

From: Dorothea

Sent: 10 November 2025 15:58

To: Vicky Wemyss-Cooke <vicky.wemyss-cooke@camden.gov.uk>

Cc: camdencivicsociety

Subject: Re: RE: Deputation request for Cabinet item 11 on 12/11/25

You don't often get email from. [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Deputation for agenda item 11 Camden Cabinet meeting 12/11/25 N

Regents Park Estate north redevelopment proposals

Firstly some general observations:

Despite a Council consultation exercise the residents I have spoken with are completely unaware of these redevelopment proposals, particularly those leaseholders left stranded in the blocks HS2 has rendered uninhabitable.

The majority of developments supported by planning committee result in the developer ducking out of providing the social housing commitment in the end, which in any case was a tiny fraction of the social housing it is being proposed to demolish.

It looks as if the existing 160 odd Council flats to be demolished will be replaced with, maybe 30 or 40 social housing units. The rest will be being sold off to the highest bidder as luxury investments for developer profit.

In the current climate emergency, the Council need to look to refurbishing, not demolishing. The UK cannot afford the carbon cost of demolition and rebuild.

In no way are these buildings derelict. They were all built in the late 40s, 50's and early 60's and extensively refurbished in 2000 using £40m of EU money. To get the money Camden had to rename the area West Euston because 'Regent's Park sounded too posh'. All blocks were given central heating, new lifts where applicable, double glazing PVC windows and the gardens were all refurbished, including Cumberland Market. As at 2017 (before HS2) a 2 bed flat on the 'sought after' RPE was selling for £550,000. They cannot be claimed to be derelict just to cynically satisfy the HS2 claim of bringing new housing to Euston.

I understand that this is the Community Investment Programme, Phase two for the area (phase 1 was merged with HS2 replacement housing). I knew that Stanhope Parade and the nursery were in line for 'densification'. These are just 6 or seven council maisonettes/flats above a parade of shops, three floors high. The nursery is a one floor purpose built block, probably to be replaced in these proposals with a tall tower.

£1bn is borrowed every 15 years and given to private developers to smash up a decent council estate and rebuild it with mostly private 'city living' investment properties. They won't be family homes. This is one reason why Camden's population has been falling steadily for the last 10 years and continues to do so to the detriment of school enrolments. Some people call it social cleansing. Others call it theft of public land and property.

As to lumping in the HS2 Yellow blocks Cartmel, Langdale and Ainsdale: at ECRG during a presentation on the Euston Redevelopment proposals the community representatives drew attention to where the HS2 safeguarded land boundary appeared to have migrated westward to include this part of the RPE including Stanhope Parade.

The main points of this deputation are:

1. Depopulation - including a further decline in school rolls. Many in the RPA attend Regent High. The need is for family housing to stop the falling school rolls.
2. Another 5 years of demolitions and building works will follow on from, or running concurrently with, another 10 years of HS2.

This will be further pressure on residents.

3. A fire hazard. Densification is a simple fire safety issue. Grenfell was one of three identical blocks in close proximity to each other on the Lancaster West Estate. The fire did not jump to the other two blocks because of sufficient and properly planned distance. Current planning would likely follow the Central Zone standards. These were specifically designed for the square mile but have now morphed into a standard for all London Boroughs where investment money is looking for buildings to demolish. Densification is a massive risk to us all.

I am asking for:

1. A deferral of a decision until proper plans are made guaranteeing full replacement of family council housing
2. reconsideration of refurbishment for the blocks which seem structurally sound and in terms of outlook and internal space are better than anything that the council would produce for social housing now
3. some flats to be offered out as a homeless shelter over winter and perhaps longer term. It is disappointing that Camden brings forward a plan to demolish all this social housing in the run up to winter.
4. A proper evaluation of the climate and ecological impact of demolition and rebuild.

Dorothea Hackman