunity for a taller building **(indicative height 40-60m / 66-86m AOD)** to be located on this site. ~~The building would need to be less than 60 metres tall from approximate ground level (which equates to between 82 metres AOD and 84 metres AOD)~~ ~~to not affect~~ **Proposals for a taller building** will **need to fully assess and avoid and / or minimise harm to** the setting **and significance of** ~~and views within and of~~, nationally important heritage assets including Regent's Park and Chester Terrace.	To provide clarification and respond to comments from Historic England (Responder ID: R31)
MM21	Site Allocation EA2 (Royal Mail)	Section 4.1 EA2, Other Considerations, Pg. 144	Propose the following modifications to Site Allocation EA2 Royal Mail, new bullet point in Other Considerations, Pg. 144: **The indicative capacity of this site assumes full demolition. Given this, only Part E of Policy CC2 (Prioritising the retention of existing buildings) of the Camden Local Plan will apply to schemes on this site.**	To align with the Main Modifications of the Camden Local Plan

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
MM22	Development Principle EAP 2: Euston Road	Improved pedestrian environment, Pg. 149 bullet 4	Propose the following modification to Development Principle EAP2, Improved pedestrian environment, Pg. 149 bullet 4: **Proposals for a** new sub-surface crossing linking Euston Station with Euston Square Station should be ~~provided~~ **fully explored** to help meet additional passenger demand, **providing a direct interchange between train and tube lines and helping to improve road safety** and to help ease the pressure on above ground crossings, ~~. This would help to~~ **helping to** improve road safety.	To provide clarification and respond to comments from TfL (Responder ID: R27)
MM23	Development Principle EAP 2: Euston Road Site Allocation EA4: 250 Euston Road	• Allocated use • Potential location of taller buildings • Description of Existing Site • Context • Development and Design Principles • Potential Location of taller buildings	Propose modifications to site allocation EA4 250 Euston Road, which include reference to health uses, clearer expectations around retention of existing building and reduction in proposed heights. The full proposed modification are set out in appendix 1.	In response to consultation responses from landowner (Respond er ID: R19) and local community (Responder IDs: R01, R02, R03, R04, R05, R06, R08, R09, R11, R12, R16, R17, R18, R20, R21, R22, R23, R26, R29, R30, R32, R34, R38, R39, R44, R47, R48, R50, R54, R57, R58, R60, R61,

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
				R62, R63 and R64)
MM24	Euston Square Hotel (EA5)	Section 4.3 Camden Cutting, Other Considerations Pg. 162	Propose the following modifications to Site Allocation EA5 Euston Station and Tracks, in Other Considerations, Pg. 162: ~~If a scheme proposes substantial or full demolition of existing buildings on these sites, this would need to comply with Local Pla,n policies on demolition including a condition and feasibility study, and options appraisal. Please refer to the Local Plan and Camden Planning Guidance.~~ **The indicative capacity of this site assumes full demolition. Given this, only Part E of Policy CC2 (Prioritising the retention of existing buildings) of the Camden Local Plan will apply to schemes on this site.**	To align with the Main Modifications of the Camden Local Plan
MM25	Development Principle EAP3: Camden Cutting Site Allocation EA6 Park Village East	Potential location of taller buildings, Pg. 175 Bullet 7	Propose the following modification to Site allocation EA8: Cutting at Mornington Terrace, Potential location of taller buildings, Pg. 175 Bullet 7: Tall buildings of around 12 storeys (up to approximately 42m / 73m AOD) may be appropriate in some locations. Potential taller building may be appropriate to the north, by the railway tracks**.** ~~subject to testing of impacts on strategic views in the London View Management Framework and relevant local views.~~ **The exact height of a future tall**	To address comments made by Historic England (Responder ID: R31)

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			building would be subject to testing of impacts on strategic views in the London View Management Framework relevant local views and heritage assets. Exceptional quality design and shaped massing should be developed to ~~minimise~~ **avoid and/or minimise** any impact on the setting of the Conservation areas and listed buildings, **including the grade I listed 2-11 Gloucester Terrace**.	
MM26	Development Principle EAP3: Camden Cutting Site allocation EA6: Cutting at Park Village East	Pg. 175, end of section	Propose the following modification to Site allocation EA8: Cutting at Mornington Terrace, Potential location of taller buildings, Pg. 175, end of section: • **Proposals resulting in harm will require clear and convincing justification, and will be considered in accordance with National, London and Local Plan policies.**	To address comments made by Historic England (Responder ID: R31)
MM27	Development Principle EAP3: Camden Cutting Site allocation EA8: Cutting at Mornington Terrace	Pg. 180 Bullet 3	Propose the following modification to Site allocation EA8: Cutting at Mornington Terrace, Development and Design Principles, Pg. 180, bullet 3: Development should be contextual **and respond to** the historic grain of Camden Town Conservation Area, and adjacent /nearby listed buildings, **and the nearby Regent's Park Conservation Area**. Height of approx. 5 storeys"	For clarity and to address comments by Regent's Park Conservation Advisory Committee (Responder ID: R46)

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
MM28	Development Principle EAP 4: Drummond Street & Hampstead Road Site Allocation EA9: Maria Fidelis	Pg. 190 Bullet 9 Potential location of taller buildings	Propose the following modification to Site Allocation EA9: Maria Fidelis, Potential location of taller buildings, Pg. 190 Bullet 9: …. subject to testing of impacts on strategic views in the London View Management Framework and relevant local views and relevant local views. ***Particular attention should be given to any impacts on the setting of the grade II* St Katharine's Church in views from Regent's Park, with the design, height and massing of development proposals such that any adverse effects on significance are avoided and/or minimised***. **Proposals resulting in harm will require clear and convincing justification, and will be considered in accordance with National, London and Local Plan policies.** ***Development in the wider setting consultation area of Protected Vista 4A.1 'Primrose Hill: the summit – looking toward St Paul's Cathedral' (and in the wider panorama), should be carefully designed to avoid creating a canyoning effect and to not detract from the panorama as a whole.***	To provide clarity - adding reference to existing policy framework and highlighting particular area of sensitivity in response to comments from Historic England (Responder ID: R31) and comments made by St Paul's Cathedral (Responder ID:R53)

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
MM29	Development Principle EAP 5: Regent's Park Estate Site Allocation EA10 - Regent's Park Estate	Development and Design Principles, Pg. 204	Propose the following modification to Site Allocation EA10 - Regent's Park Estate, Development and Design Principles, Pg. 204: **The re-provision of storage use (Class B8) is not expected on the site, as the provision of housing and community facilities are prioritised here. The site allocations in the Local Plan and the Euston Area Plan identify the main opportunities to provide new and intensify existing employment sites to provide a better range of workspaces.**	Adding text to provide clarification in response to comments made by Shurgard (Responder ID: R49)
MM30	Development Principle EAP 5: Regent's Park Estate Site Allocation EA10 – Regent's Park Estate North	Pg. 205, bullet 1 Potential location of taller buildings,	Propose the following modification to Site Allocation EA10 - Regent's Park Estate, Potential location of taller buildings: … A taller building up to approximately 15 storeys may be appropriate subject to testing of impacts on strategic views in the London View Management Framework and relevant local views. ***Particular attention should be given to any impacts on the setting of the grade II* St Katharine's Church in views from Regent's Park, with the design, height and massing of development proposals such that any adverse effects on significance are avoided and/or minimised.***	To provide clarification and respond to comments made by Historic England (Responder ID: R31) and comments made by St Paul's Cathedral (Responder ID:R53)

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			Development in the wider setting consultation area of Protected Vista 4A.1 'Primrose Hill: the summit – looking toward St Paul's Cathedral' (and in the wider panorama), should be carefully designed to avoid creating a canyoning effect and to not detract from the panorama as a whole. **Proposals resulting in harm will require clear and convincing justification, and will be considered in accordance with National, London and Local Plan policies.**	
MM31	Section 4.5 Regent's Park Estate Site Allocation EA11 – Capital City College	Pg. 208, Other Considerations	Propose the following modifications to Site Allocation EA11 Capital City College, Pg. 208, new bullet point in Other Considerations: **The indicative capacity of this site assumes full demolition. Given this, only Part E of Policy CC2 (Prioritising the retention of existing buildings) of the Camden Local Plan will apply to schemes on this site.**	To align with the Main Modifications of the Camden Local Plan
MM32	Section 4.5 Regent's Park Estate Site Allocation EA12 – Surma Centre	Pg. 210, Other Considerations	Propose the following modifications to Site Allocation EA12 Surma Centre, Pg. 210, new bullet point in Other Considerations: **The indicative capacity of this site assumes full demolition. Given this, only Part E of**	To align with the Main Modifications of the Camden Local Plan

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			Policy CC2 (Prioritising the retention of existing buildings) of the Camden Local Plan will apply to schemes on this site.	
MM33	Section 4.6 Ampthill & Mornington Crescent Station, Site Allocation EA13 – Ampthill Estate Railway Edge	Pg. 218, Other Considerations	Propose the following modifications to Site Allocation EA13 – Ampthill Estate Railway Edge, Pg. 218, new bullet point in Other Considerations: **The indicative capacity of this site assumes full demolition. Given this, only Part E of Policy CC2 (Prioritising the retention of existing buildings) of the Camden Local Plan will apply to schemes on this site.**	To align with the Main Modifications of the Camden Local Plan
M34	5. Delivery, Planning Benefits and Monitoring	5.6 Flexibility, Pg. 235, paragraph 5	Propose the following modification to Chapter 5. Delivery, Planning Benefits and Monitoring, 5.6 Flexibility, Page 235, paragraph 5 ~~This~~**The** range **of floorspace included in the EAP** is considered to be appropriate representing the capacity capable of being supported in the Euston area – able to meet both wider planning requirements and the Plan policies and objectives. Should new opportunities for development be identified through design refinement it may be possible to deliver in excess of the ranges identified. It is recognised that with the **significant and** unusual costs involved in development connected to the station and above tracks, development viability will be a considerable	To provide clarity and respond to comments made by the Landowner Representatives (Responder ID: R35)

Ref number	Policy	Paragraph of Figure	Proposed modification	Reason
			challenge. In considering proposals for redeveloping the station and tracks area in particular, the priority will be to ensure a development of high quality and excellently designed masterplan alongside any new station(s), ~~and if additional development or taller buildings are necessary to facilitate this~~, some flexibility towards other requirements in this plan may be considered with reference to London and Local Plan policy, in order to ensure that **development is deliverable and** public benefits are ~~maximised~~ **optimised.**	

Appendix 1: Proposed modifications to Site Allocation EA4: 250 Euston Road



Address	250 Euston Road, NW1 2PG	Area	6500m2 / 0.65 hectares
Allocated Use	Mixed use (residential and commercial): Permanent self-contained homes; employment **including office / research and development; healthcare**; retail	Indicative Housing Capacity	~~115~~ **80** new homes
Description of Existing Site	Existing ~~office~~ building **currently occupied by UCLH NHS Foundation Trust and used for a range of office; research and development and healthcare purposes**. **The site** fronts ~~ing~~ North Gower Street, Euston Road and Hampstead Road with ~~the~~ **a** pedestrian route through Tolmers Square to the north. The site includes 'The Square Tavern' pub**l**ic house which faces towards the public open space within Tolmers Square**, which is surrounded by residential properties**.		
Context	The site is located in the CAZ and within the Landmark Viewing corridors (and Wider Setting Consultation Area) as set out in the London View Management Framework SPG. To the north of the site there are two terraces of listed buildings on North Gower Street: Nos.168 and 170 and Nos.185-191. **The northern part of the open space is owned by the Council and the southern part belongs to 250 Euston Road. The whole of the open space in**		

	Tolmers Square is protected as a designated public open space.
Development and Design Principles	• The site should be redeveloped to provide new homes as well as to enhance workspace provision. **The reprovision of healthcare uses would be supported and the development should seek to retain existing healthcare facilities that wish to stay on the site where possible.** LVMF constraints may allow for a tall building which is relatively slim in this location. Given the constrained floorplate of a tall building **and the identified need for housing in Camden**, residential use ~~w~~**sh**ould be ~~supported~~ **prioritised where additional floorspace is provided.** • **The developer should work with the existing healthcare tenant to understand their requirements, ambitions and the potential for reprovision or relocation. A business retention / relocation strategy must be provided as part of the planning application for the site.** • The development should provide active frontage and improve public realm on Euston Road and Hampstead Road, retain and improve the pedestrian East-West link to the north and retain or re-provide the existing public house. • Development must be designed to respect the nearby listed buildings. • A retrofit first approach should be assessed. **The proportion of the building being demolished should be reduced as far as possible and the option of refurbishment and extension is strongly encouraged.**

	• Impact on neighbouring amenities **and Tolmers Square public open space** should be mitigated. • Development of this site will need to consider the development potential of the Euston Square hotel site (EA5) to provide a design led solution which optimises development potential. • **Development should interact positively with Tolmers Square public open space, supporting enhancements or upgrades if required, in consultation with local residents.** • Designs to ensure that the residential elements have a good public and private space distinction and active ground floors.
Potential location of taller buildings	• ~~A potential taller building may be appropriate of up to approx. 75m (from ground level / 101m AOD) on the corner of Euston Road and North Gower Street subject to detailed design and testing.~~ **A tall building may be appropriate on the corner of Euston Road and North Gower Street subject to detailed design and testing. The final appropriate height will be the product of detailed design within the development management process but initial testing suggests that a residential building of approx. 53m (79m AOD) may be appropriate.** • The height and massing should be tested so as to mitigate impact on residential amenities to the north **and to assess its townscape impact. An application for a tall building should demonstrate how the proposal would make a positive contribution to the area and enhance its townscape characteristics.** • The acceptability of particular tall building proposals, and their location within the site, will be assessed against relevant Development Plan policies including Tall Building policy. Any

	building which encroaches on the LVMF will be subject to consultation with the GLA.
Infrastructure Requirements	• Development must contribute to public realm and active travel improvements on Euston Road, including those to be delivered through the Euston Healthy Streets project (see key projects identified in this section (Section 4.2)). • **Contributions to open space should be made in accordance with open space policy in the Local Plan, with reference to the Open Space study which supports this Plan (noting identified shortfalls) and the illustrative masterplan in figure 3.12**
Other Considerations	• If a scheme proposes substantial or full demolition of existing buildings on these sites, this would need to comply with Local Plan policies on demolition including a condition and feasibility study, and options appraisal. Please refer to the Local Plan and Camden Planning Guidance. • The site is within an area identified by the Council as being at risk of flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment will therefore be required in accordance with Local Plan policy. • Proposals involving substantial demolition will be required to submit a pre-demolition audit in accordance with Local Plan and demonstrate that circular economy principles have been applied.