

# Meeting minutes

## Euston Community Representatives Group (ECRG)

<b>Meeting date</b>	Tuesday, 29 November 2022
<b>Meeting location</b>	The Wesley Hotel, Euston and via Microsoft Teams
<b>Meeting time</b>	5.20pm – 7pm

### Attendees

AA	Amy Allen	SCS, Stakeholder Engagement Manager – Area Central
AC	Anne Clarke	London Assembly
AK	Aigul Kalioldina	HS2, Engagement Manager
AM	Alex Murtagh	Euston Station IPT, Stakeholder Team Coordinator
AR	Abbas Raza	Transport for London
CA	Charlotte Akinola (Teams)	LB Camden, Communications Manager
DBe	Cllr Danny Beales (Teams)	LB Camden, Ward Councillor
DD	David Demolder (chair for this meeting)	Euston Station IPT, Head of Stakeholder Management
DH	Dorothea Hackman* (Teams)	Camden Civic Society, St Pancras Church, Netley School
DM	Declan McCafferty	Euston Station IPT, Design
DT	Damien Thomas	Euston Station IPT, Design Engagement
EH	Emily Hanlon (Teams)	Network Rail, Communications and Engagement
FC	Fiona Chilton	Lendlease
GS	Giorgia Sharpe	Euston Station IPT, Design Engagement
JM	John Myers*	Drummond Street TRA
JTr	Jeff Travers	Primrose Hill, Gloucester Avenue
LB	Laura Brown	Euston Station IPT, Design Engagement
LeH	Lee Harman (Teams)	SCS

LuH	Lucy Haskett	Euston Station IPT, Utilities Project Manager
MH	Matt Hollier*	Camden Cutting Group, Co-Chair
MR	Mark Reece	Network Rail, On Network Works
NVK	Neil Van Kervel	SCS, Engagement 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
RK	Rasna Khanom	Lendlease
RL	Robert Latham	Silsoe House
ROL	Robert O'Leary	Euston Station IPT, Transport Planning
SC	Steve Christophi	Treasurer of the RPE TRA and HS2 Rep
SD	Slaney Devlin	Somers Town Neighbourhood Forum
SH	Stuart Hodgetts	Euston Station IPT, Planning and Consents
SK	Shelly Khan (Teams)	LB Camden, Community Engagement
UB	Ursula Brown	Woodhall resident

\*ECRG Contact Group

Apologies were received from

CW	Chris Winfield	Head of Delivery Unit RECS, Network Rail
HGT	Hero Granger-Taylor	Park Village East Heritage Group
JC	Jonathan Cooke	Network Rail, Senior Communications Manager ONW
LA	Luisa Auletta (Teams)	Camden Cutting Group
LW	Laurence Whitbourn	HS2, Euston Area Client Director
MB	Mary Burd	Chair Albert Street North RA and LEAP
MS	Maddelyn Sutton	HS2, Head of Community Engagement
SN	Sandra Nichols	Mornington Place Residents' Association
SP	Simon Pitkeathley	Camden Town Unlimited, CEO

## 1 Welcome and introductions

- 1.1 DD explained that Karl Mackie had resigned as Independent Chair. With the agreement of the Contact Group it had been decided to continue with the meeting with DD as interim Chair.
- 1.2 The apologies were noted.

- 1.3 The attendees were asked to note 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 Chair.

## **2 Hampstead Road Bus Stops**

- 2.1 LS and AR presented the previously circulated slides.
- 2.2 LH explained that the current works on Hampstead Road were necessary to provide a replacement water main for the one currently running under Cardington Street. In order to keep Hampstead Road open, temporary traffic management was necessary.
- 2.3 AR apologised that it had become necessary to suspend Bus Stop J at short notice. Whilst the temporary traffic management arrangements had been approved by TfL they had given rise to safety concerns. In practice the arrangements were not being followed consistently by bus drivers and also gave rise to temptation for other drivers to overtake buses and the risk of head on collision.
- 2.4 Comments, questions and answers.
- 2.5 Q: JM asked why TfL had not used enforcement cameras to prevent unsafe driving? A: AR responded that this had not been considered as it would not prevent the danger, only record overtaking.
- 2.6 C: UB commented that the problem should have been foreseen and the works should not have commenced until a solution had been found. The reopening of the original Stop had been promised for December but looking at the slides it was evident that this would not be until into the New Year. In order to manage without the Stop residents were crossing to the other side of the road getting the bus for one Stop then recrossing the road to get the bus in the direction they wanted.
- 2.7 Q: SC commented that residents crossing the road was unsafe particularly where they were tempted to do so at the nearest point rather than over a crossing. In the Environmental Statement it had been stated that Bus Stops would not be affected as they did not fall within

the HS2 work zone but they now did. He went on to ask why the original Stop had not been reopened. A: AR responded that the cycle lane had been introduced as an emergency measure during Covid and there was concern for the safety of cyclists if it were to be closed. SC responded that parts of the cycle lane had been closed so there was no reason why it could not all be closed asking why the safety of cyclists was prioritised over buses, bus users and pedestrians. A: AR replied that the safety of all users was considered equally important. LH added that it was not possible to move back to the original arrangements without considering the cycle lane.

- 2.8 LH highlighted that in order to reopen the original Stop J it would be necessary to relocate Stop K further south to avoid the two Stops clashing due to the lane widths available. These changes required safety audits to be carried out, the first of which would be completed in December. It was expected that the second would be completed in January.
- 2.9 C: RL reminded the meeting of the need for HS2 to undertake an equality impact assessment of closures of Bus Stops and road which may affect residents. Where necessary HS2 must provide mitigation.
- 2.10 C: UB commented that there seemed to be no sense of urgency to resolve this. Bus users seem to be the last priority. This problem should have been foreseen. Residents are still waiting for a solution having been told December and it is now looking like next March.
- 2.11 C: SC commented that bus passengers had not been considered and elderly people crossing to the opposite Stop was far more dangerous than the dangers to other users. A: LH responded that all users were considered equally.
- 2.12 It was confirmed that everything possible was being done to expedite resolution of this issue.

### **3 HS2 Euston Station Design Engagement**

- 3.1 DM and NRF presented the previously circulated slides in detail. It was explained that the current round of design engagement is designed to give feedback on comments received earlier in the year and also to ask for views on a number of new design details and developments. A brochure had been produced setting these out which can be found here [London Euston - HS2](#).
- 3.2 DH and NRF asked that the following points be noted:
  - 3.2.1 Feedback can be provided until 12 January 2023
  - 3.2.2 The scheme being put forward does not rely on the Lendlease developments or redevelopment of the existing network Rail station and further smaller applications would be made as necessary (once the other developments were approved) to ensure all of the developments at Euston were integrated.

3.2.3 The HS2 Act and operational needs of the railway set some constraints and therefore those items could not be influenced. However matters which could be influenced were highlighted in the engagement material.

- 3.3 Comments, questions and answers on the detailed presentation of the slides (items 3.13 onwards were added to the chat and answers were provided after the meeting):
- 3.4 Q: DH asked if the image on slide 36 showing the view from Euston Square Gardens across to Gordon Street was accurate in relation to the removal of trees. A: DM replied that the image was indicative and may have had trees omitted to provide a clearer view of the Gordon Street Pavilion. The full details of tree planting and any removals would be provided in due course.
- 3.5 C: A number of comments were made around the proposals to reconfigure car parking spaces and the introduction of one way flows in some streets. A: ROL encouraged attendees to consider these and provide their views through the engagement survey. NRA agreed to provide copies of the parking slides to JM after the meeting.
- 3.6 Q: JT asked if pre-application engagement is being undertaken with LB Camden and the minutes of the meetings would be published without the need for a Freedom of Information Request as necessary for the Vent Shaft minutes. A: DM confirmed that engagement had taken place during the course of the year and more intensively over the Summer. *Post meeting note:* It is not planned that pre-application engagement materials will be published. However, the outcome of the discussions will be reflected in the materials published prior to submission of the Schedule 17 application.
- 3.7 Q: JT asked why blue sky was depicted. A: DM agreed that the effect of shading particularly caused by future over site development by Lendlease was a fair point to raise and that it was being considered.
- 3.8 Q: JT asked why the location of trains was not being shown and asked how the heat from trains would be mechanically vented below platforms. A: DM confirmed that the platforms would be at basement level and that the operational requirements of the railway meant that many factors relating them could not be changed. He also confirmed that the passive ventilation system would be used to help heat escape in hot weather and be retained when it was cooler.
- 3.9 Q: SC asked about the impact of the proposed one-way streets on drop offs such as Ubers. A: ROL confirmed that LB Camden had raised similar concerns and this was being considered. At present it was planned that all station related drop offs would be provided for in the new taxi rank in the North. It had previously been highlighted in the presentation that vehicles accessing and leaving the taxi rank would be allowed to turn across Hampstead Road to lessen the need to use other local roads.
- 3.10 C: RL commented that a future agenda item should be devoted to how housing could be introduced above the station. This should include explanation of any legal reasons why this

could not be done and how these might be overcome (*Post meeting note:* the Contact Group is asked to note this request please although this may be a question for the DfL/Lendlease).

- 3.11 Q: SC asked if the Gordon Street station entrance could be highlighted/more visible to people alighting from buses on Euston Road. This would reduce the number of people crossing the road. A: DM agreed to consider this.
- 3.12 Q: Will there be a new underground station entrance closer to Regents Park Estate? A: Residents will be able to access the underground station more easily through the Northern and Cobourg Street entrances HS2 station entrances.
- 3.13 Q: DH asked if HS2 was planning solar or wind power. A: DM responded that the height of surrounding buildings presented challenges for efficient solar power generation. There is not adequate space or wind to generate using wind power.
- 3.14 Q: DH asked if heating for local area can be provided from the trains. A: This has been looked at and there are no plans to do so. Heat from platform level had been factored into the heating and cooling plan for the station.
- 3.15 Q: DH asked why it was necessary to site the London Underground station entrance in Euston Square Gardens, losing trees. A: The existing LU entrances and ticket hall are undersized to suit current passenger numbers – and the station often has to be closed to manage numbers. With the growth of passengers on HS2 arrival the ticket hall and number of entrances needs to increase. We are seeking to minimise the impact on trees.
- 3.16 C: DH commented - you need to provide for rough sleepers and homeless - not just lock them out and force them into surrounding residential areas. They are part of the community around a mainline station, and under austerity and cost of living their numbers will only increase dramatically.
- 3.17 C: DH asked that consideration be given to screening for keeping pollution on the Euston Road, not in the “community” garden.
- 3.18 Q: DH asked where will private cars and Ubers drop off. A: In the new taxi rank.
- 3.19 ECRG members were invited to attend the advertised engagement events and provide feedback on the plans.

## **4 Materials by Rail**

- 4.1 LW was unable to join the meeting. However, he had provided the following update which was displayed on screen and highlighted by DD:
- We know that the construction works at Euston, and the impact they have on the road network are of concern to the community and road users in the area.

- We are committed to exploring all options to reduce this impact and are working with the Department for Transport and other stakeholders on a review of options to deliver materials by rail.
- This work is progressing, and we will be updating stakeholders in Euston in January. No decisions have been made yet but we hope to reach a conclusion in the near future.
- Regardless of the decision on MbR, HS2 is committed to exploring further projects that, through innovation, could deliver significant benefits to those impacted by the proposed lorry movements.

## 5 HS2 update

5.1 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.

5.2 Members were invited to ask questions or make comments in the meeting or afterwards by emailing DD.

5.3 Comments, questions and answers:

### **Mace Dragados update**

5.4 None

### **Network Rail**

5.5 Q: JT let the meeting know that he had received a letter explaining that the Camden bridge over the Regents Canal would be closed for replacement. This had been circulated at very short notice. A: EH confirmed (via the chat) that an engagement meeting had been arranged for 30 November at 18.30 in Primrose Hill Library to explain this.

### **SCS update**

5.6 None

## 6 Flash Report

6.1 The previously circulated Flash Report was NOTED.

## 7 Actions Log

7.1 The meeting noted that JT had raised a number of comments relating to actions marked to be closed. DD confirmed that these actions would remain open pending further discussion with JT. This concerned actions 302 (meeting to be arranged with NR), 321 (agenda to be agreed and meeting to be arranged), 323 (agenda to be agreed and meeting to be arranged) 326 (green walling to be discussed) and 327 (gabion baskets to be discussed) would remain open.

- 7.2 RL asked that Action 331 be left open pending an explanation of the term “relevant works” and why the works adjacent to Silsoe House had not fallen with this definition.
- 7.3 It was noted that the remaining actions marked for closure would be closed subject to any further comments.

## 8 Community Questions/AOB

- 8.1 The following additional questions were raised:
- 8.2 RL asked that HS2 pass on the community’s thanks and best wishes to Karl Mackie for his service as independent chair. DD agreed to ensure that this would be done. *Post meeting note:* A thank you note has been sent to Karl on behalf of the community representatives.
- 8.3 Q: SC asked what the frequency, format for and next meeting date was for the Traffic Working Group. A: AK explained that a survey was currently being undertaken to assess people’s views on the future format and arrangements for the group.
- 8.4 Q: SC asked if the original indicator boards in the Network Road Euston Station would be switched off once the new boards on the concourse are commissioned. A: MR confirmed that the new boards were now live and that the old one would be switched off to improve crowd flows.

## 9 Minutes of the last meeting

- 9.1 DD explained that the Contact Group had received comments from JT relating to the Adelaide Road item at the last meeting. It was noted that HS2’s Schedule 17 application for the design had been submitted to LB Camden. JT complained that HS2 had given misinformation fundamental to the application. For example at the September ECRG MS had claimed “revealing the machine” aesthetic was appropriate for railway context, incorrectly denying the Primrose Hill context.
- 9.2 It had been agreed that JT’s outstanding concerns (as summarised by JT) would be shown here as a post meeting note:
- HS2 must admit that the information that they gave ECRG (that the vent shaft would cause no visual impact to Primrose Hill) was incorrect. They said the building would be obscured by the parapet of the bridge and showed photos. They must correct this and confirm that the vent shaft will visually impact Primrose Hill and this should be minuted
  - ECRG should censure HS2 for this misinformation and should ask them to explain their conduct. Essentially... their denying visual impact is the oldest trick in the book.. There has to be visual impact on the public realm at the bridge to cause Camden to follow government guidance and ask for that impact to be mitigated.. eg by green walling etc
  - ECRG need to record details of HS2’s justification of their misinformation at the last ECRG. HS2 showed two photos of the bridge at ECRG that had not been sent to attendees... saying (incorrectly) that the parapet was 6 feet high and will prevent the public from seeing the vent shaft which they misleadingly said was only a small (two storey building). I have just been sent the photos following my request. Protocol requires that they should be published with the November



minutes which should note that this bridge parapet does not obstruct the public's view of the vent shaft.

- To prove this major visual impact, I sent the Contact Group and David Demolder my own visualisations of the public view of the vent shaft from the bridge. I will place one visualization on each table at ECRG tomorrow. This visualization should be referenced in the minutes and distributed.
- ECRG should ask HS2 to verify my visualisation by producing their own vizualization and issue it to Camden as part of the Schedule 17 submission to demonstrate visual impact on Primrose Hill. ECRG need to ask Camden or HS2 to make public their negotiations to mitigate this visual impact on Primrose Hill.
- An explanation should be given regarding re the design workshops involving local professionals (promised to ECRG by Laurence Whitbourne in June as Action 323) to help devise mitigation for the visual impacts... These workshops are implied as being not possible by the post meeting note in the September draft minute item 8.5. (not voiced at ECRG) on the grounds that the Schedule 17 submission has been submitted ... notwithstanding that HS2 told ECRG that the design of the north (street) elevation (which HS2 said they recognise will cause impact) will be resubmitted. Camden have emailed me to say that this new Schedule 17 design will be accompanied by a new public consultation. This post meeting note needs explanation.

9.3 JT distributed copies of a visualisation he had prepared which he said proved the impact on Primrose Hill.

9.4 The minutes of the meeting held in September 2022 were AGREED.

## **10 Date of the next meeting**

10.1 It was noted that the dates of the meetings in 2023 would be circulated in due course.