
From: jeff travers [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 March 2023 15:37
To: Planning Planning; Kate Henry
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: ECRG Comments on Additional Schedule 17 Photomontage Submission re HS2 Misinformation to ECRG in September 2022.
Attachments: HS2 Adelaide Road Headhouse Site Woodland in 2017.jpg; HS2 Adelaide Road Headhouse Revealed from Primrose Hill.JPG

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

For attention of Kate Henry

Dear Kate

Below in blue is the text of my comments (that I have registered on Camden's web site today) re the additional photomontage submitted to Camden by HS2's contractor re the current Schedule 17 application for Adelaide Road Headhouse.

I'm copying this (ahead of the ECRG meeting on Thursday when this subject will be raised) to David Demolder for ECRG and to the ECRG Contact Group because it references blatantly misleading information given by HS2 regarding the Schedule 17 submission in September (ie denying visual impact on Primrose Hill).

I'm also sending it to councillors and officers interested in this Schedule 17 application ahead of the Planning Committee meeting scheduled for 30th March... because this photomontage shows that determination should not be possible without further submissions.

My comments note that I'm sending you (as the baseline) my photograph of almost the same view showing the Chalk Farm Embankment woodland that HS2's contractor has destroyed (taken in May 2017 by Google from almost the same viewpoint on King Henrys Road) as the correct baseline for the photomontage to enable the visual impact to be correctly measured. I note that the D & A Statement in the application names Google as the source of the contractor's submitted photos (and viewpoints) for their photomontages on Adelaide Road.. So I attach the photo from King Henry's Road herewith and HS2's contractor should be asked to submit it to replace their photo of the excavated construction site (which is obviously not the baseline). I also attach the newly submitted photomontage for reference.

Please put this email on your website as a comment. I say this because my two previous lengthy comments to Camden on the submission have not been put on your website. This is important because many people have told me of their intention to write to Camden to support my comments.. but have been unable to do so because Camden have failed to publish my comments on the web site.

The comments that I have registered today on Camden's consultation website are as follows...

Regarding the additional photo and "photomontage from the same viewpoint on King Henrys Road, (across the road from Regents Park Road bridge) ... they clearly demonstrate that HS2's Adelaide Road Vent Shaft is a large alien box that sticks out like a sore thumb at the focal point of the view ... which is prominent in the field of vision of one of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement's six "significant views" in

subarea 2 (ie the main tourist area). This visual impact is clearly very damaging to the local context as it creates an industrial landmark at the main entry point to Primrose Hill to replace (or screens) the previous view of the extensive green woodland which completely screened all nearby buildings (so it seemed to tourists and residents that Primrose Hill was in the countryside). The new visualization proves that because of this greatly damaging visual impact to this important local context, Camden should have negotiated mitigation with the applicant... However HS2 previously maintained publicly that the head house would not be visible from the vicinity of Regents Park Road bridge.. and that therefore no mitigation would be justified... So Camden were presumably misled by HS2 and their contractor.

This seems to be corroborated by the minutes of Camden's pre-application meetings with HS2 and its contractor which do not record any discussion about visual impact and mitigation other than to the north elevation.

Notwithstanding that the submitted visualization now proves that HS2 were wrong and mitigation now needs to be negotiated... there are three problems with the new items submitted which need to be addressed via additional visualizations to enable proper mitigation to be negotiated and further design work submitted so the Sch 17 application can be determined...

1 The new "photomontage" visualization has been fiddled to minimize visual impact. It shows the building to be partly obscured by flats and vegetation. This was mainly due to HS2's poor choice of viewpoint... (ie too close to the back edge of pavement and too low).

But also foreground vegetation has been Photoshopped to hide the headhouse. And this trompe also makes the Headhouse appear "embedded in the landscape" (HS2's greenwashing slogan from the application's Design and Access Statement) even though... around the vent shaft... hardly any vegetation is evident on the photomontage compared with the woodland that HS2 have destroyed (even on their "photomontage" showing 15 years growth). Also neither the legally required "green corridor" is evident nor HS2's proposed security fence nor the green roof and nor the rooftop equipment which now replaces most of the green roof... so the appearance is far from accurate.

2 HS2's new submission does not include a photo of the Chalk Farm Embankment Nature Reserve woodland of 500+ trees (from the same viewpoint) that HS2 have removed to provide a baseline to measure visual impact ... I will separately send the Case Officer my photo of the woodland (taken in May 2017 by Google from a viewpoint close to HS2's which Camden should insist be the viewpoint of a revised more accurate photomontage). Instead HS2 only provide an irrelevant photo of their treeless excavated building site as the baseline.

3 The planning submission doesn't address HS2's Lead Architect's blatant misinformation, when he publicly insisted (at the September ECRG meeting) that this headhouse won't be visible from the pedestrian route on Regents Park Road bridge (ie within the field of vision of the second of the Conservation Area Statement's six "significant views" in subarea 2).

So Camden need to require more visualizations to counter HS2's misinformation.. and many others too.. eg north south east and west... or a video... like the one produced for the Chilterns... to identify the visual impact of another boxy HS2 headhouse at a mundane ring-road location. Such a video will enable the full impacts to be identified so mitigation measures can be agreed for this prominent site in such a sensitive area.

HS2 previously publicised use of advanced Building Information Modelling (BIM) for all their design work "to inform community engagement" was advertized to make accurate 3D simulation routine.

Best
Jeff Travers

