

[REDACTED]

From: Sexton, Gavin
Sent: 02 May 2019 11:53
To: Planning
Subject: objection Application 2019/1810/P – Cobourg Street substation – proposed 8 metre upward extension

Please redact as necessary and log this as an objection ON BEHALF OF THE Drummond Street TRA to the above certificate of lawfulness application.

Gavin
Principal Planner

From: Richard Cople [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 April 2019 10:40
To: Mann, Katy <Katy.Mann@camden.gov.uk>

[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Planning Application 2019/1810/P – Cobourg Street substation – proposed 8 metre upward extension

Hi Katy,

On behalf of the Drummond street TRA we strongly oppose this planning application 2019/1810/P. We are in full support of John Myers comments in his email dated the 24th April 2019 and oppose the application on the same grounds.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Copley
Secretary
Drummond Street TRA

From: "Mann, Katy" <Katy.Mann@camden.gov.uk>
Date: Thursday, 25 April 2019 at 08:30

[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Planning Application 2019/1810/P – Cobourg Street substation – proposed 8 metre upward extension

Thanks again John, I'll pass this on.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: John Myers [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 6:56:29 PM
To: Ugoji, Moira; Mann, Katy

[REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application 2019/1810/P – Cobourg Street substation – proposed 8 metre upward extension

Moira and Katy

The above planning application gives a deadline for comments of 3/4/19, which is before the date that it was registered. Please could you let me know how to convey these comments to the case officer?

>>>>

I object to the proposal unless amendments are made as requested below.

First, the proposed development does not appear to fall within Part 8, Class A because it is admitted to be to 'provide additional capacity for the new Piccadilly Line trains'. The proposed site is nowhere near the Piccadilly Line and no evidence has been put forward that the equipment could not be put in a less damaging location. The fact that the site is one of the sites that already serves the Piccadilly Line is not determinative in this context. No evidence is provided that the proposed works are 'required in connection with the movement of traffic by rail', as opposed to being merely convenient, nor that other less damaging sites would not be suitable, or that such equipment could not be accommodated within existing buildings. My understanding had been that the applicant expects the existing building to become obsolete within a few years. No evidence has been provided that the applicant expects to continue to use the existing building permanently.

The applicant expressly recognizes that 'speed of construction' has been emphasized in the designs but there is no evidence that any effort has been made to achieve designs suitable for an urban landscape rather than an oil rig.

Furthermore the additional 'two storeys' are proposed to be 8m in height and therefore more comparable to three and a half storeys on surrounding buildings, none of which west of Cobourg Street exceed six storeys in total height. It will therefore protrude far above surrounding buildings.

It is a work of fantasy to claim that the 'existing building ensemble [...] fit into the context in a fairly integrated way.' On the contrary, it is almost universally recognized to be the most unappealing building in the area and prevents a blank and hostile facade for most of its perimeter. Furthermore the applicant has chosen to match the colouring of the aggregate in the most unfriendly part of the external facade, which provides a dead zone on Cobourg Street and Drummond Street which encourages crime. The building also represents an unattractive entry point from the sole current entrance to the area from Euston Station along Drummond Street, when local businesses are already suffering from loss of footfall due to the loss of two nearby hotels and are highly dependent upon footfall from the station. The applicant should not be permitted to make that impact worse by making such movements even more unappealing to pedestrians.

It is implausible that the reason the why "all downpipes and main access routes are on the internal elevations" is to "keep the external language as simple and harmonious as possible within the context" – particularly when all surrounding buildings are characterised by extensive detailing. The existing building is as unharmonious as it could be. It is the blankness of the current facade that is its most hostile aspect. A representative of the applicant has previously admitted to me that it has significant concerns about the stability of the existing concrete aggregate facade. I suspect the avoidance of any detail on the external elevation is far more to do with that concern and with concerns about security. There is no reason to believe that the applicant has made any serious effort at harmony whatsoever.

The reference to future development above the HS2 station is entirely misleading. The proposed extension will be a discordant protrusion above the landscape west of Cobourg Street and will substantially overshadow residents and balconies to the north on Drummond Street. No daylight or sunlight impact study has been provided.

I would withdraw this objection if the applicant committed to suspend wires as a passive provision for non-invasive climbing plants at a small distance from the existing blank concrete facade, to improve its appearance. The fact that the new structure is proposed demonstrates that there must be sufficient strength within the existing or proposed building to provide support for such wires, suspended from supports cantilevered out from above. The Euston Town BID and other bodies have already indicated willingness to fund such climbing plants. That would start to reduce the appalling negative impact that the current building has on the surrounding streetscape.

John Myers
Secretary, Drummond Street Neighbourhood Forum
116 Drummond Street



This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.