

## Meeting minutes

### Euston Community Representatives Group (ECRG)

<b>Meeting date</b>	Thursday, 25 July 2024
<b>Meeting location</b>	The Wesley Hotel, Euston Street, NW1 2EZ
<b>Meeting time</b>	5:20pm – 7:00pm

#### Attendees

AA	Amy Allen	Senior Engagement Manager, SCS Area Central
AC	Anne Clarke	Barnet and Camden London Assembly Member
AM	Andy Mateer	Utilities Lead, MDjv
AMo	Andrew Morgan	Head of Euston delivery unit for Network Rail On Network Works
BW	Ben White	Communications and Engagement Director, The Euston Partnership
CHJ	Cllr Heather Johnson	Ward Councillor
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
DC	David Clayton	SCS
DH	Dorothea Hackman*	Camden Civic Society
GO	Gerry O'Donnell	Beaumont Walk
HGT	Hero Granger-Taylor	Park Village East Heritage Group
JC	John Collins	Project Manager, HS2
JCo	Jonathan Cooke	Senior Communications Manager, Network Rail – ONW
JM	John Myers*	Drummond Street TRA
JT	Jeff Travers*	Primrose Hill, Gloucester Avenue
KL	Kai-Yen Lau	Marketing and Communications Assistant, MDjv
KH	Kamal Hanif	Head of Stakeholders and Communities – The Euston Partnership
KF	Katie Fulcher	Euston Engagement Lead, HS2

KM	Katy Mann	Construction Lead, LB Camden
MB	Mary Burd	CHARGE and chairs LAEP
MHo	Myall Hornsby	Community relations executive, ONW (Network Rail)
NJ	Nick Jones	Head of Delivery, HS2
NK	Natalie Kirkwood (minutes)	Senior Engagement Manager, MDjv
NVK	Neil Van Kervel	Engagement Manager SCS
PB	Paul Braithwaite	Ex Chair, Air Quality AQGOST
RC	Richard Crathern	HS2, Senior Project Manager - SCS East
RL	Robert Latham	Silsoe House
SF	Samantha Fernandes	Consents and Engagement Lead, SCS
SC	Steve Christofi	Treasurer of the RPE TRA and HS2 Rep
SD	Slaney Devlin	Chair of Somers Town Neighbourhood Forum
SN	Sandra Nicholls	Mornington Place Residents Association
TS	Timothy Stockton	Resident
TY	Tom Young	Resident
UB	Ursula Brown*	Regents Park Estate TRA

## Apologies

MS	Maddelyn Sutton	Head of Community Engagement, HS2
PL	Paul Leighton	Project Director, Mace Dragados
SP	Simon Pitkeathley	Euston BID

\*ECRG Contact Group

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

**1.1** DD opened the meeting and highlighted the agreed arrangements for the conduct of the meeting. He explained that at the previous meeting attendees had interrupted speakers and talked across them. He asked that people wishing to ask a question or make a point wait until the speaker had finished as they may answer the question in their presentation. Those wishing to ask a question should raise their hand and wait until invited to speak. This would allow the meeting to run more smoothly, ensure time for all points to be raised and show respect to speakers who give up their time to attend.

**1.2** *Post meeting note: The arrangements described above were not universally followed in part causing the meeting to overrun and leaving some residents unable to ask their questions. To ensure respect for all if an attendee interrupts a speaker or other attendee without permission from the Chair, their comment or question will not be answered or reflected in the minutes from now on.*

**1.3** TY is a local resident and architect and was welcomed to the meeting.

## 2. Minutes of the Last Meeting

- 2.1** The minutes of the March 2024 meeting were APPROVED for publishing on the HS2 website. It was noted that the minutes are not narrative minutes and are intended to capture the spirit of what is said.

## 3. Actions Log

- 3.1** DD asked the meeting to NOTE that a number of actions which relate to the Adelaide Road Headhouse have been closed as this has now had Schedule 17 approval. Some relating to it's landscaping will be moved for reconsideration in 2026 to tie in the site restoration engagement that will be undertaken then. All other points marked "Closed" will be closed out unless valid comments are received.

### 3.2 Questions and comments:

**C:** JT noted that there are certain grey areas on the actions relating to Adelaide Road which the Schedule 17 does not cover. **C:** GO further expanded on this point and would like these actions to remain open for now. GO is concerned about the design plans particularly the status of the boundary wall. **A:** DD further clarified that items that have received Schedule 17 approval will be closed and those relating to landscaping will remain open. He invited JT to provide any further comments following the meeting which were: *JT noted that he understood from GO that important items like the restoration of the historic boundary wall (which HS2 had previously assured residents would be subject to future Schedule 17 landscaping approval) were now not considered by HS2 as requiring Camden's planning determination. JT requested clarification.*

- 3.3 C:** JT commented that he is not happy with the latest response on transfer times (Action 357) from Old Oak Common and that these undermined the business case for HS2 Euston as stated by Sir Keir Starmer in the House of Commons Select Committee.

- 3.4 C:** DA expressed concern about the integrity and honesty of decision makers. He referenced his appearance in the Phase One Hybrid Bill Select Committee where he outlined his concerns about trains being terminated at Old Oak Common. At that time he had been advised during the hearing that this would not happen.

- 3.5 C:** JT commented that he had been in touch with a lawyer regarding Schedule 17 applications. They had advised that local authorities may propose alternative design designs. This means that LB Camden could and should propose a design alternative for the Hampstead Road bridge which is smaller (Action 361).

- 3.6 C:** PB wanted to amplify DA's point on trust. On the 5 October 2023 the then Prime Minister said that HS2 Ltd will terminate at Euston and the new HS2 Euston Station would have six platforms (reduced from ten). Trust has dwindled due to works scheduled to take place on Hampstead Road Bridge to accommodate a ten-platform station.
- 3.7 C:** UB stated that it seems that the Hampstead Road Bridge extension it will go ahead, which is not part of the 'no regrets' work. UB further stated that she is unsure why this work is being pushed ahead when there is no agreed plan for HS2 Euston Station. **Q:** TS – asked why is no regrets works going on? **A:** RC stated that regardless of the number of platforms, the bridge still needs to be extended. The bridge spans required are dependent on the station platform positioning and bridge pier alignment to achieve mandatory straight platforms. Even if a redesign were desirable, this would incur considerable additional cost, programme implications and removes flexibility from the station re-design. **C:** DA commented that HS2 does not know what station it is building but despite this there is a planning application for review.
- 3.8 DD** reminded attendees that they could make comments on the Hampstead Road Bridge application to LB Camden via their usual planning application process. HS2 had been clear that it planned to proceed with this design and was taking no further comments.

## **4. The Euston Partnership (TEP) Engagements**

- 4.1 BW** introduced himself and KH.
- 4.2** The group received a presentation on the role of The Euston Partnership (the slides for this are contained in the pack circulated after the meeting). This covered the composition of the partnership, its role and high-level future plans.
- 4.3** Questions and comments:
- 4.4 Q:** SC asked if TEP is advisory and therefore can only make recommendations so cannot instruct? **A:** BW advised that this is correct. TEP does this via collaborative working with partners across the Euston campus.
- 4.5 Q:** JT asked if TEP is making decisions for ministers? **A:** BW stated that TEP advises ministers on all things Euston (housing, commercial, funding etc.), but does not make decisions.
- 4.6 Q:** JT wanted more information on the Community Review Panel – what it is and will briefings be available for all to see. **A:** BW explained that the panel is made up

of community members to help hold TEP to account and to get community perspective which can inform discussions and conversations.

- 4.7 C:** UB commented that information is discussed on the panel but no one from her area was included. **A:** BW advised that the panel is not area based but community based. He further stated that information shared is information that has already been then shared publicly.
- 4.8 Q:** DH enquired if on the panel there are community members east of Hampstead Road. **A:** BW will check that members are happy for their names and areas to be shared. If agreed, this will be shared with this group.
- 4.9 C:** RL commented that we are talking about engagement but what I want is transparency. For example, will capacity reduce up to Manchester? He also commented that Hampstead Road Bridge is being expanded as it will make it more expensive to cancel HS2 to Euston the more money that is spent on so called “no regrets works”.
- 4.10** BW acknowledged that there is room for improvement in engagement across the Euston campus. Currently, he is unclear about the impact engagement is having. BW will identify opportunities where feedback can influence decision making and design.
- 4.11** BW stated that TEP is producing a Communication and Engagement Strategy which will be presented to the TEP board in September 2024. Before this date TEP will test this with the community for input and feedback.
- 4.12 C:** DA commented that understanding the impact of engagement, the feedback you are getting is the function of how residents are treated. Questions have been asked that have not been answered. Until this is rectified, you will not get a better quality of engagement meeting (referring to ECRG meetings). **A:** DD stated that the ECRG is staged under a U&A to residents and its purpose is to give them the opportunity to raise topics they wish. Agenda items are chosen by residents but answers are not always going to be available for all questions such as the final plan for the HS2 Euston Station.
- 4.13 C:** DH said the ECRG meetings point to make is the meeting fell apart when the tree felling in Euston Square Gardens West took place. This meeting should be genuinely consultative where residents can influence decision. **A:** BW responded that TEP will challenge themselves to find genuine opportunities for residents to influence plans at Euston.
- 4.14 C:** PB thanked BW for attending and embracing the feedback received. PB noted that with current plans, the link to Euston Square Underground Station has been

lost. Without this, and if we have a HS2 Euston Station, it will be three pedestrian crossings on Euston Road and we need more.

- 4.15 C:** TS commented on the announcement by the then Prime Minister in October 2023 regarding HS2 only coming to Euston if commercially viable and that HS2 Ltd will not be leading the works. However, 10 months on and HS2 Ltd is still involved. TS further commented on the recent announcement regarding Lendlease no longer vying for Europe based projects, but they still have an interest in Euston TS would like a reinstatement of green space that has been removed. TS is concerned that the focus now is to prioritise commercial spaces.
- 4.16 Q:** SC queried if LB Camden was involved in the TEP Communications and Engagement Strategy. **A:** BW confirmed that it is.
- 4.17 C:** SC commented that he would like to see the full big picture across the Euston Campus with all partners. **A:** BW advised that one of the key objectives of TEP's work is to improve the level of awareness and improve communications. However, BW also stated that at the moment, he does not know what is being built for HS2 Euston so can give an overview of what is currently known only.
- 4.18 C:** DH commented that when trees are cut, the focus should be on replacing them within the borough.
- 4.19 Q:** UB agreed with all comments made. UB would like to know what engagement has taken place to date. **A:** TEP will provide a summary of engagement to date.
- 4.20 Q:** JT asked if TEP cover Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPOs)? **A:** BW advised that they will not cover this. **C:** JT observed that Oakervee report stated there needs to be more integration between Network Rail and HS2; JT suggested that simplification of concourse levels could achieve some of this. **A:** BW stated that TEP are looking at various ways that better integration can be achieved and will provide options to the Department for Transport (DfT).
- 4.21 Q:** JT asked if TEP will be advising on LB Camden's Workstream 2 proposals. JT further stated that the National Audit Office (NAO) doesn't cover integration with main works, only between Network Rail and LendLease and asked if TEP will be bridging this gap. **A:** BW advised that TEP will be aiming to integrate all schemes across the Euston Campus.
- 4.22 C:** RL explained his frustration with engaging with HS2 and is no longer concerned with the long-term plans and just wants to get his life back. RL used the example of engaging with LendLease and queries whether they were there to deliver the masterplan or to look for commercial opportunities. RL is disappointed that there have been no further communications on how the HS2 Euston can be funded

privately. RL hopes with the new Government, that we can be aligned and deliver transparency.

- 4.23 Q:** RL asked when will the funding for the completion of HS2 Euston emerge? **A:** DD advised that we do not have a timescale and that design activities remain paused until March 2025.
- 4.24 C:** JT noted recent reports which say over £1bn has been spent on CPOs in Euston.
- 4.25** BW continued his presentation and spoke about the Euston Community Hub.
- 4.26 C:** TS noted that TEP has a direct funding allocation from the DfT. TS asked what happens to TEP if there is no commercial partner appointed. **A:** BW explained the balance between private and public funding and further stated that with the change of government, he is currently unsure.
- 4.27 C:** JT noted that a bike workshop proposal was not eligible for meanwhile while uses and suggested that a space in the hub could be used for this purpose.
- 4.28 C:** DA stated that good engagement leads to good decision making and he hopes this is implemented across the Euston campus.
- 4.29 C:** GO stated that a good win for TEP and the community of Adelaide Road is to pause the Schedule 17 application or at least listen to the feedback regarding the design of the boundary wall.
- 4.30 C:** SD agrees with the sentiment in 4.26 and further reiterated that active listening is important. SD view is that Hampstead Road Bridge does not need to be expanded and the land could be put to better use. SD commented no one has looked at the social cost to residents in Camden and this is having a detrimental impact on residents' lives.

## **5. London Borough of Camden**

- 5.1** The group NOTED that various consultations are underway, including Open Spaces and the Euston Area Plan (please refer to slide 18 in the slide deck).
- 5.2 C:** DH stated that if you read the Euston Area Plan, it seems to be dependent on HS2 coming to Euston and that this should be clearly stated. **A:** DD suggested that any views should be shared with LB Camden via the consultation exercises.

## **6. Works Lookahead**

- 6.1** NOTED

## 7. HS2 Update

7.1 NOTED. No questions were raised.

## 8. Dates of next meeting

8.1 DD advised that the next meeting date may change to Thursday 3 October to avoid the Labour Party Conference taking place the week before. This would be confirmed following consultation with the DfT as it was hoped that they would still attend the next meeting. *Post meeting note: In order to allow members to attend the Labour Party Conference the next meeting will move to 3 October 2024 at the Wesley Hotel. Please note that the DfT does not expect to be in a position to provide an update at the meeting but will join a future meeting when it is in a position to provide a substantial update.*

8.2 DD thanked the speaker and attendees and closed the meeting.