

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Prof Jeff Waage	10/01/2023 23:08:31	OBJ	<p>I am compelled object to this proposal as it claims to restore a wildlife corridor linking natural habitats damaged by the HS2 development. As a professional ecologist, I dispute the claim that green roofs and sparse tree plantings create sufficient habitat for maintaining important London wildlife. In my view, this appears to be unprofessional greenwashing on the part of HS2. It is my understanding that HS2 is obliged to reconnect and restore the Camden Local Nature Reserve with the Chalk Farm Embankment woodland, and this will not be achieved by this proposal in any meaningful ecological sense.</p> <p>HS2 illustrations of the proposed ventilation shaft building show it surrounded by trees and vegetation. This is a false representation of the nature of the nearby and planned vegetation and its proximity to the building, which I presume is intended to mislead the reader by creating the impression that this building is set within a green corridor. Which it clearly will not be, unless Camden demands that HS2 deliver on this commitment.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Prof Jeff Waage	10/01/2023 23:08:26	OBJ	<p>I am compelled object to this proposal as it claims to restore a wildlife corridor linking natural habitats damaged by the HS2 development. As a professional ecologist, I dispute the claim that green roofs and sparse tree plantings create sufficient habitat for maintaining important London wildlife. In my view, this appears to be unprofessional greenwashing on the part of HS2. It is my understanding that HS2 is obliged to reconnect and restore the Camden Local Nature Reserve with the Chalk Farm Embankment woodland, and this will not be achieved by this proposal in any meaningful ecological sense.</p> <p>HS2 illustrations of the proposed ventilation shaft building show it surrounded by trees and vegetation. This is a false representation of the nature of the nearby and planned vegetation and its proximity to the building, which I presume is intended to mislead the reader by creating the impression that this building is set within a green corridor. Which it clearly will not be, unless Camden demands that HS2 deliver on this commitment.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Prof Jeff Waage	10/01/2023 23:08:21	OBJ	<p>I am compelled object to this proposal as it claims to restore a wildlife corridor linking natural habitats damaged by the HS2 development. As a professional ecologist, I dispute the claim that green roofs and sparse tree plantings create sufficient habitat for maintaining important London wildlife. In my view, this appears to be unprofessional greenwashing on the part of HS2. It is my understanding that HS2 is obliged to reconnect and restore the Camden Local Nature Reserve with the Chalk Farm Embankment woodland, and this will not be achieved by this proposal in any meaningful ecological sense.</p> <p>HS2 illustrations of the proposed ventilation shaft building show it surrounded by trees and vegetation. This is a false representation of the nature of the nearby and planned vegetation and its proximity to the building, which I presume is intended to mislead the reader by creating the impression that this building is set within a green corridor. Which it clearly will not be, unless Camden demands that HS2 deliver on this commitment.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Prof Jeff Waage	10/01/2023 23:08:17	OBJ	<p>I am compelled object to this proposal as it claims to restore a wildlife corridor linking natural habitats damaged by the HS2 development. As a professional ecologist, I dispute the claim that green roofs and sparse tree plantings create sufficient habitat for maintaining important London wildlife. In my view, this appears to be unprofessional greenwashing on the part of HS2. It is my understanding that HS2 is obliged to reconnect and restore the Camden Local Nature Reserve with the Chalk Farm Embankment woodland, and this will not be achieved by this proposal in any meaningful ecological sense.</p> <p>HS2 illustrations of the proposed ventilation shaft building show it surrounded by trees and vegetation. This is a false representation of the nature of the nearby and planned vegetation and its proximity to the building, which I presume is intended to mislead the reader by creating the impression that this building is set within a green corridor. Which it clearly will not be, unless Camden demands that HS2 deliver on this commitment.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Prof Jeff Waage	10/01/2023 23:08:12	OBJ	<p>I am compelled object to this proposal as it claims to restore a wildlife corridor linking natural habitats damaged by the HS2 development. As a professional ecologist, I dispute the claim that green roofs and sparse tree plantings create sufficient habitat for maintaining important London wildlife. In my view, this appears to be unprofessional greenwashing on the part of HS2. It is my understanding that HS2 is obliged to reconnect and restore the Camden Local Nature Reserve with the Chalk Farm Embankment woodland, and this will not be achieved by this proposal in any meaningful ecological sense.</p> <p>HS2 illustrations of the proposed ventilation shaft building show it surrounded by trees and vegetation. This is a false representation of the nature of the nearby and planned vegetation and its proximity to the building, which I presume is intended to mislead the reader by creating the impression that this building is set within a green corridor. Which it clearly will not be, unless Camden demands that HS2 deliver on this commitment.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Anna	10/01/2023 19:41:34	OBJ	<p>This revised planning application was submitted just before Christmas and has not been advertised, giving local people very little time to comment on it.</p> <p>The proposed vent shaft headhouse seems even larger than in the original design and it's not suitable for the local area with Victorian villas.</p> <p>The construction should be smaller in size and completely screened by trees, shrubs and evergreens, so it doesn't disturb the area.</p> <p>The high density of greenery is also important to dump the noise pollution from the trains and the shaft (no data about the noise from the tunnels, vent fans, headhouse has been provided by Hs2, in spite of resident's requests).</p> <p>The brick wall in Adelaide Road that was pulled down by Hs2 should be rebuilt to its original, Victorian style, height and colour. Residents requested this many times in the past.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Richard Brearley	10/01/2023 17:35:23	OBJ	<p>I am recording my objections to the current application for approval under Schedule 17 of High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Act 2017 relating to vent shaft head-house building, and associated works as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The complex is a crude series of huge volumes stretching along Adelaide Road, cutting off the existing connectivity and long views between Adelaide Road to the north and King Henrys Road to the south.</li> <li>2. The building volumes are grossly over-scaled and without context or reference to the adjacent street architecture. The design comprises of an unrelieved and unarticulated blue/black brick base over 100mm long and 12metres high facing south onto the railway and rear gardens of houses along King Henrys Road. A simplistic box sits over the base and rises up a further 10m above. This box is finished in plain vertical grey cladding. There is neither any attempt to articulate or step the surfaces to visually reduce the scale and volume nor provide the opportunity for planting or play of shadows.</li> <li>3. The idea of linking the existing green areas to the east and west of the proposal with a vestigial 'wildlife corridor' is a feeble gesture and missed opportunity. The south facing elevation, currently proposed as plain and unadorned surfaces could be hugely improved by creating stepped sections with long planting runs and tall 'green' planted walls facing south, which would enrich and help re-wild the habitat, now decimated by the development.</li> <li>4. The application seems to been submitted without either open notification or proper consultation time being allowed. The consultation period must be extended so that all issues related to the application are address and correctly illustrated to enable further review and iterative consultation.</li> </ol> <p>In summary, the simplistic, brutal and lumpen proposal must be reduced in scale, and to include architectural detail to break up and modulate the vast areas of plain surfaces. The south facing surfaces should be created as green walls together with increased shrub planting opportunities to embed the buildings into the existing green margins and former swathe of woodland.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Jane Shorter	10/01/2023 10:19:06	COMMNT	<p>I am concerned about loss of green space and wildlife corridors, and the height of this building that looks like a massive grey box. I have heard that the artists impressions of elevations are misleading by minimising it's visual impact from the surrounding public areas, especially the bridge at The Pembroke Pub. I request more accurate information and time be given to make comment on.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Leo Smith	10/01/2023 18:39:52	OBJ	HS2 Adelaide Road Vent Shaft Planning Consultation - notes

This consultation should be extended - new drawings by HS2 have been included recently and no notification of these, or additional time added, to make the public aware and allow time to review this project.

Green-wash: the drawing supplied is not accurate, it is designed to make it look like the vent shaft is in a wooded site. Nearly all of the trees in the drawing do not exist.

HS2 say they don't want to screen the construction because they want it to be "a landmark"... "to celebrate this ground-breaking engineering project". This does not take the concerns or local people, or their non-interests in having to look at an industrial site - this is no more than using the nature reserve, of which we have very few, as HS2 propaganda, and more green-wash.

Drawings - The drawings/designs it seems are unfinished:  
 Lacking accurate visualizations from Primrose Hill streets;  
 Need feasibility studies for replacing much of the cladding, including designs more appropriate to the site - such as green walling;  
 HS2 have got rid of the wildlife corridor which is required by the HS2 Act;  
 The 'green roof' is now full of equipment; and  
 Better understanding of how lighting design will effect wildlife and impact on neighborhood.

Regarding biodiversity impact:  
 the designs (and project) are in stark contrasts with the nature reserve;  
 the wildlife corridor is now close to non-existent / non-functional;  
 Green walling, if included in the design, could include space for habitats and improve the wildlife corridor (no matter what reasons HS2 gives for not including).

Nature Reserves should not be destroyed.

Considering:

- The ever increasing climate emergency and the failure of all governments to take responsible action - to act positively in response to this;
  - HS2's Environmental Impact Assessments were extremely limited, it is know that they commit wildlife crimes, that HS2 will never be carbon neutral, that the majority (62% by their figures) of trees cut down go to Drax to be burnt;
- Here in Camden HS2 is a recognised and ongoing danger to health of the whole community, and especially those who live, work and study close to the sites; and
- Given Camden Council has declared a climate emergency - it is time Camden used its powers, and the potential that exists in the Paris Agreement, to seriously hold HS2 to account and stop helping to facilitate and green-wash the project.

Camden has a responsibility first to the health and wellbeing of the people of Camden, it should use this as the starting point for any consultation and developments.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	H Doyle	10/01/2023 23:27:12	COMMNT	<p>My comments are about the drawings, time extension, the wildlife corridor and the biodiversity impact.</p> <p>With regards to many residents noticing that HS2 have slipped in revised drawings just before Christmas, it is only right that an extension of time is granted especially as Camden Council did not advertise such revised drawings.</p> <p>Camden Council are also required to collaborate with HS2 regarding the mitigation of design to suit the Primrose Hill contextual environment but they've only negotiated about the north elevation facing Adelaide Rd. There is much to be said of the drawings presented. They look like they have been changed to make it seem that the vent shaft is within the wooded site when actually the drawings of the trees are not only fictitious but are exaggerated in size to make it look like the building doesn't need screening.</p> <p>In addition one can see from the drawings that HS2 have dismissed the Wildlife Corridor which is required by the HS2 Act. Much of the green roof has been replaced with equipment. How does this equate to improving our beautiful biodiversity? I would like therefore some accurate visualisations from Primrose Hill Streets and some feasibility studies for replacing the cladding with systems more appropriate to the site, such as Green Walling. With regards to biodiversity, Green Walling would improve the Wildlife corridor, for example you could add Bat Boxes and Swift habitats. With regards to the current drawings, if there is a security fence between the vent shaft and Camden's Nature Reserve, how will this improve the movement of wildlife? They won't be able to get through! Hence, a more appropriate system of Green Walling and Green Roofing is far more adequate. In doing so, a far more appreciated appearance that would blend into the surrounding Primrose Hill Streets would be much better received.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Phebe Robinow	10/01/2023 23:26:54	COMMNT	<p>I write to request an extension of time on this application, which I believe was not advertised as well as it should have been. The pictures of how it should look (visualisations) are misleading and should be corrected. There is a precedent to this: when the MoD wished to plonk a large building on the site of the old victorian hospital at the Regent's Park Barracks, they told residents it could not be seen because of the tree cover. It was shown to them and to Camden planners that the MoD had taken photos from above but not from the ground. The trees did not cover the view in any form. I suggest this may be the case here.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Sally Kindberg	10/01/2023 09:45:55	COMMNT	<p>The proposed building will be an unaesthetic and unwelcome replacement of green space (ie woodland etc) seen from the Primrose Hill area, especially from the bridge end of Gloucester Avenue. This will have a detrimental impact on flora and fauna currently in the Camden Nature Reserve, and to those visiting the Nature Reserve, and of course on any visitors coming to Primrose Hill</p>