

# HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS)

Equality impact assessment update CFA1

Summary of responses

March 2016



## Department for Transport

High Speed Two (HS2) Limited has been tasked by the Department for Transport (DfT) with managing the delivery of a new national high speed rail network. It is a non-departmental public body wholly owned by the DfT.

High Speed Two (HS2) Limited,  
One Canada Square,  
Canary Wharf,  
London E14 5AB

Telephone: 020 7944 4908

General email enquiries: [HS2enquiries@hs2.org.uk](mailto:HS2enquiries@hs2.org.uk)

Website: [www.gov.uk/hs2](http://www.gov.uk/hs2)

High Speed Two (HS2) Limited has actively considered the needs of blind and partially sighted people in accessing this document. The text will be made available in full on the HS2 website. The text may be freely downloaded and translated by individuals or organisations for conversion into other accessible formats. If you have other needs in this regard please contact High Speed Two (HS2) Limited.

© High Speed Two (HS2) Limited, 2016, except where otherwise stated.

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with High Speed Two (HS2) Limited.

This information is licensed under the Open Government Licence v2.0. To view this licence, visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/2](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/2) **OG** or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk). Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.



Printed in Great Britain on paper containing at least 75% recycled fibre.

# Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Executive summary</b>                         | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>1 Background to the consultation process</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2 Notification, material and engagement</b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| 2.1 Notification                                 | 5         |
| 2.2 Material and engagement                      | 5         |
| <b>3 Approach to analysis</b>                    | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>4 Participation rates</b>                     | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>5 Summary of responses</b>                    | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Appendix A - Coding framework</b>             | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Appendix B - Organisation respondent list</b> | <b>21</b> |



## Executive summary

The *High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Equality impact assessment: CFA 1 Euston station and approach* consultation was launched on 26 September 2015 and closed on 6 November 2015. The consultation sought views on a document – the Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) – which HS2 Ltd produced at the same time as another set of documents that explained how its proposed modifications to the existing Euston station had been updated.

As explained in that document, the EQIA update had three main aims:

- to report on potential equality effects that were unchanged since equality issues related to HS2 were first reported on in 2013;
- to report on potential equality effects reported in 2013 that have now been mitigated, including mitigations that came about because of the revised scheme; and
- to identify and report on any new potential equality effects arising from the revised scheme, as well as proposals to mitigate those new effects.

The aim of the consultation was to enhance HS2 Ltd's approach to identifying and addressing equality issues in Euston, by seeking views on the accuracy and appropriateness of its EQIA update. One consultation question was asked:

*"What are your views on the EQIA update for CFA1: Euston Station and approach? Please provide as much detail as possible, and let us know if you think anything has been missed from the assessment."*

A total of 24 responses were submitted during the consultation period. Of those, 11 were sent by representative organisations, including the London Borough of Camden and University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust. There were also responses from Camden Association of Street Properties, Camden Civic Society and two local primary schools. The remainder were submitted by individual members of the public, with no stated affiliation to an organisation or group. See Appendix B for a list of the organisations that responded to the consultation.

The EQIA update explained that responses to this consultation would inform HS2 Ltd's developing plans for Euston. It also explained that responses would be summarised in a report that would inform Parliament's consideration of the High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill.

This is the summary report of responses. It provides some background information to HS2 Ltd's delivery of the consultation, and then an overview of the key issues and themes that emerged from the consultation responses.

It is expected that another document will be written and published in response to this report. It will explain how HS2 Ltd intends to use the information submitted during the consultation.

# 1 Background to the consultation process

- 1.1.1 An Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) was produced for Phase One of HS2 in November 2013, when detailed proposals for the scheme were first submitted to Parliament for consideration. This was in line with the Equality Act 2010, which requires public authorities to adhere to the Public Sector Equality Duty by, among other things, promoting equality of opportunity through its works between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not.
  - 1.1.2 The Equality Act defines nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation.
  - 1.1.3 The 2013 EQIA described all known equality effects on those protected characteristics groups resulting from the construction and operation of Phase One, as it was then intended. Since the deposit of the hybrid Bill, HS2 Ltd has made various amendments to that original scheme, and submitted those changes to Parliament in the form of sets of documents called 'Additional Provisions' (APs).
  - 1.1.4 One of those Additional Provisions, AP3, described a set of changes to HS2 Ltd's approach to modifying Euston station in central London. The changes were of a sufficient scale that HS2 Ltd decided to reassess the equality impacts of the scheme in that area, and to invite feedback on that update to the EQIA by holding a consultation.
  - 1.1.5 The EQIA update was researched and produced according to the same criteria as the 2013 route-wide assessment. It assesses the extent to which people with protected characteristics would be affected **disproportionately** or **differentially** by the construction and operation of the scheme in Euston.
  - 1.1.6 A disproportionate equality effect occurs where an environmental, economic or social impact has a greater impact on people sharing a protected characteristic than on other members of the general population in that location.
  - 1.1.7 A differential equality effect is one which affects members of a protected characteristic group differently from the rest of the general population because of specific needs or a recognised sensitivity or vulnerability associated with that protected characteristic.
  - 1.1.8 The EQIA update considered the potential impacts of the revised scheme in Euston – as they had been described in documents associated with AP3 – in light of HS2 Ltd's understanding of the social composition of the affected area. Information derived from the 2011 Census, as well as extensive records of its engagement with Euston stakeholders, enabled HS2 Ltd to identify and assess the various equality impacts outlined in its EQIA update. The update also includes information about how HS2 Ltd proposes to avoid or reduce those impacts.
  - 1.1.9 The purpose of the consultation was to seek views on the EQIA update and gather any additional information which might be relevant. The information received through the
-

consultation will inform how HS2 Ltd works with its stakeholders in Euston to avoid or reduce negative equality effects of the project and enhance its benefits.

## **2 Notification, material and engagement**

### **2.1 Notification**

- 2.1.1 The EQIA consultation sought views from all interested and affected parties, and there were no restrictions on who could respond. HS2 Ltd understood that residents of Euston would be particularly interested in this consultation and so its publicity activities focused mainly on engaging with those people. The following is a summary of the efforts by HS2 Ltd to ensure that all local people had an opportunity to find out about the consultation and access more information if they wanted to.
- 2.1.2 HS2 Ltd organised a mailout to all listed addresses within a set of postcodes surrounding Euston station. In total, over 15,000 addresses received this mailout, which included a letter about the EQIA consultation, a factsheet providing further information about it, and another letter concerning the AP3 consultation, which ran in parallel with this one.
- 2.1.3 Another letter was sent to a list of around 75 organisations that represent people who HS2 Ltd believed might be interested in or affected by equalities issues in Euston. Those organisations included the local authority, residents' associations and community groups, as well as support service providers for people with disabilities. Libraries in the Euston area were also included in this mailout, and were asked to display copies of the consultation material in their reference collections. Some stakeholder organisations were provided with posters about the consultation, including posters in Somali and Bengali.
- 2.1.4 HS2 Ltd was aware that residents of the Regents Park Estate and Drummond Street neighbourhoods would be particularly interested in this consultation, and so further efforts were made to inform those people. A flyer carrying details of the consultation was sent to just over 1,300 properties. It included a message in English as well as a Bengali and Somali translation.
- 2.1.5 Advertisements were placed in two local newspapers: the Hampstead and Highgate Express and the Camden New Journal. Both newspapers carried the advert on two occasions: at the start of the consultation and mid-way through.
- 2.1.6 A page of the HS2 section of [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk) was dedicated to the consultation, and it was a main feature on the landing page for the duration of the consultation. The consultation was also advertised on social media, with tweets and updates sent to followers.

### **2.2 Material and engagement**

- 2.2.1 The EQIA formed the basis of all the material produced for this consultation. It explained, in as much detail available, how HS2 Ltd had assessed the equality impacts of the proposed scheme in CFA1, affecting Euston, and how the organisation intends to reduce or avoid those impacts.

The document is more than 50 pages long, including maps and diagrams. To make this information more accessible to stakeholders, HS2 Ltd produced a 12-page summary of the main report, as well as a one-page factsheet explaining the purpose of the consultation and some of the basic concepts of the EQIA update.

- 2.2.2 HS2 Ltd is aware from previous engagement in the Euston area that many of its residents are speakers of Bengali or Somali. The summary was translated into those languages and made available to download or order in hard copy. As mentioned previously, a flyer with information translated into Somali and Bengali was also produced and distributed to particular Euston neighbourhoods.
- 2.2.3 'Easy Read' is a way of translating complex information into a format combining words and pictures that will be accessible to people who, for a variety of reasons, find it easier to receive information in that format. HS2 Ltd produced a version of the EQIA in this format. It was advertised on the website and in other ways to make sure any person or organisation with an interest could use it.
- 2.2.4 The summary was transcribed into Braille and recorded as an audio CD so people with visual impairment would find it easier to participate in the consultation. These were advertised on the HS2 website, and certain organisations in the Euston area were sent copies of the Braille report, along with an offer to supply further copies if required.
- 2.2.5 As well as producing information in various formats and making them available to stakeholders, HS2 Ltd offered to meet local organisations representing people with protected characteristics to promote the consultation and encourage participation.

## 3 Approach to analysis

- 3.1.1 The receipt, analysis and reporting of responses to this consultation were all undertaken by a team within HS2 Ltd.
- 3.1.2 Three response channels – a Freepost address, an email account and an online response form – were set up for this consultation. All were managed directly by HS2 Ltd.
- 3.1.3 Once delivered to one of the three channels, every response was logged and added to a single database so that they could be read and analysed. The format of a response (e.g. a hard copy, email or online submission) or the type of respondent who had submitted it (e.g. an elected official or a member of the public) had no bearing on the type of analysis it received, which was consistent across all formats and types.
- 3.1.4 The approach taken towards analysis of responses was to carefully read each one and apply specific 'codes' to the different issues and assertions they contained. A preliminary set of codes was produced to begin this process, but new ones could be created throughout the analysis process whenever an issue arose in a response that could not be adequately covered by an existing code.

- 3.1.5 There was a phased process of checking and rationalising this list of codes so that the issues they categorised did not become unhelpfully granular or specific. It was possible to amalgamate codes if it became clear to the analysis team that two or more separate codes were being used to cover the same issue.
- 3.1.6 Codes were organised in groups that related to a general unifying theme – for example, one of the 'impacts' reported in the EQIA update – and then by a more specific sub-theme. So, if a response contained a comment along the lines of 'changes to local transport services will cause confusion for local residents', then the following code would have been applied: 'Impacts – public transport services'. In this example, 'Impacts' is the theme and 'public transport services' is the sub-theme. See Appendix A of this report for a list of applied codes.
- 3.1.7 It is important to note that the purpose of applying codes in a qualitative report such as this is not to quantify issues or sentiments within a set of responses. Its primary purpose is to help an analysis team to structure their preliminary and subsequent reading of responses, so that the summary report gives a neutral, balanced and useful overview of consultation feedback. Wherever numbers are used in this report, the purpose is not to rank sentiments or the importance of issues, but to provide the reader with context and to demonstrate the transparency of the analysis process.
- 3.1.8 This is an accepted approach to qualitative analysis and is appropriate to a consultation such as this, which received a relatively small number of responses but relatively detailed comments across a wide range of issues.
- 3.1.9 Quality assurance exercises were carried out at different phases of this project to ensure that the receipt, coding and reporting of responses was consistent and fair.

## 4 Participation rates

- 4.1.1 The Euston EQIA update consultation received 24 responses. Of these, 11 were from organisations and 13 were from individual respondents not affiliated with an organisation or group. In all, 13 responses were received via the online response form on the dedicated consultation responses website, nine email responses were received and two hard copy letters were received via the dedicated Freepost address set up for the consultation.
- 4.1.2 The vast majority of responses were received from a London postcode, of which the majority fell within the London Borough of Camden.
- 4.1.3 There were no late responses received for the consultation. One email query was forwarded to the HS2 Ltd helpdesk because it did not constitute a response to the consultation.

## 5 Summary of responses

*What are your views on the revised EQIA for London Euston? Please provide as much detail on your reasoning as possible.*

- 5.1.1 This was the only question posed in the EQIA update consultation for CFA1 Euston Station and approach. Respondents chose to address the question in various ways and a large number of different topics were discussed by respondents, with reference to various geographical locations within the wider London Borough of Camden area.
- 5.1.2 Some respondents structured their response using the same topic headings from the Summary Document; others focused on particular themes which were more relevant to their own situation, and some solely commented on the demographic statistics in the EQIA update document and looked more closely at the methodology used to produce it.
- 5.1.3 The nature of the consultation encouraged respondents to focus on the protected characteristic groups, as defined in the Equality Act 2010, and how these groups in particular would be affected by the proposed plans for CFA1 Euston Station and approach.
- 5.1.4 A large number of the respondents expressed concern about the potential construction impacts as a whole on residents who were of a vulnerable age. These respondents identified potential risks to young children and elderly residents living close to planned construction works, with many respondents demanding that strong mitigation be in place to minimise the scale of impacts on this protected characteristic group.
- 5.1.5 Christ Church Primary School expressed explicit concern over the school's proximity to future construction sites, for sustained periods, and the potential detrimental impact that the construction phase would have on the education of the students. The school's response included messages written by pupils expressing concern with the projected noise impacts from construction, such as: "Are we expected to just carry on with our SATS with the sound of machinery ringing in our heads?" The school's response reported a higher than average number of pupils with autism and autistic traits, explaining that "these children are highly sensitive to noise, sensory overload and any disruption. For them, this will have a major effect on their progress and wellbeing." The school's response criticised the lack of mitigation outlined by HS2 Ltd, and suggested that direct impacts on the school had not been adequately accounted for.
- 5.1.6 A number of responses pointed to the omission of Netley Primary School from the EQIA update and questioned why The Autism Unit and Robson House were also not included. Another respondent described the years of disruption for pupils at Netley Primary School and how, during the construction phase, children will have to walk to school along a construction traffic route, adding an increased risk to their safety.
- 5.1.7 Some responses expressed concern for the elderly population of Euston, and the potential for isolation by living close to construction works was a general theme throughout. Respondents

explained that an increase in heavy goods vehicles on local roads and unavoidable diversions due to road closures would affect their ability to access local services. Respondents felt this could increase the likelihood of isolating local residents and jeopardise the safety of the elderly and vulnerable.

- 5.1.8 A number of respondents expressed concern over the potential impacts that the disabled community would experience during the construction period, with some suggesting that this particular protected characteristic group would be more adversely affected than any other.
- 5.1.9 One respondent referred to their own experience as a blind person living close to a recent railway station redevelopment which had little mitigation in place for the disabled community. The respondent called for an independent, localised panel to work with the disabled community to address potential impacts and find suitable mitigation solutions. The respondent stressed concern about construction noise and the potential danger to the public if noise levels are not monitored. The respondent recommended a review of lessons learned on previous projects regarding noise reduction techniques, and described the scale of disruption previously experienced, saying "...noise levels were not monitored, the use of large pneumatic drills and breakers without sound reduction apparatus being fitted, or the use of noise reduction screens made parts of the station approach unusable."
- 5.1.10 The University College London Hospital (UCLH) NHS Foundation Trust's response called attention to their numerous hospital premises across London and sought assurances that the welfare of hospital patients was being considered, stating: "Patients with chronic illnesses and suppressed immune systems are particularly vulnerable to the impact of construction operations." UCLH outlined their concerns about potential impacts on emergency services getting in and out, and highlighted the repercussions that construction vibration and dust could have on the air quality of the hospitals.
- 5.1.11 One of the main concerns from respondents overall was the loss of green space as a result of planned construction and the mitigation identified to address the issue. Respondents noted a number of potential health issues which could arise if there is not an adequate mitigation plan to compensate for the loss of parks and play areas in Euston.
- 5.1.12 Some respondents described the social aspect and community cohesion which would be impacted if local residents no longer had a place for recreation. Others focused on a heightened level of air pollution that would result from such a loss of green space.
- 5.1.13 A joint consultation response from the Camden Town District Management Committee and Amptill Square Tenants and Residents' Association stated: "Not only do trees create a visually pleasing environment, but the benefits of trees in the micro-climate has not been mentioned in reducing the harmful impacts of air pollution, which is so poor in the vicinity of Euston Road."
- 5.1.14 Some respondents reiterated the impact of a number of years without suitable green space for residents of the Euston area, particularly when a number of local residents do not have

their own gardens. A few respondents shared the view that "A whole generation will not have a playground or green space nearby, and trees to soothe and provide a green lung against pollution."

- 5.1.15 Concerns were expressed about the character and quality of the proposed replacement open space, as respondents requested more detail on the mitigation to ensure a "like for like" replacement.
- 5.1.16 A number of respondents addressed the notion that the EQIA update had not taken into account the cumulative impact of a long construction period in the Euston area and the potential strain this could have on local residents. Some respondents commented that years of disruption would be stressful for the local community and that robust mitigation should be in place to tackle the potential repercussions of being affected by "building noise, road works, air pollution, temporary and permanent loss of open spaces, disruption and displacement from their homes" for a long period.
- 5.1.17 The London Borough of Camden (LBC) expressed concern about cumulative impacts on local residents: "especially for vulnerable people, due to the length of time it will take to complete the scheme, which will have ongoing impacts for example in relation to noise, air-quality and other construction related issues."
- 5.1.18 LBC's response expressed particular concern about the cumulative effect relating to both age and disability, warning that people could be disproportionately affected where age and disability intersect with other protected characteristics. To illustrate this point, the response provides the example of "older Bangladeshi women who are users of the Surma Centre or who have disabilities".
- 5.1.19 A number of respondents expressed concern that the health and wellbeing of local residents will be deeply affected during the construction phase in Euston. A very common view among respondents was that the level of emotional stress and anxiety would increase. One respondent wrote on behalf of an elderly relative in the early stages of dementia and explained that HS2 is already causing great anxiety. The respondent explained that proximity to construction sites, road diversions and the impacts on public transport are all factors which will lead to the isolation of many vulnerable residents.
- 5.1.20 Some respondents analysed the demographic data used in the EQIA update and questioned the Lower Layer Super Output Area (LSOA) boundaries, with a number of respondents saying they were too large. One respondent questioned why areas of nil population, such as car parks, have been included and called it a "deliberate attempt to confuse and/or manipulate the figures by HS2 Ltd".
- 5.1.21 Other respondents expressed their frustration about the data being reported in percentages, claiming it is an attempt to dilute the scale of the issue, particularly when it comes to actual numbers of people affected.

- 5.1.22 Some respondents attached their own data set comparisons against the information used in the EQIA update. One respondent suggested that the age data in the report was incorrect for LSOA 022C compared with the 2011 Census data, and that there were discrepancies in the age brackets of 75+-year-olds and 30- to 44-year-olds.
- 5.1.23 Numerous respondents discussed property compensation as a means of mitigation, but expressed concern over the length of time that Euston residents would have to wait until they were entitled to it. Some respondents referred to the difference in compensation schemes for urban and rural areas.
- 5.1.24 One respondent criticised the "discriminatory compensation schemes", saying they are "more generous in rural areas than in urban areas where there is a much higher proportion of people with protected characteristics".
- 5.1.25 It was also common for respondents to mention the mitigation planned to address different impacts identified in the EQIA update as "vague and inadequate". One respondent questioned the type of noise insulation that will be offered to residents and whether it would vary depending on the type of building in question. The respondent said the lack of information shows a "lack of concern" on behalf of HS2 Ltd.
- 5.1.26 One local resident asked that in terms of mitigation, consideration be given to the construction timetable, with no overnight working and suitable monitors in place to record air quality and noise levels. The respondent also requests a temporary bridge to ensure continued access to Regent's Park for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 5.1.27 Some respondents mentioned the impacts on local businesses during the construction phase and refer to the reputation that Drummond Street, in particular, has built over many years, which they said will be irrevocably damaged.
- 5.1.28 One respondent questioned the number of construction jobs that are likely to go to local residents, and compares this against the number of jobs lost which are occupied by local residents. The respondent stated: "There is no evidence to suggest that goods and services would be procured locally, but there is evidence of the adverse effects on local businesses during construction. The net outcome is therefore likely to be negative."
- 5.1.29 One respondent criticised the "poor design quality" of the plans for Euston station and expressed concern that the opportunity to completely redesign the station complex is being squandered. The Camden Association of Street Properties response stated that input from the local community should feed into the design plans and that the lack of involvement from the general public could be in contravention of article 5 of the Aarhus Convention.
- 5.1.30 A few respondents criticised the consultation process, with one late request for an extension of 21 days to allow more time for a respondent to produce a response.
- 5.1.31 One respondent set out their frustration with locating a reference document online in order to inform a response to the AP3 SES consultation and stated that it was discriminatory against

the disabled community that they should have to visit a library to read a document. Another respondent said that the letters received by post and the information on the website are too technical to understand, believing that HS2 Ltd deliberately wants to deter people from objecting.

# Appendix A - Coding framework

A coding framework was developed as a way of identifying and categorising the various different issues raised in responses to the consultation. A coding framework such as this helps the writers of a summary report to organise and logically present issues in a way that will be most useful to readers.

## Codes:

|  |
|--|
| Consultation - documentation - criticise |
| Consultation - engagement - criticise    |
| Consultation - process - criticise       |
| EQIA document - challenge                |
| EQIA document - demographics - challenge |
| General - documentation - challenge      |
| General - opposition to HS2              |
| General - opposition to the Government   |
| General - question raised                |
| General - suggestion - other             |
| Impacts - access                         |
| Impacts - access to services             |
| Impacts - both EQIA and HIA              |
| Impacts - community cohesion             |
| Impacts - construction                   |
| Impacts - construction - working hours   |
| Impacts - construction period duration   |
| Impacts - construction traffic           |
| Impacts - crime                          |
| Impacts - cumulative effects             |
| Impacts - cyclists                       |
| Impacts - demolitions                    |
| Impacts - dirt                           |
| Impacts - disruption                     |
| Impacts - dust                           |

|   |
|---|
| Impacts - education                                 |
| Impacts - effects on planned developments           |
| Impacts - elderly/vulnerable                        |
| Impacts - emergency services                        |
| Impacts - faith centres                             |
| Impacts - health/wellbeing                          |
| Impacts - heritage                                  |
| Impacts - hospitals                                 |
| Impacts - hospitals - equipment                     |
| Impacts - housing                                   |
| Impacts - increase in taxis                         |
| Impacts - insurance                                 |
| Impacts - isolating people                          |
| Impacts - listed buildings                          |
| Impacts - livelihood/business                       |
| Impacts - local people                              |
| Impacts - loss of green space                       |
| Impacts - loss of property value/blight             |
| Impacts - loss of trees                             |
| Impacts - mitigation - compensation                 |
| Impacts - mitigation - criticise                    |
| Impacts - mitigation - emissions                    |
| Impacts - mitigation - insulation                   |
| Impacts - mitigation - learning from other projects |
| Impacts - mitigation - local involvement            |
| Impacts - mitigation - monitoring                   |
| Impacts - mitigation - noise                        |
| Impacts - mitigation - suggestion                   |
| Impacts - mitigation - surveys                      |
| Impacts - more HGVs on the roads                    |

|                                       |
|---------------------------------------|
| Impacts - noise                       |
| Impacts - opportunities lost          |
| Impacts - parking                     |
| Impacts - peace/tranquillity          |
| Impacts - pedestrians                 |
| Impacts - places of worship           |
| Impacts - pollution                   |
| Impacts - property value              |
| Impacts - protected characteristics   |
| Impacts - proximity to construction   |
| Impacts - public transport            |
| Impacts - quality of life             |
| Impacts - road closures               |
| Impacts - road safety                 |
| Impacts - safety                      |
| Impacts - schools                     |
| Impacts - social connection           |
| Impacts - social housing              |
| Impacts - spoil (construction)        |
| Impacts - station design - criticism  |
| Impacts - stress/anxiety/uncertainty  |
| Impacts - time period - over 10 years |
| Impacts - traffic                     |
| Impacts - urban/rural areas           |
| Impacts - utilities                   |
| Impacts - vibration                   |
| Impacts - visual amenity              |
| Location - Albany Street              |
| Location - Albert Street              |
| Location - Ampthill Estate            |
| Location - Augustus                   |

|   |
|---|
| Location - Autism Unit                  |
| Location - Barnet                       |
| Location - Birmingham New Street        |
| Location - Bloomsbury                   |
| Location - Camden                       |
| Location - Camden Cutting               |
| Location - Camden Town                  |
| Location - Capper Street                |
| Location - Cardington Street            |
| Location - Christ Church School         |
| Location - Clarence Gardens             |
| Location - Cobourg Street               |
| Location - Cumberland Market            |
| Location - Drummond Street              |
| Location - Eastman Dental Hospital      |
| Location - Edith Neville Primary School |
| Location - Eskdale                      |
| Location - Euston                       |
| Location - Euston Circus                |
| Location - Euston Road                  |
| Location - Euston Square                |
| Location - Euston Square Gardens        |
| Location - Euston Station               |
| Location - Eversholt Street             |
| Location - Great Ormond Street Hospital |
| Location - Grafton Street               |
| Location - Granby Terrace               |
| Location - Gray's Inn Road              |
| Location - Hampstead Road               |
| Location - Hampstead Road Bridge        |
| Location - Haringey                     |

|   |
|---|
| Location - Harrington                                       |
| Location - Huntley Street                                   |
| Location - Irish Centre                                     |
| Location - Islington  |
| Location - Jewish Museum                                    |
| Location - Kentish Town                                     |
| Location - King's Cross St Pancras                          |
| Location - London   |
| Location - Maple House                                      |
| Location - Maria Fidelis Lower Convent School               |
| Location - Melton Street                                    |
| Location - Mornington Crescent                              |
| Location - Mornington Place                                 |
| Location - Mornington Street                                |
| Location - Mornington Street bridge                         |
| Location - Mornington Terrace                               |
| Location - Munster  |
| Location - National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery |
| Location - National Temperance Hospital                     |
| Location - Netley School                                    |
| Location - Newlands   |
| Location - North Gower Street                               |
| Location - Old Oak Common                                   |
| Location - Old Tenants Hall                                 |
| Location - Outer Circle                                     |
| Location - Park Village East                                |
| Location - Queen Square campus                              |
| Location - Redhill  |
| Location - Regent High School                               |
| Location - Regent's Park                                    |

|  |
|--|
| Location - Regent's Park Children's Centre                   |
| Location - Regent's Park Estate                              |
| Location - Regent's Park zoo                                 |
| Location - Richard Cobden Primary School                     |
| Location - Robert Street                                     |
| Location - Robson House                                      |
| Location - Royal London Hospital for Integrated Medicine     |
| Location - Royal National Throat Nose and Ear Hospital       |
| Location - Somers Town                                       |
| Location - St Aloysius' School                               |
| Location - St James' burial ground                           |
| Location - St James' chapel                                  |
| Location - St James' Gardens                                 |
| Location - St Pancras Parish Church Parochial Church Council |
| Location - Surma Centre                                      |
| Location - Torrington Place                                  |
| Location - Tottenham Court Road                              |
| Location - University College London Hospital                |
| Location - Varndell Street                                   |
| Location - Wellesley House                                   |
| Location - Westminster                                       |
| Opportunities - employment - challenge                       |
| Opportunities - local goods/services - challenge             |
| Protected characteristic - age                               |
| Protected characteristic - disability                        |
| Protected characteristic - pregnancy and maternity           |
| Protected characteristic - race                              |
| Protected characteristic - religion                          |
|  |

|   |
|---|
| Protected characteristic - sex                                |
| Reference - 2011 Census                                       |
| Reference - Aarhus Convention                                 |
| Reference - additional information - map of estate            |
| Reference - Ampthill Square Tenants and Residents Association |
| Reference - AP3   |
| Reference - BBC   |
| Reference - BME groups  |
| Reference - Camden Association of Street Properties           |
| Reference - Camden Civic Society                              |
| Reference - Camden Council                                    |
| Reference - Camden Town District Management Committee         |
| Reference - CFA1  |
| Reference - CoCP  |
| Reference - Court of Appeal                                   |
| Reference - Crossrail   |
| Reference - DfT   |
| Reference - EGA maternity wing                                |
| Reference - Environmental Impact Assessment                   |
| Reference - Equalities Act 2010                               |
| Reference - ES  |
| Reference - EU Environmental Impact Assessment Directive      |
| Reference - Euro VI   |
| Reference - Euston arch                                       |
| Reference - Euston Area Plan                                  |
| Reference - Great Hall  |
| Reference - health impact assessment                          |
| Reference - hospital for tropical diseases                    |

|  |
|--|
| Reference - House of Commons Library             |
| Reference - HS2 Euston Action Group              |
| Reference - hybrid Bill                          |
| Reference - independent review panel             |
| Reference - ISEH                                 |
| Reference - LEMP                                 |
| Reference - Local Authority                      |
| Reference - local bus routes                     |
| Reference - London Ambulance Service             |
| Reference - London Squares Preservation Act 1931 |
| Reference - LSOA                                 |
| Reference - MCC                                  |
| Reference - Midland Metro                        |
| Reference - National Audit Office                |
| Reference - National Planning Policy Framework   |
| Reference - National Rail                        |
| Reference - need to sell scheme                  |
| Reference - Network Rail BEAP                    |
| Reference - NHS                                  |
| Reference - OA                                   |
| Reference - Office of National Statistics        |
| Reference - other consultation response          |
| Reference - other projects - impacts             |
| Reference - Outer Circle                         |
| Reference - personal situation - impact          |
| Reference - Planning Act 1990                    |
| Reference - PM2.5                                |
| Reference - Regent's Park Estate Residents Group |
| Reference - Royal Assent                         |
| Reference - SES2                                 |

|  |
|--|
| Reference - Silverdale Motorcycle Project      |
| Reference - TfL                                |
| Reference - Town and Country Planning Act 1990 |
| Reference - UCL                                |
| Reference - UCL IoN                            |
| Reference - Victoria Embankment                |
| Reference - World Health Organisation          |

## Appendix B - Organisation respondent list

It is important to note that respondent type had no bearing on the level of analysis a response received in order to produce this report. All responses were analysed in the same way, with no weighting given to one type of response over another.

### Organisation:

|   |
|---|
| Amphill Square Tenants and Residents' Association and Camden Town District Management Committee |
| Camden Association of Street Properties   |
| Camden Civic Society  |
| Christ Church Primary School  |
| HS2 Euston Action Group   |
| London Borough of Camden  |
| Netley Primary School   |
| Regent's Park Estate Residents Group  |
| St Pancras Parish Church Parochial Church Council   |
| The Camden Cutting Group  |
| University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  |