

Meeting minutes

Euston Community Representatives Group (ECRG)

Meeting date	Thursday, 03 October 2024
Meeting location	The Wesley Hotel, Euston Street, NW1 2EZ
Meeting time	5:20pm – 7:00pm

Attendees

AA	Amy Allen	Senior Engagement Manager, SCS Tunnels & Shafts
AH	Cllr Adam Harrison	HS2 Lead LB Camden
CM	Cameron Macleod	LB Camden
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
DH	Dorothea Hackman*	Camden Civic Society
GO	Gerry O'Connell	Beaumont Mews
HGT	Hero Granger-Taylor	Park Village East Heritage Group
JC	John Collins	Project Manager, HS2
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
MAL	Mary-Ann Lewis	LB Camden
MB	Mary Burd*	CHARGE and chairs LAEP
MS	Maddelyn Sutton	Head of Community Engagement, HS2
NA	Nassar Ali	The Euston Partnership
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
PL	Paul Leighton	Project Director, MDjv
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	Somerstown TRA
SP	Simon Pitkeathley	Euston Town BID, CEO
TY	Tom Young	Resident and Architect

Apologies

AM	Andrew Morgan	Network Rail
MH	Matt Hollier*	Contact Group member

*ECRG Contact Group

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1** DD introduced the meeting and explained the arrangements for asking questions and making contributions. He asked that it be noted that Cllr Adam Harrison will join the ECRG meetings from today as lead for LB Camden in place of Cllr Beales and that Cllr Harrison had given apologies for lateness. *Post meeting note: Cllr Harrison joined at 18:00 during agenda item 3.*

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting

- 2.1** DD presented the minutes of the July 2024 meeting for approval and publishing on the HS2 website. He reminded members that they are not narrative minutes but were intended to capture the spirit of the discussions.
- 2.2** **C:** JT asked that it be noted that although a number of his proposed changes had been accepted he is not happy with the minutes, and thinks certain points are misleading. **A:** DD advised that requests for further changes may be made to the Contact Group.
- 2.3** The group APPROVED the minutes of the July 2024 meeting.

3. Actions Log

- 3.1** **C:** JT requested that some actions that were closed previously could be reopened. For example action 361(Hampstead Road Bridge extension) is missing; JT raised a point at the last meeting that wasn't noted. **A:** DD will look into this after this meeting. **C:** JT reiterated the importance of this issue as it is the interface between the approach and the station. *Post meeting note: Action 361 was closed at the July meeting with HS2's response to the question having been provided. JT's point was noted in minute 3.5 of the July 2024 minutes. DD had also highlighted that the route for further comments about HS2's application for the bridge was to make representations to LB Camden Planning Committee – see minute 3.8 of the July 2024 meeting.* **A:** DD highlighted that a number of other actions had been closed at the last meeting by agreement of the group as consent had now been granted for the Headhouse.
- 3.2** The Group noted SCS had provided slides relating to the Adelaide Road Headhouse engagement for the Schedule 17 application. **C:** GO commented that

he understood there were around 500 responses to the application and all had wanted the wall back. The reasons being HS2 assured us at the beginning it would be restored, it is an historic part of the area and the railway, people do want to see the site of the headhouse through railings, noise- it is necessary to block out the noise of the railway behind.**A:** AA explained that the entirety of the previous wall was required to enable construction of the head house and vent shaft. However, HS2's permanent compound will not be the same length as the previous wall, some land will be handed back to Network Rail. AA reiterated that there will be a distinctive split with HS2 and Network Rail compounds. The design of the boundary wall included in engagement ahead of the Sch. 17 application submission is designed to the specifications required for HS2 security - a minimum 2.8metre high boundary. AA confirmed that the *minimum* height of the piers will be 2.8metres, the *minimum* height of the brick wall will be 1.4 metres and the *maximum* height of the railings will be 1.4metres.

- 3.3 Q:** GO asked if the green and the red lines on slide 9 are going to be a different design. **A:** AA confirmed that there is currently no design for the green line yet; there are no Adelaide Road Vent Shaft design works ongoing currently due to the deferment of works. The far section is outside of the HS2 Act Limits, so there is a requirement to restore the wall as it was. The middle section will be subject to a future schedule 17 (s17) application.
- 3.4 C:** GO challenged the assertion of AA that the design of the wall had been given planning permission in the recent s17 as we (GO and other local residents present at those meetings) had been told clearly in an HS2 meeting on a number of occasions that the design with railings was only used for guidance to show the site and it was the headhouse and other stuff that was subject to that application, so it was not passed through planning
- 3.5 C:** GO wanted it noted that the community want a solid wall all along at the same height as the original wall or higher so any extra security measures would be in addition to the wall – on top of it. In previous meetings they were told that we are going to have proper engagement and consultation and that responses are not being considered – please give the community what they want back. **A:** AA stated that in terms of operational noise regarding the headhouse, we have had previous questions about this to HS2 who have provided documentation on future noise. **Action 363:** AA to circulate information about operational noise from the Headhouse.
- 3.6 Q:** GO asked if the people making decisions about the lower wall with railings can come to the next meeting. He also disputed AA's assertion that planting was being used to limit noise as this was not as effective as a wall – he also asked why HS2 is not providing to provide a complete wall as it is required to reinstate. **Action 364:** SCS to look to bring the people making decisions on the wall to the next meeting if not already resolved.

- 3.7 Q:** DH remembers when the wall was dismantled, it took a lot of time and the undertaking was it will be restored and maintained - bricks were numbered when it was dismantled – why was this if we wasn't going to do this?. Why can't we keep a wall that is part of our heritage? **Action 365:** AA to confirm if the Headhouse wall is to be rebuilt using the original bricks or if the numbering was just an identifier for each section.
- 3.8 C:** JT the presentation slides says that the wall was lowered at the request of the design panel, but this was not part of the application. The wall should not have permission under s17; it should be part of bringing into use and landscape restoration applications. **A:** AA explained that this information has been validated and provided by planning managers from both SCS and HS2.
- 3.9 C:** DA noted that he has seen a s17 application regarding operational noise at Mornington Terrace for this and the data was not accurate however LB Camden accepted without challenging. DA would encourage residents on Adelaide Road to insist upon a higher wall for the noise levels. 1.4 m protects less from 2m – we need to protect our community.
- 3.10 Action 366:** RC and AA to respond to residents on the wall height prior to the November ECRG meeting.

4. Questions received in advance

- 4.1** DD updated that due to the change in government the programme for decision making about Euston had changed. The Department for Transport would not therefore be providing an update at this meeting. An update on decisions relating to Euston would be requested for the November ECRG meeting.
- 4.2** A number of advance questions had been received via the Contact Group and written answers were provided within the previously circulated slides.
- 4.3 Q1 – Possible Subsidence (slide 16).** A question regarding possible subsidence was received which the team have provided a written response for. **Q:** JT reminded the meeting that he has requested that the settlement contours north of Parkway are published as they were for the south of Parkway area. **A:** AA stated that the information has been sent, however she would recirculate with Euston Approaches and section north of Parkway combined.
- 4.4 C:** HGT stated that she has received the settlement contours for south of Parkway but this was after repeated requests for this information and was not provided willingly. **A:** NVK clarified that there is no unwillingness in sharing technical information; the format provided to HGT at first was not appropriate so we produced a larger format of the document. **C:** HGT noted that the first document only gave the two lowest contours and not all of them. **Action 367:** NVK to provide a large scale print out of north of Parkway document to JT.

- 4.5 Q:** SD asked if they were going to be able to see patterns of changes into the ground when tunnelling commences so residents/freeholders will be actively contacted. This data should be shared with the community. **A:** NVK we will be doing this with freeholders/those with an interest in the property only.
- 4.6 C:** DA stated that he has spoken with people who were taking measurements on Mornington Terrace who were happy to share information. DA is unsure why HS2 would not share the data with the general public. DA is concerned as his experience is that the noise levels data is wrong. DA has said it is unfair that HS2 decides who sees this data. DA is requesting transparency from HS2 as he is currently in a position of distrust. **A:** NVK explained that information is shared with Freeholders.
- 4.7 C:** RL stated that for a number of years there has been major construction in front of Silsoe House and there are now obvious cracks in the building that were not previously there. RL further explained that there had been seasonal movement which is historic, but trying to differentiate between this and HS2 works is difficult and I believe this information needs to be shared. He echoed the points made by DA, HGT, and SD above and explained that as a freeholder, he has not received any information. *Post meeting note: The owners report for the cracked skylight referred to by RL was issued to Silsoe representatives Rendall & Rittner on 26 April 2023 and showed the movement data.*
- 4.8 C:** HGT agreed with RL's comments and stated that she has been informed independently that the level of subsidence is unacceptable and has requested public engagement on these issues.
- 4.9 Q2 – Drain outside 30 PVE (slide 17). Q:** RL queried if LB Camden accept that this is historic movement? **A:** MAL confirmed that the highways team are aware and are currently planning remedial works. **C:** HGT commented that she can see the efforts made to reduce subsidence historically, but it has become worse.
- 4.10 Q3 – Surplus Land (slide 18) C:** JT commented that Ben White (The Euston Partnership) stated at the previous meeting that he was going to remind the DfT (JA) to provide an explanation of Crichel Down rules. JT has been informed by CPO lawyer that the HS2 issue is too large for the Crichel Down rules. The purpose of ECRG is to understand HS2's compensation principles which Assurance 2304 requires HS2 explanation. **A:** DD highlighted the written response provided by HS2.
- 4.11 Q:** TY requested that ECRG be provided with a range for the amount of surplus land we are talking about in Euston. **A:** DD pointed out that HS2 will not be able to calculate if or how much surplus land there will be until the Government has provided further clarity about its plans for HS2 Euston station.

- 4.12 Q4 – Journey Times (slide 19). C:** JT stated that the answer provided is incorrect as the information has been changed via a DfT response to Lord Berkeley in which the DfT had stated the information is owned by HS2. **A:** DD responded that the information provided is the latest received by HS2 from the DfT.
- 4.13 Q5 – Station design group (slide 20). C:** DD confirmed that this group is not intended to replace public engagement by HS2 and its contractors. HS2 would be asked to consider topics such as works in the approaches for future meeting agendas in addition to wider public engagement.
- 4.14 Q6 – Bridge Extension (slide 21). C:** HGT wanted it noted that she did not receive the original papers email for this meeting. **A:** DD explained that the file size may have been too large and that he would resend to anyone who let him know that had not received the original one.
- 4.15 Q:** JT requested that the written answer provided is reviewed as it is not good enough. JT wanted clarity on full flexibility and the extent to which delay to this SCS contract could delay the completion of the station. **A:** DD clarified that this question is different to action 361 as this is related to the Euston Community Review Panel (CRP). DD further explained that as previously stated any objections to the bridge application should be registered with LB Camden.
- 4.16 C:** JT asked that we refer back to the original intention of the ECRG where attendees are consulted. **A:** DD stated that this meeting is held as part of an assurance in favour of the HS2 Euston Action Group which will be shared with the minutes of the meeting. The CRP is a group serving the TEP and is distinct from ECRG. **C:** DA confirmed that after petitioning the Hybrid Bill the HS2 Euston Action Group stood down and CHARGE is became successor of this organisation.

U&A ref id (T) (Y)	Status (T)	Subject (Y)	To Whom (T) (Y)	U&A Text (T) (Y)
2304	Current	Euston Community Representatives Group (ECRG)	HS2 Euston Action Group	<p>In this assurance:</p> <p>'Works' means those of the Authorised Works to be carried out in the London Borough of Camden; 'the ECRG' means the Euston Community Representatives Group which was established on 18 May 2015; and 'the ECRG Terms of Reference' means the document titled 'Terms of Reference for Independent Chair' adopted by the ECRG on 14 July 2016.</p> <p>The Promoter will require the nominated undertaker to hold meetings of the ECRG on a quarterly basis and continue to provide secretarial support for an independent chair of the ECRG, as set out in the ECRG Terms of Reference, for such period of the Works as the ECRG remains in existence.</p>

- 4.17 C:** SD commented that she is very concerned that the social impact of the extension of Hampstead Road Bridge has not been considered. There is no information regarding loss of land which could be used for housing or open spaces, and no information regarding a further divide in the community.
- 4.18 Q:** RL queried if there are Terms of Reference (ToR) for ECRG. **A:** DD confirmed that draft ToR were referred to in the U&A text (see above), but there was no record these had been adopted. The most recent ToR were produced for the role of the last Independent Chair. **C:** RL offered to circulate the original draft ToR to

the Contact Group to see if they remain suitable to be adopted *[done]*. **C:** DH commented that in the absence of anything else, the ToR that RL circulates should be adopted. **Q:** JT asked if Cllr Harrison – Chair of the CRP could publish the ToRs for his group. JT believes It would be good to see how the differing sub-groups of ECRG work together. *Post meeting note: The ECRG and CRP are not connected.*

5. Government Announcements

- 5.1** It was noted that no government announcements relating to Euston had been made since the last meeting.

6. SCS Update

- 6.1** **Q:** HGT asked for clarification regarding strengthening of the retaining wall. **A:** NVK advised that it is the same reason regarding ground movement. Ongoing works had previously been explained at ECRG and the HGT (at Stephenson House in May 2024).
- 6.2** **C:** JT commented that the whole of the site is covered in tension piles of large size which is a constraint on many design changes. **A:** RC confirmed that the piles are both for retaining the box wall and tension piles for securing the base slab from uplift and are not for stabilising the ground. **Q:** JT requested confirmation that grade separation is not a HS2 requirement for six platforms at Euston. **A:** RC responded that grade separation is dependent on the degree of operational flexibility that is required from the train service. **C:** JT stated that the recent HS2 seven platform option avoided grade separation.
- 6.3** **C:** RL updated that he had requested a full list of completed, planned, and unscheduled utility works that directly relate to HS2.

7. HS2 Update

- 7.1** **Q:** DH asked how long the meanwhile use spaces will be in place. **A:** DD advised that this will be determined by any Government announcement on HS2 works at Euston. They were originally made available until March 2025 but it is likely that a number of the areas will be available for longer than this.

8. Community Questions/AOB

- 8.1** DD reported that he had been made aware that a letter had been received in error by a resident regarding electricity compensation for noise insulation. He asked that others let him know if they have also received something in error. **C:** DA clarified that he raised this and his concern is about the accuracy of HS2 records.

- 8.2 C:** RL had attended the Labour Party Conference and provided a verbal update to the group. He was confident the government would make announcements about Euston in the forthcoming budget.
- 8.3 Q:** PB asked Cllr AH to explain the understanding of the roles of the Cabinet and the split of responsibilities on HS2? **A:** AH the new leader of the council is the main lead with support from Cabinet Members.
- 8.4 C:** HGT commented that the Hampstead Road Bridge engagement via CRP needs to be more inclusive of wards within LB Camden.
- 8.5 C:** DA met with a representative from Network Rail (NR) regarding staff using the access points opposite properties. The agreement was that it is an emergency use only for NR and not to be used for HS2 staff. This agreement has been broken three times in the last month where residents have been disturbed. DA is disappointed that this agreement is not being enforced and he advised that he will be escalating this issue.

9. Dates of next meeting

- 9.1** DD advised that the next meeting date will be held on Thursday 28 November 2024.
- 9.2** He thanked the attendees for their contributions and closed the meeting.