

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/5240/P	Richard Simpson for Regent's Park CAAC	27/01/2025 17:49:29	OBJ	<p>Advice from The Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>06 January 2025</p> <p>London Borough of Camden</p> <p>Euston Tower – 2023/5240/P revised scheme December 2024</p> <p>1. The Advisory Committee reviewed the revised application scheme at our meeting on 6 January 2025 when this advice was agreed. The RPCAAC noted that it had considered the developing proposals for the Euston Tower in a lengthy series of reviews. The RPCAAC considered pre-app information at its meeting on 6 November 2023, and the formal application at its meeting on 8 January 2024 when it agreed its advice to Camden objecting to the application. At its meeting on 6 September 2024 the RPCAAC reviewed revisions presented as work in progress in August 2024 and agreed written informal comments subject to review when further changes and CGI views were made available. RPCAAC members attended the public consultation on 7 and 9 November 2024, and the Advisory Committee reviewed the revised scheme at our meeting on 2 December 2024 when we agreed further written comment.</p> <p>2. In these reviews the RPCAAC consistently advised (see RPCAAC advice to Camden 8 January 2024 (paras 4-5)) that changes to the existing Tower should mitigate and not exacerbate the impact of the Tower on Regent's Park and its component heritage assets, that is, its Listed Buildings, the conservation area, and the settings and views of and from these assets. In assessing the proposals in these terms the RPCAAC identified as areas of concern: the bulk and massing of the application building; the detailed forms of the elevations, and the colour of the elevations.</p> <p>Bulk and massing – detailed forms of elevations</p> <p>3. While we welcomed the modification of the detailed forms of the elevations in terms of their impact on the apparent massing of the building in our comments of 6 September 2024 (para. 4-5) and 2 December 2024 (para. 4-5), we found that overall the building would be bulkier than the existing tower. We sought CGIs to test the extent of this increase in massing and its impact. Now that we can see the CGI showing the bulk and massing of the building ('Environmental Statement Addendum' volume 2 view B3 at pp. 285-287) it is clear that the increase in massing – even allowing for the August/November 2024 modifications to the elevations – is significant and fails to mitigate the harm to the heritage assets identified. It fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>4. In our original advice of 8 January 2024 (para 6) we welcomed the decision not to increase the height of the Tower. We object to the increase in height now shown in 'Environmental Statement Addendum' volume 2 view B3 at pp. 285-287.</p> <p>Colour of elevations</p> <p>5. In our original advice to Camden of 8 January 2024 (at paras 11-12) we advised 'that the colours [terracotta] proposed for the Tower exacerbate rather than mitigate the harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings and the</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

character and appearance of the conservation area.' We explained that '... The warmer colours currently proposed for the Tower conflict with the subtler, cool colours – perhaps more characteristic of northern European light' which we argued blended 'better with the blue/grey colours of the roofscapes of the Park buildings and the luminosity of the sky'.

6. We support the colour (white/grey/blue) proposed in the revised application scheme which addresses our objection to the colour of the original application scheme especially when seen in longer views and in the heritage context (see 'Environmental Statement Addendum' volume 2 view A14 pp. 228-230). We noted that the lower stories would use the terracotta colour which harmonises better with the lower height buildings in the more immediate vicinity.

7. However, we asked in our 6 September 2024 comments (para. 7) for further details, all of which remain outstanding. These include: the colour range, including luminosity, of the proposed cladding; the reflectivity of the GRC panels; how would the panels be expected to weather; and how to be maintained? What options are there for the reflectivity and colour tones of the glazing itself? These points are important in achieving the mitigation of harm sought by the agreed change of colour.

8. In our 6 September 2024 comments (para. 8) we raised the question of the lighting of the building at night. How would light pollution be avoided given the aspirations of the Park to 'dark skies' and the impact on the ecology of the conservation area? This important issue also remains outstanding.

9. We recalled that in September 2024 (para. 9-10) we had sought an enhanced dynamic between the external landscape and the animation of the public spaces indicated within the podium. We were also concerned as to whether the wind-tunnel effect of the present building would be mitigated by the new design: it would diminish the value of the landscape if it wasn't.

10. We would expect to see a traffic management scheme included in a CMP in any consent: the congestion in Hampstead Road is already severe as a result of the HS2 works.

11. We would be happy to undertake further discussion of the developing scheme, as well as review of the up-dated CGIs.

Richard Simpson FSA
Chair RPCAAC
