# **Meeting minutes**

# **Euston Community Representatives Group (ECRG)**

Meeting date Tuesday, 22 March 2022

**Meeting location** Via Microsoft Teams

**Meeting time** 5pm – 7pm

#### **Attendees**

KM	Dr. Karl Mackie CBE	Independent Chair
AA	Amy Allen	SCS, Stakeholder Engagement Manager – Area Central
AK	Aigul Kalioldina	HS2, Engagement Manager
CA	Charlotte Akinola	LB Camden, Communications Manager
DBe	Cllr Danny Beales	LB Camden
DD	David Demolder	Euston Station IPT, Head of Stakeholder Management
DH	Dorothea Hackman*	Camden Civic Society, St Pancras Church, Netley School
EH	Emily Hanlon	Network Rail
GH	Greg Hitchcock	LB Camden, Green Spaces Team
HJ	Cllr Heather Johnson	LB Camden
JN	James New	LB Camden, Green Spaces Team
JTr	Jeff Travers	Primrose Hill, Gloucester Avenue
KM	Katy Mann	LB Camden, Head of HS2 Programme Delivery
LA	Luisa Auletta	Camden Cutting Group
LH	Lee Harman	SCS, Delivery Lead Area East
LW	Laurence Whitbourn	HS2, Euston Area Client Director
MB	Mark Burling	Euston Station IPT, Highways Consents Manager
MH	Matt Hollier*	Camden Cutting Group, Co-Chair
MS	Maddelyn Sutton	HS2, Head of Community Engagement
NA	Nassar Ali	LB Camden, Community Engagement Manager
NR	Nina Radford	Euston Station IPT, Head of Engagement

#### HS2-HS2-GV-TEM-000-000006 P01

Page 1 of 9

High Speed Two (HS2) Limited, registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: Two Snowhill, Snow Hill Queensway, Birmingham B4 6GA. Company registration number: 06791686. VAT registration number: 181 4312 30.

RC	Richard Crathern	HS2, Senior Project Manager- SCS - East
RL	Robert Latham	Silsoe House
RP	Ross Pearson	HS2, Senior Community Engagement Manager
SC	Stephen Charman	HS2, Community Engagement Manager
SD	Slaney Devlin	Somers Town Neighbourhood Forum
SF	Samantha Fernandes	SCS, Stakeholder Engagement Manager
TD	Tom Duckmanton	Network Rail, Sponsorship Manager

<sup>\*</sup>ECRG Contact Group

Apologies were received from

JM John Myers\* Drummond Street TRA

#### 1 Welcome and introductions

- 1.1 The HS2 representatives introduced themselves.
- 1.2 The Contact Group representatives introduced themselves.
- 1.3 KM briefed the attendees on the meeting format designed to help keep the meeting to time, ensure that all agenda items are covered and provide greater opportunity for community representatives to raise questions.
  - Please note that as presentations are circulated in advance the time allowed for additional information to be provided by presenters is limited to the time set out under each item.
  - The time allowed for questions on each agenda item is set out under that item.
  - HS2 and contractors have been asked not to present the slides for their update, just to take questions.
  - The contribution from any one speaker is limited to five minutes for the meeting overall and three minutes per contribution
  - You are encouraged to join the meeting early should you wish to check that your microphone and speakers are working.
  - Questions may be posed in the "Chat" or by raising your "hand".
  - If time remains at the end of the meeting further questions may be asked at the discretion of the Independent Chair.

#### 2 Coordination of Works

- 2.1 The Group NOTED the previously circulated slides relating to the coordination of works, particularly those of UKPN with HS2's works.
- 2.2 Comments, questions and answers.

- 2.3 C: LA commented that there had been concern about the UKPN works under discussion as there had been little or no warning about them. A: MB responded that all works should be entered onto the "Street Manager" system and will then be viewable publicly on the <a href="https://one.network.org/">one.network</a> website. It is not clear what the issue was on the occasion raised however UKPN are now inputting into the various coordination meetings.
- 2.4 C: SD said that people were blindsided by UKPN as other works are normally well engaged on. The incident had undermined confidence and emphasised that it is very important to collaborate to minimise impact.

# **3 Bus Stop Closures**

- 3.1 The Group NOTED the previously circulated presentation slides on bus stop closures and the TfL's considerations for providing temporary alternatives.
- 3.2 Comments, questions and answers:
- 3.3 Q: SD had seen a temporary dolly stop on the plan for Hampstead Road but this had not been installed. Bus stops nearby are a lifeline for people who are unable to walk far and rely on buses. A: MB responded that the closure had been necessary due to works. It had been hoped to provide a temporary dolly stop but TfL's assessment was that it would not be safe to provide it. The permanent stop was expected to reopen in April and signage to the next nearest stop had been provided.
- 3.4 Q: SD asked if closures and alternatives are routinely signed? A: MB answered that TfL was responsible for signing closures and alternatives. However this was only at the original stop, not more widely. **ACTION 313:** Assess if it is possible to publicise closures more widely eg through residents associations (MB).
- 3.5 C: RL commented that it is not just bus stop closures that cause issues for access to facilities, other restrictions such as road closures impede access to for example Hampstead Road. Could HS2 provide alternative transport where it is assessed as necessary under an equality impact assessment? **ACTION 314:** Undertake a review of impact assessments to access and egress routes, especially through the Regents Park Estate to Hampstead Road and review solutions such as alternative transport arrangements where beneficial to those affected. (LH).

# 4 Adelaide Road Schedule 17 application

- 4.1 The Group was asked to NOTE the previously circulated presentation slides on the engagement information relating to materials and context of the area and the current status of the application.
- 4.2 Comments, questions and answers:

- 4.3 Q: JT expressed concern that SCS considers the recent feedback process not to be consultation for LB Camden's Schedule 17 collaboration. SCS had confirmed that overwhelmingly respondents felt that the materials did not suit the local context and this was a ground for refusal by LB Camden. HS2 need to collaborate with LB Camden to ensure the material fits in with local context (c/f Hillingdon's refusal of an application on this basis). The head house will be visible for up to half a mile so it is important it suits the context, not HS2 branding. Green walling is needed by public and LB Camden to downplay branding but SCS has said it is not compatible with security fencing. JT feels that LB Camden cannot grant consent as the engagement findings say that the material does not suit the context of the area. A: RP highlighted HS2's pillars of engagement and although the time for consultation on the scheme as a whole had now passed HS2 was still asking for feedback on some issues and would take this on board where it can. AA said LB Camden and the Design Panel agreed design suits context and that landscape screening had been increased and following the feedback received green walls were being provided as much as possible. The landscaping Site Restoration application would form part of a later submission but details had been provided with the headhouse engagement to help give context. There would be a further opportunity to comment on the final proposals for the site restoration scheme. The red brick wall on the headhouse boundary has been added in to the application following comments.
- 4.4 Q: JT commented that while it was understood that the site restoration scheme would come later tension wires for planting should be shown in the headhouse application as a means of covering the boxy building. A: AA responded that increased greenery was being added to the building but was precluded in some places due to the functional requirements of building. JT said maximising green-walling needed SCS.LB Camden collaboration.
- 4.5 Q: LA asked how the design was taking account of the Grade II\* Listed tunnel portals. A: **ACTION 315** AA to respond by email on how the headhouse design is taking account of the Grade II\* Listed tunnel portals.

# **5** Green Spaces

#### No net loss of bio-diversity

- 5.1 The Group NOTED the previously circulated presentation slides relating to the presentation to the Air Quality, Trees and Open Spaces Working Group on no net loss of biodiversity.
- 5.2 Comments, questions and answers:
- 5.3 Q: SD asked that the baselines for no net loss of bio-diversity be included in the briefing to the Air Quality etc Working Group. A: **ACTION 316:** Include explanation of baseline being used in the no net loss assessment at the Air Quality etc Working Group meeting (DD).
- 5.4 Q: DH queried how it was possible to balance bio-diversity in Euston/Camden given that a SINC has been removed and bio-diversity is irreplaceable. She could not see how it was possible to achieve no net loss across the route as so much mature habitat had been lost let

alone locally. She went on to express the importance of arboreal ivy supporting bio-diversity and how this has been lost on Adelaide Road. The remaining native oak tree with arboreal ivy in nature area next to the headhouse site was a last hope of regenerating the SINC woodland area. She was unhappy that trees continued to be removed even when the matter was still under discussion and this is unacceptable behaviour. **ACTION 317:** AA to provide feedback on the oak tree in the nature area. LW explained that this tree is to go before tree panel as its roots are affected by the head house works. DH would have the opportunity to put her views about opportunities for the tree to remain (even if propped up) to allow the ivy to regenerate.

#### LB Camden Green Spaces Team update

- 5.5 JN and GH provided an update on the provision of temporary open spaces by LB Camden.
- 5.6 Comments, questions and answers:
- 5.7 Q: LA asked what the plan is for maintenance of these enhanced areas? Also whilst it is good that areas are now more accessible she questioned the location of some of the benches. A: JN explained that maintenance is planned in to ensure the areas are kept to a good level. The location of benches had been decided following advice from contractor Groundwork London, community safety engagement and advice from the Police so as not to encourage antisocial behaviour.
- 5.8 Q: LA responded that the planting at Mardale had failed quickly so maintenance remains a concern. A: JN reassured the meeting that maintenance had been allowed for for a minimum of 10 years. He agreed to pass on feedback about the Mardale and other schemes mentioned.
- 5.9 C: DH congratulated the team on its thorough consultations and the schemes provided for the for money available. However two hectares of space had been lost and the schemes do not replace these nor the bio-diversity of St James's Gardens.
- 5.10 Q: SD residents of Churchway are keen for an update: A: JN agreed to provide an update to residents.
- 5.11 Q: JT asked who is paying for these schemes? A: JN assurances for seven named open spaces had HS2 funding of £2.6m and £1.5m for green space enhancements. An exercise to score and prioritise areas had been undertaken. Further HS2 funding of £0.5m had been provided for nature conservation including accessibility to existing. In addition there were undertakings in respect of the greening of Pheonix Road and the replacement of lost trees in the area. Therefore to answer 5.9 also the works are intended to be temporary mitigation for the loss of green space until HS2 main works completed. The permanent works will be funded by HS2.

# 6 Engagement approach

- 6.1 The Group NOTED the previously circulated slides on engagement.
- 6.2 Comments, questions and answers:

- 6.3 Q: RL asked how ECRG attendance can be more diverse? In his experience of Chair of the Drummond Street Traders forum people need to see outcomes from attendance in order to want to get involved or at least see some value. A: RP will include on the agenda for the ECRG Improvements meeting but also noted that returning to meeting in person may help attendances too.
- 6.4 C: DH commented that engagement should take place be in advance of what HS2 does to the residents rather than saying what HS2 is going to do, then doing it anyway. HS2 is not taking on board how horrific this level of devastation in the local area is. A: RP responded that at this stage the communication is more about informing what is happening but HS2 does involve people where possible. Therefore there is a difference of opinion on this matter. KM suggested that this be a topic for discussion at the ECRG Improvements Meeting. He also commented that the ECRG agenda is very wide and therefore it may be desirable to make it narrower and more relevant.
- 6.5 Q: JT noted that HS2's revised Local Area Engagement Plan does cover HS2's approach to engagement though excludes consultation. However, he asked that it be spelt out where people can still influence (eg in respect of Schedule 17 applications). A: RP agreed confirming HS2 could put this in the Local Area Engagement Plan.

#### 7 Actions Items Review

- 7.1 DD took the meeting through the outstanding items on the Actions List.
- 7.2 Comments, questions and answers:
- 7.3 312 to be closed.
- 7.4 It was noted that the actions on the Actions List marked for closure will not be removed until after the draft minutes have been commented on allowing for further time for comments on the actions.

# **8 HS2 Station Public Engagement**

- 8.1 The Group NOTED the previously circulated slides setting out the arrangements for engagement on the station and public realm.
- 8.2 Comments, questions and answers:
- 8.3 Q: SD said that people are getting confused about the numerous engagements by LB Camden, Lendlease and others going on at the same time. Lots of time was being demanded of residents and there was confusion in people's minds over who is doing what. A: NR explained that HS2 meets regularly with other campus partners (such as LB Camden, Network Rail, TfL) on a regular basis through The Euston Partnership. This was with a view to share feedback and minimise duplication. HS2 and Lendlease are looking to do shared events

- where possible, agreeing that the programme is potentially burdensome. Details of the engagements of all partners can be found here <a href="https://www.discovereuston.org.uk">www.discovereuston.org.uk</a>
- 8.4 C: LA commented in the chat "Thanks Nina, I think one of the real disappointments is that virtually none of the proposed new green space will be on real ground. But St. James Gardens, and ESG was..."
- 8.5 C: DH pointed out that the tone of Flash Report is offensive as it gives the impression residents are happy with the works and there should be no pretence of comfortable acceptance. A: MS noted the concern and would consider the tone of the report for future editions.

# 9 HS2 update

- 9.1 The Group NOTED the previously circulated slides. The Contact Group had requested that questions be taken but that the contractor update slides are not presented.
- 9.2 Comments, questions and answers:

#### **Mace Dragados update**

9.3 None

#### **Network Rail**

9.4 Q: LA requested a link to the Clarkson Row Town Planning application. A: TD responded that LB Camden have requested an updated gate design, we have provided this in a draft format and LB Camden will consult the Conservation Area Advisory Committee on the amended design. Please see the link <a href="http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/PlanRec?q=recContainer:%222021/4110/P%">http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/PlanRec?q=recContainer:%222021/4110/P%</a>

#### **SCS** update

22

- 9.5 Q: MH commented that the slide on page 84 Parkway Works update was very thin. Closures will have significant impact on travel in the area. What level of consultation has been done to minimise impact and why has the modelling still not shared despite earlier promises at ECRG? A: SF explained that a workshop had been held in in December with chairs of Residents Groups and they gave feedback on plans. Also information had been collected via the January survey and have passed on to Traffic Management Teams. The Design of Parkway has not yet been finalised so Traffic Management Plans are yet to be updated. A second workshop will take place in April along with drop ins to discuss access requirements.
- 9.6 C: MH expressed concerned that there is a big difference between a survey of the thoughts of residents and modelling information using traffic data using the area at present which is needed to estimate impact and mitigation to minimise this. A: SF and RC responded explaining that the amount of work needed in the area was being reviewed with a view to

- minimising it. If this could be achieved (eg monitor Thames Water pipes rather than replace) this would reduce the amount of traffic management needed. Once the level of work was known modelling could take place and allow feed back into the community possibly in May.
- 9.7 Q: RL commented that it is now known that another seven years of work will be taking place. This will lead to noise disruption when opening windows on a nice day. He asked if the Granby Terrace will this area be open to the elements or decked over as suggested in the Euston Area Plan? A: LW understood that it was necessary for the venting of trains so there were no HS2 plans to deck over. DBe responded that the Euston Area Plan was developed a long time ago and emerging designs for the area will need to be updated which is in hand. LB Camden has looked for this to be decked over originally and irrespective of whether this happened affordable housing remains a priority.

# 10 Community Questions/AOB

- 10.1 The following additional questions were raised:
- 10.2 It was noted that the HS2 Station Team would shortly be seeking a representative for its Arts and Culture Committee. Further details would be circulated in due course. DBe suggested that the group link with the Cultural Camden Group for local connections.

# 11 Minutes of the last meeting

- 11.1 It was noted that Luisa Auletta had accidentally been omitted from the minutes but had now been added. Minute 9.5 had been duplicated and had been removed.
- 11.2 The minutes of the meeting held in December 2021 were AGREED.

# 12 Meeting format for June

12.1 It was NOTED that the June meeting, and remaining meetings for the year, would be held in person at the Wesley Hotel.

# **Closing remarks**

- 12.2 KM thanked the Group for their attendance, questions and contributions.
- 12.3 The dates for 2022 were noted as having been circulated:

Meeting	Walkabout	ECRG Meeting
June 2022	Wednesday 8 June, 16.00-17.00	Tuesday 14 June, 17.00-19.00
September 2022	Wednesday 14 September, 16.00-1700	Tuesday 20 September, 17.00-19.00
November 2022	Wednesday 23 November, 15.00-16.00	Tuesday 29 November, 17.00-19.00