

Euston Communities Representatives Group Actions List
Updated for the March 2024 meeting


AI No.	Action	Who	When	Closed?
246	DA to clarify the information he is seeking in relation to the use of Mornington Terrace as a construction traffic route. HS2 to respond	DA HS2 SCS E	20 Dec 6 Jan	<p>Left open at the request of DA</p> <p>A response has previously been sent at action 160: "Responses were sent to DA on 12/9/18 and 29/11/18. In summary: The AP3 Environmental Assessment considered three construction scenarios in the Euston area for the period to 2026. In one of these scenarios Mornington Terrace was closed to general traffic."</p> <p>DA to advise if there is a further question on this and provide in writing before ECRG. No further information received.</p> <p>Further to 16 July ECRG this action to remain open and DA to forward further questions by email. HS2 to advise</p> <p>1. Whether an assessment was made of the air quality and other impacts of the work on the up sidings, and if so, provide a copy. 2. If no assessment was made, whether it is HS2's position that no such assessment is required under human rights and other legislation.</p> <p>HS2 response:</p> <p>We can confirm that an Air Quality Assessment was undertaken, using the construction traffic data as detailed in the Volume 5 ES Appendix SES2 and AP3 TR-001-000 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachme</p>

			<p>nt_data/file/460734/SES2 and AP3 ES Volume 5 Air quality AQ-001-001 AQ-001-002 AQ-001-003 and AQ-001-004 .pdf</p> <p>which includes the use of Mornington Terrace as a construction traffic route, see mapbooks for reference (Page 19 – indicates construction traffic route including Mornington Terrace):</p> <p>https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/461185/Y30 VOL5 Environmental Topics WATERMARK.pdf</p> <p>The Traffic Data is from SES2 and Ap3 Environmental Statement Volume 5 Appendix TR-001-000 Annex D</p> <p>https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/460746/SES2_A_P3_ES Volume 5 Transport Assessment TR-001-000 Annexes Part 2.pdf</p> <p>DA clarifying by email the further information he is requesting from HS2.</p> <p>DA has advised that he would like confirmation that an air quality assessment was carried out for the Network Rail enabling works. HS2 is investigating.</p> <p>Response sent to DA on 20 November 2020 confirming that all associated works with the project, were considered in the Air Quality Assessment as part of the ES. DA has responded and requested a copy of the air quality assessment.</p> <p>March 2021 – awaiting report from Environment Team.</p> <p>02.12.21 LH to check if it is agreed that this action is now closed.</p>
--	--	--	--

A.I. No.	Action	Who?	When?	Closed?
302	<p>With reference to previous actions 262, 274, 282, 290, 294: SCS to issue Adelaide Road ecology survey details and methodology by 30th June 2021.</p> <p>Adelaide Road Workshop to be arranged for August 2021, and NR will be invited to attend.</p>	<p>NG LH SCS AA-SCS</p>	3 rd August 2021	<p>Open</p> <p>June note from JT: NR attendance at workshop/meeting was discussed with NR after last ECRG and NR agreed to participate.</p> <p>March 2023 JT has requested that the proposed workshop go ahead before this action is closed.</p> <p>02.12.21 AA to update response noting the suggestion that an Open Spaces working group could be used to review "net loss"</p> <p>21.01.22 'No net loss' calculations are representative of the entire route, and incorporate all works across HS2. At Adelaide Road there are additional agreements to consider, in the form of Undertakings & Assurances (U&As) HS2 have made with LB Camden. 'No net loss' will ensure that any vegetation removed at Adelaide Road is accounted for in future landscaping plans, but HS2 must also ensure compliance with additional statements made within the Environment Statement and within the U&As HS2 has agreed to.</p> <p>Where practicable, SCS will provide updates RE: 'no net loss' in relation to the Adelaide Road site, in coordination with the HS2 Environment team. As this links directly to the future replanting strategy, it must be noted there may not be an update upon each occasion of the working group it falls into – as part of the AQTOSWG or a dedicated open spaces group.</p> <p>30.06.21 - Response to FOI-21-4080 issued, which included Adelaide Road CSJV survey data 2017 – 2020 and the SCSJV tree fell count.</p> <p>18.08.22 - 'No net loss' is included in AQTOSWG and therefore this action should be closed out in ECRG action log.</p>

A.I. No.	Action	Who?	When?	Closed?
315	AA to respond by email on how the headhouse design is taking account of the Grade II* Listed tunnel portals.	Amy Allen	27 October 2022	<p>Open</p> <p>June note from JT: Camden's Sch17 Planning report advised Camden's Planning Committee that the historic portals cannot be seen from public places. However SCS's response to the scheduled question about setting up public viewpoints of the portal across the site recognised that public viewpoints of the portals framed by the headhouse exist. This was discussed after the last ECRG meeting re the Construction Commissioners request to SCS to create hoarding windows for public views across the SCS sites.</p> <p>March 2023 JT has requested that the information about the relationship with the listed portal be provided before this action is closed.</p> <p>Previous response: Local context and materiality were considered in design stages ahead of the Sch. 17 Plans & Specifications application for the Adelaide Road Vent Shaft & Headhouse, including photographic surveys undertaken to help provide examples of the local context, character, materiality and colors. In addition, principal building and paving materials, principal boundary treatments and principal vegetation types were all studied.</p> <p>The materials palette considers the requirements of the Land Design Approach to ensure that the <i>finishes and materials will suit local character</i> and attention to detail is considered to <i>help fit these components in well with particular rural or urban locations.</i></p> <p>The materials proposed in our design for the Adelaide Road headhouse are timber, metal, concrete and brickwork. We are planning to use similar</p>

				materials at all headhouses between Euston and West Ruislip. The materials palette has been chosen according to the environment, moving from brick, through metal and towards wood as we move between rural and urban locations.
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).	MS/AA	21 December 2022	<p>In progress</p> <p>September 2023: JT advised that this matter is now the subject of a compliant to the HS2 Construction Commissioner.</p> <p>June note from JT: The action notes that a follow up walkabout meeting re future plans is awaited. But as noted above (302)... it seems that engagement may now be via NR (rather than SCS or HS2).</p> <p>Also SCS have failed to raise and complete hoardings as promised following the walkabout meeting in January (despite regular expressions of concern by distressed residents since Walkabout).</p> <p>March 2023 JT has requested that the action remains open pending further meetings to discuss future impacts.</p> <p>01.12.22 Agenda and date for meeting to be agreed</p> <p>Meeting dates offered to Jeff Travers. Yet to be convened.</p> <p>22.08.22 operatives were re-briefed about behaviours ahead of the Utilities work commencing, e.g. no parking in local areas, no taking breaks outside resident properties etc. Frequent walkarounds were undertaken during the road closure works. In addition, some fly tipped rubbish (broken pallets, bin bags etc.) on Fellows Road was removed by SCS JV as a good will gesture - this rubbish was a H&S risk, impacting the footway and included food waste in hot weather which was attracting vermin. 29.09.22 MS clarified that this action had been to undertake a walkabout of the local</p>

				<p>area with Gerry O'Connell of the Beaumont Walk TRA and this had taken place on 16 September with LB Camden in attendance. She would be happy to undertake a further walk with JT.</p> <p>21.11.22 AA has offered JT a walkaround before the EOY, to be confirmed by JT if required.</p>
323	<p>MS/AA to urgently convene an update/workshop session on the Adelaide Road design Schedule 17 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.</p> 	MS/AA	21 December 2022	<p>Open</p> <p>June note from JT: No SCS responses have occurred re Sch17 process updates. Action should record that Camden's Planning Committee approved the headhouse design following Camden Planning Officers testimony to the Planning Committee that Headhouse could not be seen from the tourist route on the bridge to Primrose Hill "unless people stand on tiptoe at the parapet". This appears to be the same explanation as that given to ECRG last June by HS2's Lead Architect.... But the entire height of the existing four storey white houses prominent in the photo (that the head house will completely obscure) is currently visible to a person of average height from the main pedestrian area of almost the entire length of the bridge. The existing houses are only hidden by the parapet from viewpoints very close to the parapet. This is because the bridge has a camber and the headhouse is uphill.</p> <p>March 2023 JT has requested an update as to why this has not taken place.</p> <p>01.12.22 to remain open pending a meeting/workshop to discuss</p> <p>Material shared with residents for the Head House can be found here. Microsoft PowerPoint - 2109 ARVS KDE engagement boards - FINAL (1) (hs2.org.uk)</p> <p>An update on the progress of the application will be provided to JT.</p> <p>18.08.22 - AA can provide update on status of Sch17 P&S application in</p>

				September meeting, as required. 05.10.22 At the time of the ECRG meeting the application has already been submitted to LB Camden and was under consideration.
324	LA commented via the chat: There appears to be nothing about heritage in relation to the design - how that needs to be taken into account. In relation to Adelaide Road for example, this relates to the proximity of the Listed Portal structures - it would be useful to know how the design of the structure responds directly to this important context. There is also an ambition to open up the view to the Primrose Hill Portal as part of the Railway Heritage Trust proposal to have a Brunel Walk - this would be from the road opposite the head house (which would be visible from this view along with the head house). LA also commented: There is a requirement for the setting of a Listed Building to be taken into account - at the moment the Adelaide Road design does not acknowledge this context.	Martin Short	27 October 2022	Open

A.I. No.	Action	Who?	When?	Closed?
326	C: JT commented that green walling was needed at the earliest stage to help screen the facility.	Steve Austin	21 December 2022	<p>Open</p> <p>June note from JT: NR attendance at workshop/meeting was discussed with NR after last ECRG and NR agreed to participate. No details yet given. March 2023 JT requested that precise details are needed regarding green walling feasibility in each location to properly address this Action. 01.12.22 Remain open pending workshop</p> <p>28.11.22 The Design and Access Statement confirms the functional requirements of the building, such as those relating to ventilation and security, mean it has not been possible to incorporate additional green walls, other than what is proposed on the southern elevation. Additional planting has been confirmed to not be viable on the majority of the headhouse building due to safety parameters regarding the functionality of the chimney. Climbing plants could potentially block the opening of the chimney and catch fire from heat in the event of fire.</p>
327	JH asked via the chat: Is there any reason why Gabion baskets cannot be used on the rail side of the building to give wildlife cover, insect and bat boxes etc?	Steve Austin	21 December 2022	<p>Open</p> <p>June note from JT: NR attendance at workshop/meeting was discussed with NR after last ECRG and NR agreed to participate. Response incorrect as retaining walls do exist in design and gabions can be used freestanding or as facing.</p> <p>01.12.22 remain open pending workshop</p> <p>28.11.22 Gabion walls are used on other assets for habitat creation within the wider Landscape. However, to the rail side of the proposed Adelaide Road building there are currently no retaining walls in the landscape which could utilise gabion walls.</p>

A.I. No.	Action	Who?	When?	Closed?
334	Regarding Granby Terrace consider if there is a more convenient pedestrian route to Hampstead Road.	RC		Open
338	Share tunnel alignment plans and sections once approved.	NVK		Pending NvK 15/3/2024 The detailed design phase has been completed and is currently going through the technical assurance process which we aim to conclude in end of 2024. Fresh plans to be provided following discussion with HGT Shared at sessions in September and via ECRG papers
350	SCS to share information on noise impacts and mitigation measures (from the conveyor belt).	SCS		Open Modelling not started but will be provided to ECRG once it has been completed and approved.
352	JT and HGT to share the plans they had in order that they may be confirmed as current or fresh plans be provided to them.	HGT JT		Closed for HGT Open for JT Drawings provided to ECRG in November 2023 are the most recent. Latest versions currently in detailed design phase and are not available for external circulation. Latest design will show reduced length of cavern which reduced impact on third parties. Drawings provided to ECRG in November represent more recent updates and the drawings align with those included in the pack issued by HGT (comments provided by SW).
357	HS2 to provide JT information on the transfer penalty between HS2 trains at OOC and the Elizabeth Line (see also minute 3.8).	HS2		Closed All modelled journey times are from a specific origin and destination point – usually the station entrance. The walk time quoted (13.8 minutes) therefore includes walking time (based on reference assumptions) from OOC to the platform and the walk from the

				platform at Bond Street to the street. The 'via Euston' time quoted (16.7 minutes) includes the same, as well as the additional walk from the platform at Euston to London Underground. If only the walk time at OOC was included this would effectively only provide the journey time to the Elizabeth Line platform, rather than to the street.
360	NVK to share the drawings with HGT under minute 6.6 to 6.9 and JT under minute 6.10.	NVK SCS		Open Update NvK 12/3/24 We have now completed the detailed design phase for the Euston Approaches. The design is currently going through the technical assurance process which we aim to complete at the end of 2024. These drawings will not include the contours for the Euston Approaches. The map showing the settlement contours are held on our GIS system which is proving to be difficult to print. We are currently working with our technical team to provide the ECRG with a document in a printable format for the Euston Approaches.
361	HS2 to explain why it is seeking permission to extend the planned Hampstead Road Bridge.	RC/AK		Open
362	HS2 to arrange for contractors to discuss safety on Hampstead Road and Harrington Square this with SC.	NVK SCS		Open