

Meeting minutes

Euston Community Representatives Group (ECRG)

Meeting date	Tuesday, 14 June 2022
Meeting location	The Wesley Hotel, Euston and via Microsoft Teams
Meeting time	5.20pm – 7pm

Attendees

KM	Dr. Karl Mackie CBE	Independent Chair
AA	Amy Allen (Teams)	SCS, Stakeholder Engagement Manager – Area Central
AK	Aigul Kalioldina (Teams)	HS2, Engagement Manager
CA	Charlotte Akinola (Teams)	LB Camden, Communications Manager
DBe	Cllr Danny Beales (Teams)	LB Camden, Ward Councillor
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
HJ	Cllr Heather Johnson (Teams)	LB Camden, Ward Councillor
JTr	Jeff Travers	Primrose Hill, Gloucester Avenue
KM	Katy Mann (Teams)	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
MS	Maddelyn Sutton	HS2, Head of Community Engagement
NA	Nassar Ali (Teams)	LB Camden, HS2 Community Liaison Manager
NRF	Nina Radford	Euston Station IPT, Head of Engagement
PT	Patricia Thompson	HS2, Senior Engagement Manager South
RC	Richard Crathern	HS2, Senior Project Manager- SCS - East

RL	Robert Latham (Teams)	Silsoe House
SC	Stephen Charman	HS2, Community Engagement Manager
SF	Samantha Fernandes	SCS, Senior Consents and Engagement Manager
TD	Tom Duckmanton	Network Rail, Sponsorship Manager
HGT	Hero Granger-Taylor	Park Village East Heritage Group
JC	Jonathan Cooke	Network Rail, Senior Communications Manager
MB	Mary Burd	Chair Albert Street North RA and LEAP
TS	Timothy Stockman	
GOC	Gerry O'Connell	Beaumont Walk TRA
JC	Jonathan Cooke	Network Rail, Senior Communications Manager

*ECRG Contact Group

Apologies were received from

SD	Slaney Devlin	Somers Town Neighbourhood Forum
MH	Matt Hollier*	Camden Cutting Group, Co-Chair
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.
 - 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 regular 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
 - Those joining via Teams are encouraged to join the meeting early should they wish to check that your microphone and speakers are working.
 - Those joining via Teams may pose questions in the "Chat" or by raising their "hand".
 - If time remains at the end of the meeting further questions may be asked at the discretion of the Independent Chair.

- 1.4 KM noted that those attending via Teams were having difficulty hearing the proceedings due to the size of the room and there only being one microphone (this improved slightly with comments being placed in the chat and speakers being invited to stand close to the microphone – to be resolved for next time).

2 Station Design Public Engagement

- 2.1 The Group NOTED the previously circulated slides on Stage Two of the public engagement on the HS2 station design.
- 2.2 NRF reported that so far around 160 people had attended the various engagement sessions with a further 200 conversations taking place on the station piazza and two heritage walks completed. Useful detailed feedback had been received.
- 2.3 Comments, questions and answers.
- 2.4 Q: JT asked if the updated station design included for additional requirements for subterranean ventilation. A: NRF explained that this query had already been passed to the project engineer for response.
- 2.5 C: LA stated that it would have been good to have seen design evolution between the Stage One engagement in February and March and this second round. A: NRF responded that Stage One had been an early view for selected stakeholder groups and it was always intended that Stage Two (taking place now) would be substantially the same material but to the wider public audience.

3 Materials by Rail

- 3.1 The Group NOTED the verbal update on materials by rail by LW.
- The station scheme is now 10 platforms built in one stage.
 - The previous two stage approach had meant that there was space for Materials by Rail operations.
 - A series of different options had been looked at and a briefing had been provided to the Community Review Panel in June.
 - Strong feedback had been received from LB Camden and TfL and Lord Oakervee had been asked to undertake an independent review of the options.
 - It was anticipated that Lord Oakervee's report would be submitted in the next two weeks.
- 3.2 Comments, questions and answers:
- 3.3 C: RL stated that residents need to be consulted before decisions are made. The first people heard about this was through press reports. A: LW responded that it had been planned that the topic would be engaged on but due to a "leak" it had been made public first. HS2

recognises the benefits of Materials by Rail and the final decision will be made by the Secretary of State.

- 3.4 **ACTION 318:** LW to circulate the names of The Euston Partnership's Community Review Panel members.
- 3.5 C: MB expressed concern about the report just confirming a changed approach to Materials by Rail. If this were the case this would give rise to a significant trust issue.
- 3.6 Q: LA asked that the number of lorry movements predicted be shared including a comparison with the original numbers in the Hybrid Bill scheme. A: LW confirmed that a comparison would be provided and that the new station design was smaller resulting in a 20% reduction of materials to be moved. **ACTION 319:** LW to provide lorry number comparisons relating to Materials by Rail.
- 3.7 C: LA commented that the proposed layby on Park Village East not been included in the HS2 Act and therefore was unfair on local residents. A: RC replied that the purpose of using a layby was to reduce the time taken to carry out the works and therefore the potential impact on residents. As yet designs had not been developed sufficiently for engagement but this would happen once they were. LA responded that the key concern was the principle of going beyond the Act.
- 3.8 Q: GOC asked what commitment had been provided in relation to the movement of Materials by Rail. A: LW responded that the excavation of the platforms approximately 10m below the surface and basement would give rise to the need to remove spoil. HS2's obligation was to use best endeavours and what was reasonably practicable to maximise the use of Materials by Rail to do this and submit proposals to the Secretary of State.
- 3.9 C: DH expressed concern that HS2 was seeking the cheapest way forward. A: LW replied that it was a question of practicality and the need to find space to create a railhead in the local area or use of an existing platform.
- 3.10 Summarised comments added from the Teams chat:
- 3.11 C: RL stated that Phase A was to have been completed by 2026 and Phase B1 by 2033. We now understand that HS2 will not open at Euston until 2033 at the earliest. How is this shortening the disruption?
- 3.12 C: RL commented that the Secretary of State gave Silsoe House an assurance that the wall would not be demolished. It has now been demolished. To add insult to injury, there is now to be a lorry lay-by.
- 3.13 C: HJ questions the value of assurances if they were to be reneged on.
- 3.14 Q: RL raised a similar point to 3.8 in the chat asking for an update on what was agreed under Assurance 1098 which reads:

The Secretary of State will require the Nominated Undertaker to:

5.1.2 engage actively with the London Borough of Camden, the Greater London Authority and Transport for London to develop a plan for the bringing in and removal of such excavated and construction materials to and from Euston Station by rail. This plan will include consideration of options that would require separate planning permissions that may be granted by the London Borough of Camden or the Greater London Authority.

5.1.3 Upon completion, "the plan" will be submitted to the Euston Integrated Programme Board and the ESSRB for comment. This will be no later than May 2016. The Promoter will require the Nominated Undertaker to use all reasonable endeavours to incorporate comments from the EIPB and ESSRB into the plan.

5.1.4 The plan will then be submitted to the Secretary of State for his consideration. The Secretary of State will then notify the EIPB of his decision in regards to implement the proposals contained within the plan, no later than one month from the date of the plans submission.

4 ECRG Improvements

- 4.1 The Group was asked to NOTE the previously circulated presentation slides on improvements to ECRG and the following:
- The Terms of Reference had not been agreed and members were invited to make suggestions should it be considered that adopting a new set would be beneficial
 - Drone footage being shown prior to ECRG starting could be a good alternative to the walkabout until there is more to see
 - MS highlighted that ECRG is not the only engagement session with a wide variety of other opportunities being provided
 - LW noted that a number of changes had been made to the format to ensure that residents voices were heard.
 - The design development and air quality working groups were now meeting again and more business was being carried out in these and the others.
 - Members were invited to make additional suggestions for improvements to the Contact Group.
- 4.2 Comments, questions and answers:
- 4.3 C: DH made the point that people needed to feel that attending ECRG would make a difference and that something would be achieved. A: KM suggested that people look at the closed out Actions to see the impact the group had had over the years.

5 Network Rail Station Design

- 5.1 DT updated that Network Rail expected to submit its Outline Business Case to the DfT, seeking funding for the development of its scheme, in the summer.

- 5.2 As regards future updates on the scheme a discussion took place on the best forum for that. It was noted that Network Rail's On Network Works team attends ECRG as it undertakes works to enable HS2. However, the redevelopment of the conventional station was not directly connected with HS2.
- 5.3 **ACTION 320:** LW to discuss with The Euston Partnership Board the best forum for future updates on the Network Rail station redevelopment.
- 5.4 Comments, questions and answers:
- 5.5 Q: LA expressed concern that Euston could end up with two long shopping mall type developments and a large block on the piazza if the parties did not work together on design. A: LW responded that as far as he was aware the NR design was at very early stages and noted the need for coordination.
- 5.6 Q: HGT said it was worrying to hear that a block might affect Euston Square Gardens. Any such proposals need to be heard about at the earliest stage. A: LW responded that any proposals by the Master Development Partner, Lendlease, would require planning consent and therefore would have to be the subject of consultation.
- 5.7 Q: JT asked what the strategy was for shared services between the HS2 and NR stations. A: LW said that each has its own standards that needed to be met but this would not preclude looking to see if sharing were possible.
- 5.8 Q: MB asked if the business case for the station is predicated on the receipts from over site development? A: LW responded that the main justifications were likely to be matters such as reductions to journey times and improved capacities. Over site development was likely to be the subject of separate review/justification.
- 5.9 Summarised comments added from the Teams chat
- 5.10 C: HJ expressed concern that there does not appear to be any integration and that the network development remains uncommitted. She questioned if work should have started until everything on the site was agreed.

6 HS2 update

- 6.1 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.
- 6.2 Comments, questions and answers:

Mace Dragados update

- 6.3 No questions.

Network Rail

- 6.4 It was noted that there were currently no dates for Clarkson Row works but these would be circulated when known. The application had been resubmitted.

SCS update

- 6.5 Q: GOC had detailed concerns about the local environment and had raised a number of points with MS for resolution, immediately before the meeting. Improvements proposed included having a direct link with the site management to raise concerns as they arose. A: LW proposed that a follow up conversation between MS and MOC take place to confirm practical actions to tackle some of the current operational problems in the Adelaide Road area and a walkabout of the area (to include LW, PT, AA and MS) take place to ensure that matters were being resolved. **ACTION 321:** Undertake follow up conversation to confirm practical actions to resolve some of the current operational problems in the Adelaide Road area and conduct a site walk of area (MS/AA).
- 6.6 Q: JT raised the point that the recent Design Panel minutes supported HS2's head house design saying that it supports HS2's design vision including a preference to 'reveal the machine'. However the responses from residents to the engagement on the design showed that they did not support the design's response to the local context. A: **ACTION 322:** LW to invite HS2's Head of Design to the next meeting to explain HS2's design vision and associated concepts and how it takes account of local context (to include HS2's use of indicative public realm designs to support applications prior to later submission of Site Restoration applications). **ACTION 323:** MS/AA to urgently convene an update session on the Adelaide Road design planning application. This is to also cover what is included in the application, how comments have been responded to and what will be applied for later. KM to arrange for LB Camden be involved in this review.
- 6.7 A: AA stated in the meeting chat - for clarity, the wall design is not finalised as this forms part of a later Schedule 17 application. Feedback was provided by the community in the Key Design Engagement Period in September 2021, regarding preference of wall colour, wall height, railings etc. The wall design will be presented again in the future when we are approaching the relevant Sch. 17 application. The feedback regarding the wall has not been ignored, as there is not a final design at this stage.

7 Community Questions/AOB

- 7.1 The following additional questions were raised:
- 7.2 DH reported that the removal of trees in Harrington Street had been unnecessary in her view. Their replacement had been promised with mature trees but this had not taken place. A: LW offered to discuss this at the next Tree Panel meeting.
- 7.3 DH queried why HS2 was seeking an injunction along the entire line of route which risked impacting what people could do in their homes or on the pavement adjacent to HS2 sites. A:

MS responded that it was not the intention of HS2 to restrict lawful activity or normal day to day business. **ACTION 324:** LW to ask HS2 Land and Property Team for clarification.

- 7.4 MB reported that following contact with DD useful consultations had taken place with SCS and other relevant parties relating to the Parkway works. This was a good example of people coming together to consider and resolve issues.

8 Minutes of the last meeting

- 8.1 The minutes of the meeting held in March 2022 were AGREED.

9 Actions Log

- 9.1 **ACTION 314:** Provide an update on equality impact assessments and alternative transport arrangements where access to facilities is restricted (LH).

SF provided an update : HS2 do not carry out equality impact assessments however, SCS are carrying out regular engagement with residents and various groups including the 3rd Age Project and are working with Camden Council support workers to address these issues. People can also apply to be a 'special case' and we can assess their requirements on the recommendation of the ECRG.

- 9.2 DD to circulate Log again with the minutes before closing actions marked for closure.

Closing remarks

- 9.3 KM thanked the Group for their attendance, questions and contributions.
- 9.4 KM noted that during the meeting those joining by Teams had experienced difficulties hearing contributors. Although arrangements had been put in hand to ask speakers to stand next to the microphone, improvements would be sought for the next meeting.
- 9.5 KM noted that RL had requested that the comments made in the chat be incorporated into the minutes.
- 9.6 The dates for 2022 were noted as having been circulated:

Meeting	Walkabout	ECRG Meeting
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