

**From:** CAAC Comments Form  
**Sent:** 25 August 2022 12:49  
**To:** Planning Planning; Dawn Allott; Derek Gomez; Tuhinur Khan  
**Subject:** CAAC Consultation Comments Received

## Camden Council

**Hi,**

**Someone** submitted an entry for the CAAC Comments form form in the Camden Council site. View all the form's entries by clicking [here](#).

[Click here to access the form](#)

Here's what **Someone** entered into the form:

Enter Pin

601024

Application ref.

2022/3352/HS2

Site Address

Euston Cavern Headhouse Park Village East NW1 7PX

Development Description

Application for approval under Schedule 17 of High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Act 2017 relating to vent shaft headhouse building, comprising of one headhouse building, planter boxes, earthworks to include hardstanding area

for vehicle access to the site and vehicle parking, access gates, , parapet wall and artificial lighting equipment affixed to the headhouse building and within the compound.

Planning officer

Jennifer Walsh

Advisory committee

Regents Park

Advisory committee

Please send your comments by:

2022-09-11T00:00:00.000

Please choose one

Objection

Do you have any comments or consider that the proposal is harmful to or does not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area?

The CTCAAC objects to number of aspects of this application as detailed below: Mass and Detailing We note that HS2's Independent Design Review panel emphasised the need to develop the architectural detailing of the headhouse building further, to ensure it is of the very high quality required to make a positive contribution to the setting, and to the neighbouring Grade II-listed houses. Members believe that such refinement has not occurred sufficiently, and specifically that dropping the parapet height further has resulted in the visible part of the structure being squat and without grace. With the guardrail visible above the parapet, the headhouse will look like a utilitarian box, and the Committee would rather see the brick parapet raised a little, in order that the guard railing is not visible at all. We consider that the visibility of the guardrail is likely to be highly detrimental to visual amenity, however it is designed and constructed, as it will confer a different understanding to the building and reduce its architectural purity as a brick-only structure that "expresses the machine" as is noted as an aspiration in the DAS. We hope that

the proposed brick texture 'string course' will be present below the parapet to provide some visual interest and a suitable articulation to the top of the building.

Materials

- Confirmation is required that the 'dark grey' brick proposed for the lower levels of the structure within the cutting is the same colour as the Staffordshire blue engineering brick that the cutting walls are made of - it is not clear whether this is the case or not.
- Red bricks in the local vicinity are a soft, mellow red and the illustrations appear to show a high-fired red with an impervious surface that would not match well. This needs to be confirmed as non-matching reds would be visually detrimental and would neither preserve nor enhance the CA.
- The illustration of York stone paving proposed for the floor inside the compound is laid in Opus Romano pattern which would not be appropriate in this setting. All such paving should be laid in random length and gauged width as per local York stone pavements.

Landscaping

The Committee looks forward to seeing a future application relating to the provision of planting and buffer planting (and would ask that this is Conditioned to be maintained in perpetuity). Members are concerned that these elements won't be delivered at a later stage owing to budgetary constraints - is it possible to ensure that the proposals for vegetation and public realm improvements on PVE cannot be omitted later on? The currently suggested proposed planting scheme - not for approval under this application - features very decorative trees and slow growing flowering climbers and the Committee believes that less ornamental plants should be chosen so that the planting does not draw attention to itself and looks more natural (see for example the types of shrubs and trees growing in the zoo car park), whilst providing enhanced biodiversity and support for the small birds that use the Park Village East parapet wall planting for cover and food. The planting should not look like that in Regents Park. The inability to provide a green roof is deeply regrettable but the reinstatement of the planting to Park Village East is welcomed.

Do you want to attach any files?

No

Attach files

Content is temporarily unavailable.

To receive a confirmation email, enter your address below:

[Click here to access the form](#)