

Meeting minutes

Euston Community Representatives Group (ECRG)

Meeting date	Thursday, 01 June 2023
Meeting location	The Wesley Hotel, Euston Street, NW1 2EZ
Meeting time	5:20pm – 7:00pm

Attendees

AA	Amy Allen	Senior Engagement Manager, SCS Area Central
AI	Andrew Irwin	SCS
AK	Aigul Kalioldina	HS2, Engagement Manager
AM	Alex Murtagh	Euston Station IPT, Team Coordinator
DA	David Auger	Camden Cutting Group, Rep for Clarkson Mornington TRA, CHARGE Committee Member
DD	David Demolder (Chair)	Euston Station IPT, Head of Stakeholder Management
DH	Dorothea Hackman*	Camden Civic Society, Netley Primary School, St Pancras Parish Church, Euston Foodbank
FC	Fiona Chiltern	Lendlease
HGT	Hero Granger-Taylor	Park Village East Heritage Group
HJ	Cllr Heather Johnson	LB Camden Councillor, Regents Park Ward
HK	Harvey Kutner	Silsoe House
JCI	John Collins	HS2
JC	Jonathan Cooke	Senior Communications Manager, Network Rail – ONW
JM	John Myers*	Drummond Street TRA

JT	Jeff Travers	Primrose Hill, Gloucester Avenue
KF	Katie Fulcher	Senior Engagement & Interface Manager – Euston IPT
KL	Kai-Yen Lau	Marketing and Communications Assistant, MDjv
LW	Laurence Whitbourn	Euston Area Client Director, HS2
MB	Mary Burd*	Chair of Albert Street North Residents Association – member of CHARGE and chairs LAEP
MHy	Myall Hornby	Network Rail
MS	Maddelyn Sutton	HS2, Head of Community Engagement
NA	Nasser Ali	The Euston Partnership
NK	Natalie Kirkwood (minutes)	Senior Engagement Manager, MDjv
NM	Nick Mitchell	Engagement Manager, SCS
NRA	Nina Radford	MDjv, Head of Engagement
NVK	Neil Van Kervel	SCS
PB	Paul Braithwaite	Ex Chair, Air Quality AQGOST
PL	Paul Leighton	MDjv, Project Director
PW	Peter Ward	
SC	Steve Christofi	Treasurer of the RPE TRA and HS2 Rep
SR	Shaparak Rahimi	Lendlease
TG	Therese Gallagher	LB Camden
UB	Ursula Brown	Regents Park Estate TRA

Apologies were noted as received from:

JU	Joyal Uddin	Bengali Parents & Tenants Association (BPTA) Regents Park Estate
MH	Matt Hollier*	Contact Group member
MR	Mark Reece	Network Rail
RL	Robert Latham	Silsoe House
SP	Simon Pitkeathley	Camden Town Unlimited

*ECRG Contact Group member

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 DD welcomed the members to the meeting and reminded them of the arrangements for the conduct of the meeting.

2. Minutes of March and April Meetings

- 2.1 DD asked the meeting for agreement to APPROVE the minutes for the March and April meetings. This prompted the following comments:
- 2.2 **C:** DH referenced a further set of minutes for the ECRG Air Quality, Trees and Open Spaces Working Group meeting which has a post meeting note stating that the removal of tree stumps in Euston Street Gardens West will not go ahead until there is a need to do so for works to take place. DH requested that this was also noted in this meeting and would like the minutes of the meeting be shared with attendees of the ECRG. **Action 336:** Share the minutes of the Air Quality, Trees and Open Space Working Group held on 2 May 2023 with ECRG members. *Post meeting note: **Closed** The minutes were circulated with the draft minutes of the June ECRG meeting.*
- 2.3 **C:** SC wanted more of his comments on Bus stop J from the April 2023 meeting included, as he believes these have been omitted from the minutes, in particular his strong opposition to further closures of the bus stop, which he was raising on behalf of representatives. DD commented that the minutes are always circulated in draft for comments and SC should send his comments so we can add them in. **Action 337:** SC to send any comments he made at the April 2023 meeting about Bus stop J which he feels have been omitted from the minutes to DD so these can be included in the minutes. *Post meeting note: **Closed** Wording agreed with SC and added to final April meeting minutes.*
- 2.4 **C:** UB believes the April minutes make it look like she is the only one who responded or commented regarding Bus Stop J.
- 2.5 **C:** DA would like the minutes of meetings to capture the flavour of the meeting when there is a strong emotion from people, including frustrations. He would like minutes to be clearer regarding the first time a point is raised. DA would also like the most important topics to be highlighted in minutes. These comments were noted by the HS2 team and Contact Group members.
- 2.6 **C:** JT commented that the discussions relating to the Adelaide Road Head House schedule 17 application identified there is a distinction between ECRG matters and planning matters. Where statements are made relating to schedule 17 it is important that these matters are discussed and followed through by ECRG. What

had happened at Adelaide Road should not be repeated. In particular he did not feel the HS2 presenters had acknowledged/been honest about the visual impact of the scheme. **A:** DD explained that whilst JT had raised his concerns about this to ECRG members at the April meeting the application had already been submitted to LB Camden. Therefore he had recommended to JT that he bring his concerns to the attention of LB Camden officers so that his representations could be considered by the Planning Committee when making its decision.

- 2.7 **C:** DH recorded a point on behalf of SD in her absence. The Piazza area in front of the Network Rail Euston Station should be included as a safeguarded open space and be returned to the community. There is a concern that this area is no longer referred to as such in Network Rail's plans. DD advised that the email SD sent in advance of the meeting has been passed to Network Rail for response. JC confirmed this and that he will liaise with Chris Winfield (NR RECS lead) to support this.
- 2.8 **C:** HGT agreed with DH and said that Euston Square needs to be looked after so as to not encourage anti-social behaviour.
- 2.9 The minutes of the meetings held in March and April 2023 were APPROVED subject to the above comments.

3. ECRG Contact privacy

- 3.1 DD reminded members to respond to the recent email asking if their email addresses can be shared with other members. Members agreeing to this will be able to receive electronic invitations to future meetings. Members not agreeing to this will continue to receive emails with their addresses (and those of others) hidden but will not receive electronic meeting invitations.

4. Meanwhile Uses

- 4.1 KF introduced herself to the group as the HS2 Senior Engagement Manager for this area.
- 4.2 KF went through the presentation which was previously shared with the group and fed back about the walkabout with community representatives in May. KF noted that two temporary open spaces are being brought forward quickly (in Maria Fidelis car park and adjacent to NTH cabins on Hampstead Road) in response to the feedback provided by ECRG in April. The wider Expression of Interest process is still open and people are invited to register their interest in putting forward proposals.
- 4.3 Comments and questions:

- 4.4 **C:** DH recalled when the HS2 community fund first opened, many were interested and put in applications. However, one criterion about 'Celebrating HS2' meant a lot of applications were refused. DH asked what the criteria will be for community meanwhile uses proposals as the track record on allocation has not been good. KF will share the criteria once developed but it will not include a requirement to 'Celebrate HS2'.
- 4.5 **Q:** SC asked when opening Cobourg Street if the parking bays will be reinstated. *Post meeting note: The bays will be reinstated when the hoarding on Coburg Street is moved.*
- 4.6 **Q:** SC also asked if the Exmouth Arms' beer garden would reopen. **A:** HS2 is unsure at this time as this area may be required for utilities work.
- 4.7 **Q:** SC enquired about a picture on an information board in the new Starcross Yard open space of the old fountain that was in St James' Gardens. He asked why it was there and if this indicated that the fountain would be installed at Starcross Yard in the future. **A:** DH stated that the fountain is now in the gardens behind St Pancras Church. **A:** LW will liaise with LB Camden to find out the future use of the fountain as Starcross Open Space was a project led by them.
- 4.8 **Q:** HGT asked if the black cabs at Euston could move to a meanwhile space. **A:** LW responded that the plan is to try to open up the new Interim Taxi Rank in Euston Square Gardens East for the taxis. This would allow the southern half of the existing Taxi Rank in Euston Square Gardens West to be used for meanwhile uses (with the north continuing to be used for mobility drop offs). Discussions were underway with the landowner, Network Rail, to agree a transition.
- 4.9 **C:** UB went on the walkabout. She was disappointed to see how little area is available for meanwhile use opportunities and was also very disappointed to see that nothing is being offered for residents of the Regents Park Estate. The only positive thing UB wanted to see was the NTH site but this is not on offer, however, she would like it to be considered for planting with wildflowers to help with dust. **A:** NRA informed attendees that some wildflower seeds were sowed on the banked areas which we don't need for materials storage. **A:** PL further stated that when we have final materials storage plans, we can look at more seeding.
- 4.10 **Q:** HK reiterated UB's points and expressed disappointment that no space is being made available in the Camden Cutting area. HK queried whether HS2 is in considering safety of areas. There was a problem on Primrose Hill when it was reopened, and it had to be shut. Will security be part of the consultation. **A:** KF stated this will definitely be considered alongside applications.
- 4.11 **C:** JT reiterated the point of seeding wildflowers, which is an important part of maintaining areas to ensure that weeds and invasive plants do not take over. By

seeding, you get a lot of insects back into the local area, but invasive plants discourage this. JT also commented that ponds are also good for wildlife.

- 4.12 **Q:** JT enquired about funding for meanwhile use activities; under a previous scheme, he received a £9k grant from HS2 for Adelaide Community Gardens. JT has stated that if HS2 will be using the same granting system there will be a lot of administration for anything over £10k. JT further pointed out that you cannot get people to help if they do not have the tools so people need to invest in maintenance too. **A:** LW agreed with JT and stated that early funding is available for MDjv so seeding can be completed straight away. In terms of maintenance LW stated that it is important that the community want to be involved and that it is value for money for the taxpayer. **C:** JT encouraged HS2 and MDjv to talk to their own staff as some security guards are really interested in wildlife.
- 4.13 **C:** HJ agreed with all previous points made under agenda item 4. She asked for clarity on the level of funding available as without this it will not be easy to come up with ideas. **A:** LW stated that HS2 is making funding available for the meanwhile uses, and whilst he cannot give a precise figure, he believes HS2 are committed to investing c£1m. SC requested that this figure be as noted in the minutes.
- 4.14 **C:** HJ stated that it is important that groups have an approximate figure so they know what the funding limit is. **Q:** HJ also queried whether the planting season has been missed and if this will still be worthwhile. **A:** PL stated that the project will be bringing in large quantities of materials into the NTH site and once completed, planting will continue.
- 4.15 **C:** HJ commented that when there was a pause of the Regents Place project, football pitches were installed, which proved to be very popular. **Q:** HJ asked if we have been exploring these types of commercial opportunities as they take a long lead in time to organise which may make us miss out. **A:** FC said that we are engaging with these kinds of commercial operators and interactive uses, who can move quickly.
- 4.16 **Q:** MB asked what level of cost will be considered 'value for money' and who makes that decision? **A:** LW explained that there will be a panel; LW acknowledges that there may be subjectivity around it, but we need to have a balance to ensure that there is value for money and for the community.
- 4.17 **Q:** SC asked how local residents outside of ECRG get to have their say; he further asked if there will there be a public consultation. **A:** KF responded it is important that everyone can have their say, and we will provide multiple opportunities to engage with the wider community. We will aim to have sessions in person but will have the option of online for those who need it. **Q:** NRA asked if there were any existing residents' meetings at which this topic could be discussed? **C:** SC stated that there were not as this time. However, he wanted to highlight that we need to

go to a wider area as there are 6000 people on Regents Park Estate and they all need to have the opportunity for their voice to be heard. **A:** KF stated that we will have community workshops which all will be welcome to attend.

- 4.18 **C:** DA asked that school holidays be avoided as there is scepticism about consultation in August.
- 4.19 **C:** MS also reminded the group that the existing HS2 CEF and BLEF funds are still available and seeking proposals.

5. Tunnelling Alignment

- 5.1 NVK introduced the update and gave apologies for David Hannon.
- 5.2 AI presented the previously circulated slides, reiterating that the tunnel alignment remains fixed and has been for many years.
- 5.3 The presentation advised that two Tunnel Boring Machines (TBMs) are currently scheduled to launch around 2025 (post pause) towards Euston and will arrive underground, passing through Canterbury Works and Adelaide Road vent shafts. At Euston approaches it splits into three track tunnels 9m in diameter which will be built using the Sprayed Concrete Lining (SCL) technique beneath the railway cutting and a small section of the road in Park Village East but not directly under any houses or flats.
- 5.4 **Q:** JT asked about the rest of the tunnelling, as he currently cannot find the detailed tunnel alignment in relation to his property. JT further stated that his is concerned that the SCL technique is not a safe option for tunnelling, and he referenced the Heathrow tunnel collapse (October 1994) as an example. **A:** AI stated that the alignment from Euston to Ruislip is fixed. **Q:** JT asked for clarification on where this alignment passes. JT reiterated that tunnels could be moved anywhere as long as they are in the 'zone'. JT asked for clarification on where he can locate this information. **A:** AA stated that she had previously shared engagement tools regarding tunnelling which details each section of the tunnel and where the alignment is; AA also stated that any resident can also access this information via the HS2 Helpdesk and a detailed response will be given. **C:** JT reiterated that he just wants confirmation of where the tunnel will be as he does not want this under his home.
- 5.5 **C:** HGT stated that the community need to see 'proper' drawings with dates and reference numbers as well as the status of the drawing. HGT further stated that she believes track alignments have changed since the Phase One Bill. **Q:** HRT has requested that we go over the changes in the area as her latest drawing from HS2 was dated 2019. **A:** AI informed the meeting that there had been no changes in the alignment, however, he further stated that once designs were further

developed and constraint understood, we will update drawings. There are no major changes in the area.

- 5.6 **C:** HGT further commented on the above (5.5) by stating that the Cavern, which is the area to be excavated, has massively increased (from the slides shown in the meeting) and there is also intent for another excavation one which is a change to the Bill. HGT advised that this was troubling, specifically from a ground movement perspective. **A:** NVK advised that he was going to present a detailed update in March 2023 but due to the pause this did not happen. However, NVK advised that plans will be presented in March 2024 one year before the project has resumed from this pause.
- 5.7 **C:** HGT further reiterated that if the drawings are available, then they should be shared. HGT highlighted that any drawings issued could be marked as 'draft' or similar indicators which allows for amendments. HGT shared with the group that she is feeling intimidated and pressured to allow access to her property for surveys and is disappointed that drawings cannot or will not be shared with her, who is directly impacted by the scheme. **Q:** HGT also queried why the slides shared had DfT (Department for Transport) on them. **A:** NVK acknowledged the error in the slides having DfT on them, however, he made clear that these slides were from SCS. NVK further confirmed that once the assurance process for the drawings have been approved, expected early 2024, he will be happy to share this with the group. **Action 338:** NVK to provide updated drawings, once approved, to members and attendees of the ECRG.
- 5.8 **C:** HGT commented that in 2020 she had a Judicial Review where the judge stated that they could not believe the design was going to be built as it was not safe but did not believe this to be a human rights issue. HGT further commented that HS2's non-provision of detail promised is frustrating and she also doubts that Network Rail will approve HS2's tunnelling plans as this has the potential to cause subsidence to their assets.
- 5.9 **C:** DA stated that at the last meeting we spoke about specifics of people needing to know exactly where the tunnel is going, and there seems to be a lack of appreciation that people like him and his neighbours have been going to meetings for over a decade, it feels like HS2 staff are lying to the community. DA gave several examples of where this has occurred which has led to mistrust and highlighted that it feels like we are not respecting requests of communities; DA also stated that he believes that HS2 lie to local residents when they need to and unfortunately, there was nothing in the slides presented that has changed his mind about the issues that HGT and the community are dealing with. DA finalised his comments by requesting that HS2 should review the way they treat the community and HS2 should be doing more and not less. DA also stated that the mind set of those employed by HS2 need a cultural change ensuring that the community is at the forefront of decision making – this point was agreed by those in ECRG members in attendance.

- 5.10 **Q:** SC referenced that NVK had mentioned SCS had drawings showing the tunnel alignments, which were to be presented at the March construction update events but this was put on hold due to rephasing of Euston Approaches works. However, SC would like to know if there is any way that they can be shared – even if the drawings were tagged with ‘draft’, ‘not final copy’ or something similar as SC believes that this will help to rebuild trust within the community. **Action 339:** HS2 to organise a workshop to provide further detailed information on tunnelling throughout the area, including track alignment. **Action 340:** NVK to issue the drawing included in slides labelled ‘Tunnel Sections – 15 – 20m below Park Village East’ as a drawing with reference number.
- 5.11 **Q:** DA asked what the dismantling of the TBM would involve and whether there would be impacts for residents and if so, what mitigation will be put in place. **A:** AI stated that the 120m long gantries are taken back to Old Oak Common and the cutter head will be dismantled and removed in pieces and removed via lorries.
- 5.12 **Q:** HK enquired about the route for spoil removal. **A:** AI confirmed that this will be via Old Oak Common as there is no other place for this to happen.
- 5.13 **Q:** HK acknowledged that HS2 cannot predict the future, however he requested an estimated timeline to when the TBMs will reach Camden Cutting. **A:** AI confirmed that from Old Oak Common it will take the TBMs approximately 18 – 24 months to get to Euston.
- 5.14 **Q:** HK reported that he has requested information from HS2 regarding ground movement in and around Silsoe House which has not been received. HK asked why there are so many trial/boring holes and investigations on the estate, close to the barracks wall. **Action 341:** NVK to provide information regarding ground movement in the area of Silsoe House and explain the need for trial holes on the estate and close to the barracks.
- 5.15 **C:** JT noted that there were different types of tunnelling and asked for more information on phasing and sequences of works. **A:** AA responded that SCS held its first virtual engagement event on Euston tunnelling on 16/05/23. The slides contain a lot of information which will be of interest to ECRG members and will be circulated with the ECRG minutes. **Action 342:** AA to provide slides from the engagement event held on 16/05/23 for circulation.
- 5.16 **Q:** PB queried whether the TBMs have been purchased. **A:** AI confirmed that they have been purchased from Germany, and some materials have already arrived for assembling. Exact start dates for the TBM works are still to be decided.
- 5.17 **Q:** HK asked about noise and vibrations level of TBMs and SCL tunnelling, and whether this has been allowed for in HS2s Environmental Statement for Phase

One of the scheme. HK further queried whether this will halt track side development or if TBMs be used in conjunction with this activity. **A:** AI stated that the works being carried out in Euston approaches will continue so there is no change, further detail on this will be provided at the workshop HS2 is organising.

6. HS2 Update and Contractor Updates

- 6.1 **Q:** SC asked if diversion signs could be colour coded, especially when two diversion routes cross each other. **A:** DD requested that SC provided instances this where this happening so these can be investigated. DD also noted that there is specific guidance for this. *Post meeting note: This is an example of the type of signage required to be used for multiple diversions.*



- 6.2 **C:** HGT requested accurate date notifications for days local roads are going to be closed, and to be updated when changes occur as a recent closure in Park Village East was earlier than previously notified. It was noted that Network Rail is due to respond on this point which had been raised prior to the ECRG meeting.
- 6.3 **C:** DA reiterated the above point (6.2) and also expressed his disappointment that it took an interaction from himself for the request to be escalated and managed.
- 6.4 **Q:** JT informed the meeting that he had received a recent notification regarding Adelaide Road saying for three months there will be 24/7 working laying a concrete slab outside residential properties. It was about SCS work but from Network Rail and JT shared that this could be seen as confusing. **A:** JC explained that Network Rail sends a periodic letter (c3 month cycle) which includes all works in the area, including those from other contractors.
- 6.5 **C:** DA agreed with JT's point above (6.4) and recalling a time when there was a discussion about the generic communications sent to residents which were not informative or useful. It was looked at in detail and the quality of communications has varied since, depending on the contractor and the detail of work. **A:** HS2 confirmed it is carrying out another review of communications and this feedback will be used for improvements.
- 6.6 **C:** JT highlighted the heights of the hoardings at Park Village East (c3.6m) is having an adverse impact on the community. **A:** AA acknowledged this issue and stated that there is ongoing engagement with residents and a meeting with senior HS2 staff is being arranged to address and resolve this.
- 6.7 **Q:** HK queried the light pollution coming from sites and hoardings in Camden Cutting and asked if anything can be done to alleviate this. **A:** NVK confirmed that he will look at this and provide feedback at a future meeting.

7. AOB

- 7.1 **C:** SC commented that he feels almost bullied by noise insulation contractors who noted that he 'was a special case' to receive the insulation. SC requested HS2 review how contractors treat residents and ensure that any contractor working on behalf of HS2 respect their residents.
- 7.2 **Q:** SC asked for confirmation regarding which block/property on the Regents Park Estate are eligible for noise insulation. **Action 343:** HS2 to provide details of properties on Regents Park Estate qualifying for noise insulation. *Post meeting note: **Closed** – information provided to SC.*
- 7.3 **C:** SC commented that there is demand from residents for a meeting with whoever is responsible for closing and opening bus stops as they would like to explore the best place to put temporary bus stops if more closures are forthcoming. **Action 344:** HS2 to seek organise a temporary bus stops location workshop for interested residents with Transport for London for consideration.
- 7.4 DD thanked attendees and closed the meeting, confirming that the next meeting date is 21 September 2023.