

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Beth Noakes	06/02/2023 20:03:13	OBJ	<p>The brutalist Adelaide Road Vent Shaft Headhouse, with machinery replacing the promised green roof, will be visible to thousands of people from a tourist route on the painted bridge. Though HS2's stated design objective is that it is "integrated in the landscape", they clearly don't want it hidden in any way or camouflaged to make it blend in better.</p> <p>HS2 have tried to undermine Camden's arguments for mitigation by showing fictitious and grossly exaggerated trees close to the building on their elevations to pretend that it will be well "integrated in the landscape" and suggesting falsely that the green corridor (that the HS2 Act requires HS2 to provide between the building and the existing railway) is possible.</p> <p>Views from and of the painted bridge feature as two of the "significant views" in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement and the brutalist Vent Shaft Head-house will replace the woodland backdrop.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Behar Loshi	08/02/2023 19:40:32	COMMNT	<p>Well I don't think that the vent shaft is integrate in the landscape as HS2 pretend, it sticks out oddly. It needs screening by trees and greenery</p> <p>And also it needs a green corridor passage for animal crossing</p> <p>Also it needs blending in with houses and nature reserve</p>
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:24	COMMNT	<p>This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:26	COMMNT	<p>This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:29	COMMNT	<p>This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:32	COMMNT	<p>This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:35	COMMNT	<p>This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:38	COMMNT	<p>This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:40	COMMNT	<p>This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:43	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:46	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:49	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:51	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:54	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:57	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:59	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:19:02	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:19:04	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:19:07	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:19:10	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:19:12	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:19:15	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:19:18	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:19:21	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:19:24	COMMNT	This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.
2022/1680/HS2	Grace Edghill	06/02/2023 12:44:39	OBJ	<p>I remain concernd that the enormous visual impact on the public and on homes on all sides of this gigantic prominent engineering structure (including the replacement of a significant wooded landscape feature by a large building) has not been adequately mitigated and will be a visual disaster for Primrose Hill and the amenity of the area.</p> <p>The proposed design does not integrate well into the local natural or built environment and the proposed landscaping does not adequately mitigate the visual impact on the surrounding area. As a bare minimum, better landscaping and a green wall is required.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Delancey Street Residents Association	06/02/2023 12:44:47	OBJ	<p>As Chair of Delancey Street Residents Association, I would like to object to the current design and plan for the Head House in Adelaide Road. Located next to a nature reserve, in close proximity to Primrose Hill and the surrounding listed housing, the current design is completely out of keeping with it's large scale bulky design. It will be seen from various vantage points and will create an eye sore for local residents and the environment. Primrose Hill is a wonderful preserved green space for all to enjoy - and the Head House will be a blot on the landscape.</p> <p>We believe there are not enough migrating measures in place to reduce the impact this Head House will have.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Leo Smith	06/02/2023 20:14:57	OBJ	<p>Further to my previous response to this planning application, and also in light of the recent uncertainties raised about the HS2 and the possibility that it will not reach Camden/Euston for at least 15 years and possibly never:</p> <p>Firstly - the designs of the vent shaft are in no way connected to, made in relation to, or in response to the local area - it is excessive and unsightly. It seems to want to be an architectural feature where previously it was woodland - any design should aim to be both sympathetic to the sites past and in keeping with the locality, this is neither.</p> <p>The designs fail to give a realistic sense of what is to come, visualizations should also include what those who live and work locally will actually see and be able to see.</p> <p>Although this project has been agreed under the HS2 Act (2017), the Leeds section has now been cancelled, and thus it is possible to reconsider and change direction. It is time the whole project was halted and reconsidered, given, as noted above, it is not even certain the project will come to Euston. Taking into consideration the climate emergency and the HS2 projects negative impact on this, it is time all projects should be considered and reconsidered based upon environmental impact, community health and climate change.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Lillian Shapiro	05/02/2023 18:09:06	OBJ	<p>The proposed vent shaft building is very brutalist and ugly, completely out of keeping with Primrose Hill. I cannot believe that it can be allowed. It is bad enough that we have had to suffer years of traffic inconvenience and building noise, then to end up with such an eyesore is depressing in the extreme. Please do not allow this.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Caroline Cooper	05/02/2023 21:17:49	OBJ	<p>I am appalled by this crude brutalist box which pays NO attention to the Victorian houses along Adelaide Road. I've seen a sensitive design (Grimshaw?) for a ventilation shaft etc. in the Chilterns which cleverly looks like a set of old farm buildings. Why can our area not also have something which makes an effort to blend into its surroundings?</p> <p>As for compensating for the loss of the nature reserve: shading etc will make it impossible for any decently large trees to grow around your ugly concrete construction, and I suspect that your illustrations are misleading. The very least you can do (assuming it is, sadly, too late to redesign the whole thing) is camouflage/disguise/shade it with as much green planting as possible. Thank you.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Dorothy Marden	05/02/2023 21:20:32	OBJ	<p>This building is completely out of scale with Primrose Hill, is visible from the bridge and from residents on the south side of the railway, and is right next to our nature reserve. At the very least it should have green walls, there seems to be no space as a wildlife corridor below it. Will it be floodlit at night, causing light pollution for humans and wildlife?</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Dorothy Marden	05/02/2023 21:20:49	OBJ	<p>This building is completely out of scale with Primrose Hill, is visible from the bridge and from residents on the south side of the railway, and is right next to our nature reserve. At the very least it should have green walls, there seems to be no space as a wildlife corridor below it. Will it be floodlit at night, causing light pollution for humans and wildlife?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Mary Burd	06/02/2023 11:09:07	OBJ	<p>I wish too register concern that the enormous visual impact this building will have on the public and on homes on all sides of this gigantic prominent engineering structure The building is s not integrated in the landscape it is too large and needs to be screened with vegetation on all sides. It also bears no relation to the local context and will enormously impact the views from all the surrounding streets and homes. Many more (accurate) visualizations are needed which show its impact been adequately mitigated.</p> <p>It is a totally overstated, inappropriate landmark out of scale for Primrose Hill will be an eye for all who love this area. Please reject this application and request a much more visually sensitive approach as well as asking for the replacement of a significant amount of woodland.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Mary Burd Chair ASNRA	06/02/2023 11:49:09	OBJ	<p>I write as Chair of Albert Street North Residents Association which represents over 50 households in the North End of Albert Street between Parkway and Delancey Street. Primrose Hill is a much loved landmark and frequent destination for leisure activities for many residents who feel that the proposed building of the head house which is sited next to a nature reserve will have a detrimental effect not only on those living in the immediate surrounding are but all those who travel about the area from Adelaide Road to Camden Town. In particular we object to</p> <p>The enormous size and neo brutalist design of the head house which is not integrated and does not fit in with the surrounding architecture including the red brick walls. It is a visual disaster for Primrose Hill and will be seen from many local vantage points. The suggested planting as seen in the accompanying pictures to mitigate the effects appears to be extremely low quality landscaping. It should be properly biodiverse/ ecological/ and contain good tree species etc We would urge Camden to oppose this current design and proposed very poor landscape screening. It should insist on better quality cladding, vegetation including a green wall which will completely surround the building. Primrose Hill and the surrounding area is an outstanding, iconic landmark within LBC. Please do all you can to protect it from this completely inappropriate aberration.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Helen Janecek	05/02/2023 17:30:30	OBJ	<p>The proposed vent shaft headhouse building would be visible from both sides of the track and would be an eyesore, totally out of keeping with its surroundings. Because it would be so tall, the style of architecture needs to be in keeping with surrounding buildings - mostly residential - rather than a railway yard.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	patricia callaghan	06/02/2023 10:18:21	COMMNT	<p>This will be a complete eyesore for Primrose Hill and Chalk Farm. HS2 need to honour their promises and have green walls which are maintained regularly. they need to concentrate on making it fit in with the surrounding nature reserve.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Jeff Travers	06/02/2023 23:30:44	AMEND	<p>"The creation of a green corridor to the south of the headhouse building to maintain ecological connectivity between LNR and the woodland habitat to the east" is understood to be a requirement of the HS2 Act but is clearly not adequately provided in the submitted proposal... It is currently shown as a narrow gap between building and high security fence.. not much wider than a paving slab, below an overhang.. and compromised by a service access door.</p> <p>Section 6 of the Design and Access Statement says that the remedy (and required compliance with the Act) will not be provided within the Scheduled Work but will merely be an "opportunity" for third parties and in the future. And they note that NR may convert their tracks adjacent to the headhouse as a green corridor for ecological connectivity. This was shown on HS2's drawings before the Bill.. which they presented to Camden. (And I have the presentation (and even presented this to ECRG in 2019).. ie by extending the embankment over NR's disused up-empty carriage line at the foot of the NR retaining wall). But this does not fulfill HS2's current obligation to comply with the HS2 Act via its scheduled work and deliver an adequate fully functional "green corridor".</p> <p>I have discussed this with both Adelaide Nature Reserve Association (who manage the adjacent Local Nature Reserve (LNR) at one end of the green corridor) and Camden Railway Heritage Trust (who promote Camden's railway heritage and particularly the historic railway assets in the cutting adjacent to the head house and the famous listed tunnel portal). Managed access rights for Camden (on behalf of these two organisations) to the green corridor and HS2's restored embankment would mitigate the current inadequate proposal for the green corridor by intensified Nature Conservation management. And HS2's No Net Loss of Biodiversity CoP states explicitly that such liaison (eg to affect this) can measurably uplift a sites biodiversity value.</p> <p>It appears likely that provision for this can be accommodated within the current proposals with almost no material (functional) change.</p> <p>The only change that I would advise would be to move the currently proposed service door at the east end of the south wall (within the green corridor) round the corner (on to the east wall).</p> <p>This would enable the high blank south wall to have the security function (without the current service door opening onto the green corridor).. and the green corridor to have an exclusively ecological function... whereas the currently proposed service access door will undermine (and at times even destroy) its ecological connectivity. The function of the currently proposed south security fence (that the current drawings locate on the inside face of the NR retaining wall) would be that of a safety barrier to prevent falls over the parapet of the retaining wall.</p> <p>The fence is not shown on the elevations or illustrated elevations or visualizations.. and if shown on drawings, the problematic appearance of the headhouse would be even worse. Installing a safety barrier on the south fence line instead of a high security fence will greatly reduce adverse impact on the appearance of the headhouse.</p> <p>It will also permit views out towards the historic Portals (which are not currently possible) for photographs etc. And the proposed earthworks could be very simply adjusted to create a viewing platform to accommodate a small group of people for Camden Railway Heritage Trust near the safety barrier. This might even create a viewpoint from which photos could capture this prominent HS2 headhouse in front of (and framing) the historic</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				portal in the background.  An accurate computer visualization from this viewpoint would confirm such a relationship and enable appropriate headhouse design ... which a number of Community Representatives have identified to ECRG as crucial regarding the remit that the Government's published guidance re Schedule 17 assigns to Camden .. namely to ensure the headhouse is appropriate to its local context. And I note that Schedule 17 bestows some importance to the historic nature of sites
2022/1680/HS2	Tom Symes for the Belsize Society	08/02/2023 17:26:02	OBJ	<p>The Belsize Society is the Residents Association for Belsize Park, which is in close proximity to the proposed works, and many of our members have indicated that they have serious concerns about the current proposals.</p> <p>The vast bulk of the structure will cause damage to the designated heritage asset of the listed Primrose Hill railway tunnels. There seems to be no attempt being made to avoid or to mitigate this harm, contrary to NPPF requirements applying to designated heritage assets.</p> <p>The amended proposals have removed many of the environmental protections and enhancements that were proposed and approved. For example the green roof is now gone. The drawings present a misleading appearance since the trees shown will not exist at that size for many, many years.</p> <p>The HS2 team should be required to do better. These proposals are not good enough to allow for the integration of this massive new infrastructure project in a sensitive area.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Carla	08/02/2023 12:24:08	COMMNT	<p>How is it possible the 100s of trees have been chopped down when climate change was brought so close to us last summer. It seems that local communities are not being heard or listened to while corporate interests are worshipped . It's something we are all good to pay dearly for and future generations . It's sad and very concerning</p> <p>Please consider the wealth of knowledge and wisdom from our community</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Jeff Travers	06/02/2023 21:17:36	AMEND	<p>The creation of a green corridor to the south of the headhouse building to maintain ecological connectivity between LNR and the woodland habitat to the east" is understood to be a requirement of the HS2 Act but is clearly not adequately provided in the submitted proposal... It is currently shown as a narrow gap between building and high security fence.. not much wider than a paving slab, below an overhang.. and compromised by a service access door.</p> <p>Section 6 of the Design and Access Statement says that the remedy (and required compliance with the Act) will not be provided within the Scheduled Work but will merely be an "opportunity" for third parties and in the future. And they note that NR may convert their tracks adjacent to the headhouse as a green corridor for ecological connectivity. This was shown on HS2's drawings before the Bill.. which they presented to Camden. (And I have the presentation (and even presented this to ECRG in 2019).. ie by extending the embankment over NR's disused up-empty carriage line at the foot of the NR retaining wall). But this does not fulfill HS2's current obligation to comply with the HS2 Act via its scheduled work.</p> <p>I have discussed this with both Adelaide Nature Reserve Association (who manage the adjacent Local Nature Reserve (LNR) at one end of the green corridor) and Camden Railway Heritage Trust (who promote Camden's railway heritage and particularly the historic railway assets in the cutting adjacent to the head house and the famous listed tunnel portal). Managed access rights for Camden (on behalf of these two organisations) to the green corridor and HS2's restored embankment would mitigate the current inadequate proposal for the green corridor by intensified Nature Conservation management. And HS2's No Net Loss of Biodiversity CoP states explicitly that such liaison (eg to affect this) can measurably uplift a sites biodiversity value.</p> <p>It appears likely that provision for this can be accommodated within the current proposals with almost no material (functional change). The only change that I would advise would be to move the currently proposed service door at the east end of the south wall (within the green corridor) round the corner (on to the east wall).</p> <p>This would enable the high blank south wall to have the security function (without the current door opening onto the green corridor).. and the green corridor to have an exclusively ecological function... whereas the currently proposed service access door will undermine (and at times even destroy) its ecological connectivity. The function of the currently proposed south security fence (that the current drawings locate on the inside face of the NR retaining wall) would be that of a safety barrier to prevent falls over the parapet of the retaining wall.</p> <p>The fence is not shown on the elevations or illustrated elevations or visualizations.. and if shown on drawings, the problematic appearance of the headhouse would be even worse. Installing a safety barrier on the south fence line instead of a high security fence will greatly reduce adverse impact on the appearance of the headhouse.</p> <p>It will also permit views out towards the historic Portals (which are not currently possible) for photographs etc. And the proposed earthworks could be very simply adjusted to create a viewing platform to accommodate a small group of people for Camden Railway Heritage Trust near the safety barrier. This might even create a viewpoint from which photos could capture this prominent HS2 headhouse in front of (and framing) the historic portal in the background.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>An accurate computer visualization from this viewpoint would confirm such a relationship and enable appropriate headhouse design ... which a number of Community Representatives have identified to ECRG as crucial regarding the remit that the Government's published guidance re Schedule 17 assigns to Camden .. namely to ensure the headhouse is appropriate to its local context. And I note that Schedule 17 bestows some importance to the historic importance of sites.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	R J Percival	08/02/2023 20:19:06	COMMNT	<p>1) The scale of the building is very different from what was shown initially - by a factor of 3-5.  2) The proposed 24-hour lighting is inappropriate because it sits prominently on the edges of two residential areas.  3) The PH Conservation Area Statement draws attention to the significance of views around the "Iron Bridge".  4) The "iron bridge" is PH's principal gateway, and the railway is the moat that protects PH from the outside world. The street plan of PH is even reminiscent of some planned mediaeval cities with the circuit of RPRoad and Gloucs Ave like the boulevards that replaced the fortifications!  5) Camden has, I believe, previously required "organic" green walling for the earlier Synagogue application for the same site. There is therefore a precedent for requiring organic mitigation on this site.  6) This recognises the significance of the site to the Primrose Hill CA.  6) The headhouse will be clearly visible from the east (evens) side pavement of GA from the south side of the Pembroke right through onto King Henry's Road. It will be the dominant feature on the skyline, obliterating the memory of the previous landscape of italianate villas climbing up Adelaide Road through wooded grounds. This was a picturesque view wholly different from the formal terracing (including some in Gloucester Avenue of the even more formal "palace-fronted" type) of the PH side. To me, the climb up to the bridge, the opening out of the streetscape out into the irregular "square" at the foot of the PH side of the bridge, the noise of trains, the width of the railway as a sort of "Dry moat" separating the "island", as some call PH, from the wider world. It marks a transition in the nature of the landscape into something much more natural. The "Betonklotz" of HS2 does not belong here, gatecrashing this sensitive point. It is rude, insensitive, and ill-educated.  7) Frank Lloyd Wright had wise words to say to architects: "A physician can bury his mistakes: an architect can only recommend to his clients that they plant vines."  Please make them follow his advice!</p>
2022/1680/HS2	E Sturdy	04/02/2023 17:08:21	OBJ	<p>The building proposed will be anomalous and ugly. It will be visible along King Henry's Road, Adelaide Road and from the Primrose Hill Railway Bridge. These are used by hundreds of residents and thousands of visitors. The style and construction of the building should be disguised as much as possible with green screening and suitable colours. The provision of misleading drawings that show inaccurate heights for surrounding buildings and trees that will not be permitted are unprofessional as well as creating a false impression. Camden Council must be allowed to consult again once the building is complete so that mitigation can be sensibly developed in reality rather than using inaccurate artistically false drawings.</p>
2022/1680/HS2	celia hoyles	05/02/2023 16:33:02	OBJ	<p>HS2 construction is already disrupting life in Primrose Hill but the plans for HS2's Adelaide Vent Shaft Headhouse have left us in despair.</p> <p>it is completely out of scale and context. we object strongly to how this unique area is being ruined.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Juliet	05/02/2023 16:35:58	COMMNT	I think that this is totally out of proportion with the surrounding residential area. It has no aesthetic merit but is just dumped down to ease HS2 with their problem if problem it is. If it has to be placed in this position then it definitely needs to be better landscaped/camouflaged. It is a blot on the area.I cant see that the little patches of green on the illustration will thrive at all. The Adelaide nature reserve was an oasis of calm and greenery in a built up area which is all but destroyed. HS2 are making life in Camden hell for many residents and this is just another instance of it.
2022/1680/HS2	Elisabeth Scheder-Bieschin	06/02/2023 11:27:41	APP	I live on King Henry's Road opposite the HS2 vent shaft. I am concerned about the landscaping. So far many trees have been removed - will they be replanted? Looking at the plans - the vent shaft looks enormous and visually not at all at ease in this area. I would like to suggest that trees will be replanted in order to lessen the visual impact of this rather brutal building. If I remember correctly HS2's original concept drawing showed a large green corridor planted with trees supplemented by a green roof. But the latest planning drawings replace most of the green roof with engineering equipment.
2022/1680/HS2	Kathleen J Conn	06/02/2023 17:37:02	COMMNT	I am writing to register deep concern at the impact this engineering structure will have on the streets and housing in the vicinity. It replaces a wooded landscape and amounts to an eyesore, visual pollution. At minimum it needs to be screened by vegetation, a living wall such as can be seen in other parts of Camden. I was of the understanding that under the HS2 Act, there is a requirement that a green corridor be provided. The plans give no evidence of this. We are in a climate and ecological crisis, air quality in Camden is often toxic, wooded area must be replaced with vegetation to mitigate the loss.
2022/1680/HS2	Kathleen J Conn	06/02/2023 17:37:06	COMMNT	I am writing to register deep concern at the impact this engineering structure will have on the streets and housing in the vicinity. It replaces a wooded landscape and amounts to an eyesore, visual pollution. At minimum it needs to be screened by vegetation, a living wall such as can be seen in other parts of Camden. I was of the understanding that under the HS2 Act, there is a requirement that a green corridor be provided. The plans give no evidence of this. We are in a climate and ecological crisis, air quality in Camden is often toxic, wooded area must be replaced with vegetation to mitigate the loss.
2022/1680/HS2	Catharine Nell Butler	06/02/2023 10:56:03	COMMNT	Hi there, I live on King Henry's Road and I'm concerned about the ventilation shaft for HS2. I appreciate there has to be a ventilation shaft but it's a real eyesore. In this day and age there are loads of clever ways to make industrial units blend in better with their environment. Surely the designers can do something more sympathetic than this?? It can't be difficult to put greenery on the building/around the building/obscuring the building better? What about those "growing walls" or some terracing to soften it up? I appreciate everyone's trying hard, but this is sub par in terms of effort. MORE TREES PLEASE!!!
2022/1680/HS2	carole cox	05/02/2023 17:11:32	COMMNT	The proposed vent shaft building is quite out of order ..and unsuitable for this area. A huge square eyesore it should be screened with vegetation on all sides

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Nadia Crandall	05/02/2023 15:53:05	OBJ	I'm writing to lodge my objection to this appalling and intrusive structure. Despite promises to the contrary, the Adelaide Nature reserve and the green walling have not been adequately designed. The building is a visual disaster, totally out of keeping with a quiet, low-build, pretty residential area. The only proper or possible mitigation is extensive screening with vegetation on all sides.
2022/1680/HS2	anthony hallgarten	05/02/2023 16:29:47	COMMNT	Looks absolutely horrible -- but mihght be marginally better with substantial greenery to soften it
2022/1680/HS2	Catharine Nell Butler	06/02/2023 10:56:07	COMMNT	Hi there, I live on King Henry's Road and I'm concerned about the ventilation shaft for HS2. I appreciate there has to be a ventilation shaft but it's a real eyesore. In this day and age there are loads of clever ways to make industrial units blend in better with their environment. Surely the designers can do something more sympathetic than this?? It can't be difficult to put greenery on the building/around the building/obscuring the building better? What about those "growing walls" or some terracing to soften it up? I appreciate everyone's trying hard, but this is sub par in terms of effort. MORE TREES PLEASE!!!
2022/1680/HS2	Grace Edghill	06/02/2023 12:48:59	OBJ	I remain concernd that the enormous visual impact on the public and on homes on all sides of this gigantic prominent engineering structure (including the replacement of a significant wooded landscape feature by a large building) has not been adequately mitigated and will be a visual disaster for Primrose Hill and the amenity of the area.  The proposed design does not integrate well into the local natural or built environment and the proposed landscaping does not adequately mitigate the visual impact on the surrounding area. At minimum, better landscaping and a green wall is required.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Jeff Travers	06/02/2023 23:14:29	OBJ	<p>1 Camden have confirmed to me that Camden will take note of consultation comments received after 6th February (ie up to the determination time)</p> <p>2 Camden have confirmed in writing to me they will look into my concern about HS2's false denial of the visual impact of the head house on Primrose Hill which HS2's Lead architect publicly denied at ECRG in September (by saying the headhouse will not be visible from the Regents Park Road bridge).</p> <p>3 I should note that views from and of the bridge are two of the six "significant views" listed for sub-area 3 (which includes the main tourist route) in Camden's Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement. The nature reserve woodland that HS2 have removed made a significant contribution to the quality of these views.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bridge approach and Regents Park Road (view South across railway bridge towards the Conservation Area and the intersection of Gloucester Avenue, Regents Park Road and King Henry's Road).</li> <li>- Regents Park Road (View north of the railway bridge)</li> </ul> <p>It also should be remembered that to many local people the woodland view (of the 500 plus trees that HS2 have removed) was more than just picturesque green backdrop.. or rather.. part of its significant aesthetic value was its visual meaning as one of Camden's few designated nature reserves (ie wild places)... it psychologically represented (and served as) a major green lung.. (with much greater benefit to air quality than the small mostly ornamental replacement street trees of HS2's Assurance) and it also reassured people of their place in nature and that biodiversity is sustainable in Camden.. so residents knew that many of the birds and bats that fly around the local area (eg Primrose Hill and Belsize Park) nested and roosted there. HS2's D&amp;A Statement Section 6 notes that replacement can be carried out as an opportunity for thirds loss</p> <p>At the ECRG meeting last September, HS2 justified their current gigantic (supposedly functional) headhouse style (which they call "revealing the machine" .. "to celebrate this outstanding infrastructure project") as being an appropriate style for the existing railway estate... (but admitted it was not appropriate to Primrose Hill public spaces, from where they incorrectly contended it wouldn't be visible)... So .. if their requested accurate visualizations from the bridge prove them wrong (ie prove that it is visible), Camden must insist on adjustments to the submitted drawings and documents to mitigate such railway impacts ... to ensure the headhouse's appearance is appropriate to Primrose Hill... eg by screening a lot of the structure and reducing its visual impact</p> <p>I have just been advised that Camden have now asked SCS to produce visualizations from Regents Park Road Bridge to check the impact of the headhouse on Primrose Hill Conservation Area.</p> <p>There is a question mark about the accuracy of HS2's evidence... eg last September after I persuaded HS2 to explain their design concept of "revealing the machine" to ECRG as an action item.... I was surprised that their Lead Architect gave such importance to explaining that the vent shaft could not be seen from the bridge (and Primrose Hill). He played down the currently proposed gigantic size (compared with the low screened building "embedded in the landscape" in the original concept sketch fig 38 on page 45 of the D&amp;A Statement) and even had the foresight to bring along two photos of the bridge (extra to the previously issued meeting presentations) and he (falsely) claimed his bridge photos supported his contention that it would not be visible. So in response (at the November ECRG meeting), I tabled my own visualization demonstrating the immense visual impact on the view from the bridge to support the (minuted) demand that HS2 correct their false assertion at the next ECRG meeting and mitigate the visual impact.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

HS2's denial of visual impact is particularly ironic because the vent shaft will be so prominent from the bridge that HS2 have said it is explicitly intended as "sculpture". So the famous view from the bridge is the obvious location from which HS2 will take its PR photos for the new railway for which the head house will be the only freestanding architecture in Central London.

And I know from my rail design work (HS1 etc) that brand design sets the design priorities... in order to sell train tickets.

I feel that I need to draw to your attention to the following two issues to ask you to look into other missing and incorrect information in the planning submission...

A) as well as the absence (from the Schedule 17 submission) of visualizations from the bridge... visualizations from other viewpoints in Primrose Hill are also lacking

B) several of SCS's submitted drawings that show mitigation (labelled "for information") are intentionally inaccurate... so as to falsely suggest that more mitigation isn't needed.. eg the revised illustrated elevations show many trees in close proximity to the building which appear to screen it and integrate it into the landscape with a green corridor... when in reality the trees are fictitious (impossible, greatly exaggerated in size, or in the far distance). Some trees are in the middle of the railway cutting. Others are in the treeless zone of the graded embankment planting that (SCS have explained to ECRG) NR insist must exclude trees close to their existing retaining wall. Also at EGRG, HS2's Lead Architect described the row of giant ornamental trees screening the building from Adelaide Road as being "unrealistic".

To help Camden check the accuracy of the visualization from the bridge (that you have required SCS to produce), I have previously emailed Camden's Case Officer (for inclusion with my consultation comments) my visualizations of the headhouse impact from three viewpoints on and near the bridge (together with their geometric basis.. in plan and section). I also include the submitted SCS revised illustrated elevations ("for information") which I have annotated to show the false SCS information (ie where the mitigation has been fiddled to pretend the building can be integrated into the landscape... It clearly needs much more mitigation to achieve this required integration).

The faking of the trees and vegetation also maintains HS2's pretence of the "green corridor" for "ecological connectivity" .. which is a statutory requirement. I'm assuming that pursuing this statutory "green corridor" falls outside the remit of the current Schedule 17 determination.

HS2's previous public pledges to improve the site's biodiversity are impossible to fulfill and not required by the Act which allows the offsetting of Camden's biodiversity loss elsewhere in the country)... but I understand that the provision of a "green corridor" is required comply with the HS2 Act. I note that section 6 of the D&A Statement states the current submission's lack of an adequate effective green corridor may be remedied in future as an opportunity by third parties and is outside scheduled works. This is entirely inadequate. The Act makes it clear that needs to be scheduled work.

From Camden's Pre-app meeting minutes with HS2 and SCS... which I have obtained via FOI, I understand that Camden requested visualisations and mitigation several times but SCS repeatedly rebuffed these requests (using blatantly spurious and vague general reasons).

Underpinning this rebuff is SCS's repeatedly stated intention that the building must express a (functionalist)

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

design ideology ... and "integrate" this within the restored landscape. But they assert this landscape should be "ornamental".. ie presumably a geometric style of landscape to emphasize the supposed "functional" boxiness of the building . But I note that Camden rebuffed this saying that the restored landscape must be natural and consist of native species... ie not ornamentals.

Notwithstanding this, the current submission shows the restored landscape inside the Adelaide Road boundary is a long row of giant fastigiate ornamental trees .. a formal geometric statement in front of the gigantic blank facade which is unacceptable

I'm concerned that Camden may accept the false reasoning of SCS's high-level rebuttals of Camden's mitigation requests and also Camden will be unable to provide SCS with the specific detailed design alternatives that SCS say they need (from Camden) to make them change their design further. So to help Camden negotiate mitigation appropriate to the local context.. I give you the following information regarding

- i) the extra accurate visualizations that are needed to identify impact compared with the same views before. And for accuracy the security fences (which are only shown as a line in plan and section) need to be shown. (for information)
- ii) the mitigation to offset adverse visual impact revealed by the visualizations
- iii) the debunking of SCS's functionalist style objectives and constraints.. which is essentially about essentially brand image (to promote the rail-line)

In more detail (to be useful to Camden)

i).. Visualizations are also needed from the following viewpoints...

- a) King Henry's Road homes overlooking the railway. Section 6.5 of the submitted Design and Access Statement titled "Urban Integration Opportunities"..states SCS's objective is "mitigating and enhancing views from residential properties".. Views from King Henry's Road homes are specifically identified on the diagram. Should SCS require access for photography I can arrange. Photos of the woodland nature reserve prior to clearance are also available.
- b) King Henry's Road street .. the gaps between houses and 120 metres of unobscured view at the east end (eg the view approaching the bridge impacts a major public space of international standing).
- c) Blashford Tower: yesterday I checked the view of Blashford looking up from the east boundary of the Nature Reserve.. and I can testify that almost every flat on the east and south side are in full view of the head house and vent stacks.
- d) Adelaide Local Nature Reserve... I note that the Pre-app meeting minutes record that SCS rebuffed Camden's request for green walls to the west elevations of the vent stacks facing the Local Nature Reserve by saying that there is no visual impact because nobody visits the LNR. I endorse Camden's rebuttal of this and can testify that on Sunday about 50 people visited the LNR. And it is only NR's current use of the LNR for access plus a dangerous wall (that I reported and has since been made safe) that has temporarily prevented use of the LNR for school nature visits
- e) The homes in Nos 68-78 Adelaide Road... these homes are identified on the diagram in section 6.5 of the D&A Statement noted above.... the visualizations need to pay particular attention to accurate views of the few

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

remaining patches of green roof planting and the many pieces of engineering equipment (that have just been relocated to the roof)... viewed from the top floor flats. Regarding the equipment.. I note that SCS are recorded in Camden's pre-app minutes as saying that Camden have no control over their roof equipment. This seems unlikely in this instance because the purpose of the headhouse is to house such engineering equipment. So for SCS to intentionally relocate much of the equipment outside the Headhouse (without any housing) to avoid control and mitigation... cannot be authorized by the Act.. And any housing or screening must be under LA planning control. No equipment was shown on the roof on previous drawings.

Such equipment clearly needs to be housed.. eg for noise insulation. The raised parapet appears to have no function.. it is not an effective noise insulation measure. It also hides roof vegetation and unnecessarily exaggerates the height of the building on all sides. A stainless steel handrail set back from the parapet would suffice.

ii) Mitigation ... Camden have requested several times... 'green walling'.. particularly cable supported green walling....But in the pre-app meetings SCS repeatedly dismissed this request using general, 'high-level' arguments. And SCS challenge Camden to prove feasible alternative mitigation. But without a full knowledge of SCS's design constraints Camden can't provide this. Camden can however require low level feasibility information.. eg initially about particular areas... eg the east and west facing walls and cladding. I go into this in more detail below.

SCS's dismissals of green-walling are incorrect however. They have said that it is not feasible because it will prevent maintenance operations and undermine warranties.. and by this they must mean particularly that the warranty on the timber cladding is the issue... (it being obviously out of the question to install green-walling over doors, windows and vent grilles).

Despite SCS proclaiming the building to be an expression of function... the timber cladding to the upper parts of the building is not a functional requirement .. It is decorative (as explained below) and it may not be desirable behind green walling (in the particular areas where green walling is feasible). Another type of cladding (to timber) that has no warranty issues would clearly be a feasible alternative.. enabling it to be screened by climbing plants.

My previous experience is of designing advanced timber clad buildings in conjunction with TRADA.

I can advise that untreated timber cladding need not have warranty problems in conjunction with green walling at all.

Such timber cladding will not need maintenance access for 50 years.. ie it does not need periodic coating etc. I suggest Brimstone (heat) treated UK ash or sycamore or poplar (heartwood) which will quickly weather naturally to shades of light grey. A mixture of all three with varied sized sections (but predominately ash) would appropriately echo the species that SCS have cut down in the nature reserve (predominantly ash). Camden could fact-check this with Vastern Timber.(01793676784) who TRADA recommend.

The only maintenance that might be required would in fact be to the green walling panels.. ie trimming vegetation etc. And obviously it's absurd to suggest that green walling prevents maintenance to itself.

I note that mixing the species and sizes of the vertical timbers could create the variation that Camden say they seek... particular if broken by green columns of vegetation and green panels of different widths and species. SCS's mention of maintenance issues (as relevant to Camden's mitigation requests) requires such issues to be resolved for this determination.. particularly building maintenance vs nature conservation management. For example ... what is the respective scope of these? Building maintenance will be required but nature

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

conservation is a statutory requirement too. So for example... are chemical weed killers to be used to clear paving in the green corridor... which is barely wide enough for maintenance access.. and certainly too narrow for a ladder? If ivy grows up the walls and security fencing.. will building maintenance contractors remove it? The Independent Design Panel suggested bat boxes be installed on the facades.. would these be maintained as building maintenance or nature conservation? Particularly HS2's 'No Net Loss in Biodiversity' CoP requires nature conservation management principles for sites to be established with the local authority... and as a consequence of SCS raising maintenance issues as relevant criteria to the feasibility of mitigation.. this can't be left to to be resolved at the 'bringing into use' Schedule 17 submission in years hence.

iii).. Debunking HS2's Fake Functionalism.. SCS's distinction between "functional" and "ornamental" stylistic elements of building and landscape and its validity to the SCS objective of "integration" of the headhouse into the landscape.

The pre-app minutes record that SCS argue that their design is a purely functional expression of their engineering and their perforated cladding expresses the vent shaft's air-flow.. in a manner similar to the approved LUL vent shaft in Euston (aka the sugar cube). I know however that this functional expression is completely fake. The Euston vent shaft's perforated facade hides a substation and a staff rest room .. and is not part of the tube ventilation system. The vent duct itself is a very small vertical duct in one corner that terminates on the roof without requiring perforated walling. Similarly the tunnel ventilation plant at Adelaide Road is below the carpark and enclosed in solid brickwork. The tunnel ventilation is via the separate vent stacks of solid brickwork with metal vent grilles. I'm told that the allegedly perforated vertical timber slats of the headhouse are not functional at all but are a purely decorative rainscreen. Any secondary ventilation (eg to ventilate spaces) is via metal vent grilles. So the advertised 'functionality' of the timber slats is fake. And SCS argued that this fakery be extended into the landscape.

The pre-app minutes record that SCS argued to Camden that the restored embankment landscape should be made "ornamental" in order to "integrate" it with their boxy neo-brutalist (so-called) "functional" building forms (as noted above). Ie as an extension of the neo-brutalist geometry. But Camden rebutted this to say the landscape would be natural... not ornamental.

Therefore if the building is to be integrated into the natural re-landscaping.. then the building cladding itself must be the subject of mitigation.. to reduce its apparent boxiness and exaggerated scale by introducing smaller scale natural features like green wall screening that mediate the functional expression of the building's purpose (eg the metal vent grilles) with the natural landscape. Otherwise the building won't be integrated but will stick out like a sore thumb (as per the current birds eye view visualization) . And Camden will have grounds to reject this application.

In order for Camden to understand the scope for mitigating the current facade design... and discuss the feasibility of mitigation details... Camden need to request that SCS provide drawings that identify (exactly) all the areas of solid external wall in each facade... and the (exact) minimum extent of all the openings that are visible (eg doors and windows) as well as those that may be concealed behind vent grilles, timber cladding and lightweight panels.

SCS also need to provide drawings that identify where the overhanging cladding and vent grilles are functionally necessary and where the overhang is just for effect. Similarly the roof parapet.. eg although a 1 metre high safety rail may be needed (eg set well back from the facade)... most of the current parapet cannot be functional.



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Peter Darley	05/02/2023 10:03:00	OBJ	There has been no consultation with HS2 despite the interest of Camden Railway Heritage Trust in creating a viewing platform for the Primrose Hill Tunnel East Portals (Grade 2*). The proposed brutality and size of the vent shaft will not only make such a viewing platform less accessible, by virtue of the lack of an adequate green corridor along the railway side, but demean and damage the finest buildings in Primrose Hill. Obscuring the presence of the vent shaft by blending it into the surrounding green space is the very least that HS2 should do. To treat it as a piece of industrial architecture that the community can celebrate as an icon for the new railway is to treat the community in the only way that HS2 knows - to ignore it.
2022/1680/HS2	Stephen Coates	06/02/2023 16:02:04	INT	I am extremely disheartened by the scale and massing of the monolithic HS2 headhouse building on Adelaide Road. It's an eyesore, particularly from the trackside view and out of scale to any other local building. Having look at the developers planning documents I feel they are not showing fair comparisons e.g. in Part 1 of the Design and Access Statement [fig 30. p37] the 'before' viewpoint shows the site already cleared to the ground of the established trees that previously stood on the site. Especially at a time when Camden's air quality is under scrutiny, the planting proposal in no way mitigates the loss of this woodland and it's function as both wildlife habitat and 'city lung'. Please Camden, urge HS2 to introduce green-walling and reduce the footprint and height of this ugly building. Our view from King Henry's Road across the tracks to this intimidating, uninterrupted multi-storey grey slab will simply be depressing & as it will be for all the many visitors and tourists to the park at Primrose Hill. Many of these people pass along King Henry's Road from where there will be clear views of the development from between each of the widely spaced semi-detached houses.
2022/1680/HS2	Lucy Kelsey	08/02/2023 08:49:22	OBJ	There's been a massive loss of vegetation on this site - such a big piece of infrastructure has a large impact on the neighbourhood and lost vegetation must be replaced effectively. This will also help to reduce the impact of the building and screen it, The lost woodland must be replaced and the building should be screened with vegetation on all sides.
2022/1680/HS2	Heidi Spencer	06/02/2023 12:39:46	COMMNT	The proposed design is completely out of character with the historic architecture of Primrose Hill .. eyesore .. should be constructed with consideration to the beautiful community we live in
2022/1680/HS2	Susan Brearley	06/02/2023 21:50:48	OBJ	HS2-Adelaide Headhouse The very prominent south facade of the huge crude boxlike building faces directly toward the houses along King Henry's Rd. There is a requirement for a Green corridor, along this frontage. The aerial 3d view from King Henry's Road shows no such greenery. At the very least the timber cladding along the south facing facade should be planted with a green wall, which would make a significant ecological gain and contribution to the green corridor. Timber cladding using using treated wood, such as charred timber can support greenery without causing long term deterioration of the cladding.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1680/HS2	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	05/02/2023 18:18:44	OBJ	<p>PRIMROSE HILL CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE 12A Manley Street London NW1 8LT</p> <p>1 February 2023</p> <p>Adelaide Road headhouse HS2 2022/1680/HS2</p> <p>Objection.</p> <p>1. The PHCAAC advised originally on this application on 15 June 2022, and advises now on the current scheme following its meeting on 1 February 2023.</p> <p>2. The PHCAAC noted that the headhouse is acknowledged to impact the Primrose Hill CA (application Written statement p. 21 para 3.5.5). This impact is formally acknowledged in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement – current SPD for the PHCA – at p. 21 where views north of the Regent’s Park Road railway bridge are recognized as significant. The south and east elevations of the proposed headhouse fall into that significant view which included the Nature Reserve as an important green space.</p> <p>3. We also note the importance of the headhouse for the Eton CAAC.</p> <p>4. We also note the important impact on the Primrose Hill Tunnels (Eastern Portals). Listed Grade II*, the 1837 Portal was specifically designed to integrate the railway with the local environment. The loss of green landscape, trees and shrubs, has harmed the setting of this Listed structure and its historic significance.</p> <p>5. The PHCAAC noted again the applicant’s objective ‘to enhance the green corridor and for the buildings to be considered as sculptural elements within its landscape’ (Design and access statement p. 24 para 5.4). But the Committee concluded that this objective had not been achieved in the present proposals.</p> <p>6. It is false to claim, as the applicant does, that the landscape design ‘provides visual screening’ (Design and access statement p. 24 para 5.4). The building is too close to the rail-side boundary to the south – there is no ‘landscape’ left. We advise that this would be significantly harmful to the setting of the Listed Tunnel Portals and to the Conservation Areas. The design should be modified to allow dense green planting between the building and the rail-side boundary to screen the full height of the headhouse.</p> <p>7. We continue to object strongly to the proposed timber cladding. It is claimed that this would ‘help blend the building into it’s newly landscaped setting’, but timber cladding is not characteristic of the area: it will not blend in. We are also aware that timber cladding is subject to staining and other deterioration: what starts as ‘mitigation’ will, in time, become even more harmful to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>8. High-quality brickwork for the modified building would be more appropriate to the area. We note that high-quality brickwork has been agreed for the Park Village East Headhouse for HS2.</p> <p>9. Tree planting to Adelaide Road should be of mature trees, to the same height as the building, with dense underplanting to ensure an effective green screen to the site. We note that the green roof does not achieve screening of the building. We support the Eton CAAC’s argument for the reinstatement of the original</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>boundary wall to Adelaide Road</p> <p>10. Lighting: we continue to object to the lighting design which provides permanent lighting: we note from the revised drawing that this would be lit even when the building is unoccupied. This would be deeply harmful to the surrounding environment and ecology. The design of the lighting should be modified to provide lighting only when essential to operation of the headhouse.</p> <p>Richard Simpson FSA Chair</p>
2022/1680/HS2	Beth Noakes	06/02/2023 20:03:09	OBJ	<p>The brutalist Adelaide Road Vent Shaft Headhouse, with machinery replacing the promised green roof, will be visible to thousands of people from a tourist route on the painted bridge. Though HS2's stated design objective is that it is "integrated in the landscape", they clearly don't want it hidden in any way or camouflaged to make it blend in better.</p> <p>HS2 have tried to undermine Camden's arguments for mitigation by showing fictitious and grossly exaggerated trees close to the building on their elevations to pretend that it will be well "integrated in the landscape" and suggesting falsely that the green corridor (that the HS2 Act requires HS2 to provide between the building and the existing railway) is possible.</p> <p>Views from and of the painted bridge feature as two of the "significant views" in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement and the brutalist Vent Shaft Head-house will replace the woodland backdrop.</p>