

# Meeting minutes

## Euston Community Representatives Group (ECRG)

<b>Meeting date</b>	Thursday, 27 November 2025
<b>Meeting location</b>	The Euston Community Hub, North Gower Street, NW1
<b>Meeting time</b>	5:20pm – 7:00pm

### Attendees

AS	Andy Swift	HS2 Client Director
CM	Cameron Macleod	HS2 Community Partnerships Manager, LB Camden
DD	David Demolder (Chair)	Euston Station IPT, Head of Operations and Stakeholder Management
DH	Dorothea Hackman*	Camden Civic Society
DT	Dan Taylor	SCS Project Director
HGT	Hero Granger-Taylor	Park Village East Heritage Group
JT	Jeff Travers	Primrose Hill, Gloucester Avenue
KL	Kai-Yen Lau	Marketing and Communications Assistant, MDjv
KRH	Kimberley Royer-Harris	Senior Engagement Lead, HS2
MAL	Mary-Ann Lewis	LB Camden
MB	Mary Burd*	Of Charge and chairs LAEP
MH	Myle Hornsby	ONW – Network Rail
MW	Mark Winter	Head of Delivery, HS2
ND	Noemi Drew	Constituency Office Manager, Kier Starmer's Office
NDu	Neil Durrant	SCS
NK	Natalie Kirkwood (minutes)	Senior Engagement Manager, MDjv
NVK	Neil Van Kervel	Senior Engagement Manager, SCS
PB	Paul Braithwaite	Ex Chair, Air Quality AQGOST
RC	Richard Crathern	HS2, Senior Project Manager - SCS East
SC	Steve Christofy	Treasurer of the RPE TRA and HS2 Rep
SD	Slaney Devlin	Somers Town
<b>Apologies</b>		
CAH	Cllr Adam Harrison	Bloomsbury Ward Councillor

GM	Gareth McGaw	Senior Engagement and Interface Manager, HS2
JM*	John Myers	Drummond Street Residents Association
MH*	Matt Hollier	Co-Chair Camden Cutting Group
NJ	Nick Jones	HS2
PL	Paul Leighton	Project Director, MDjv
RL	Robert Latham	Silsoe House
SN	Sandra Nichols	Mornington Place Residents Association
SP	Simon Pitkeathley	Euston BID
TS	Timothy Stockton	Resident

\*ECRG Contact Group

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

1.1 DD introduced the meeting and explained the agreed arrangements for raising points and how the meeting would be minuted.

## 2. Minutes of the Last Meeting

2.1 DD explained that the ECRG meeting minutes are not verbatim but capture the spirit of the meeting. DD explained that post meeting notes are not permitted by the Contact Group unless there is a genuine development following the meeting.

2.2 **C:** JT commented that he provided information prior to the meeting to the Contact Group and that KRH had a conversation with him regarding Action 357. He felt that this was a sufficient development that it should be included. It hadn't been as the Action comment was that the group would be updated with new information. To move the meeting along DD agreed to include this change.

2.3 The Group **AGREED** the minutes of the September 2025 meeting noting they will be published on the HS2 website.

## 3. Actions Log

3.1 **C:** Network Rail has written to DA regarding Action 377, and this is now closed.

## 4. Questions received in advance

### 4.1 Question a: Tunnel Boring Machines

4.2 **Q:** HGT asked whether the TBMS will come out of the cavern? **A:** RC responded that most of the tunnelling machines are removed and dismantled via Old Oak Common with the remainder (cutter head) being removed from the Euston Approaches when the tunnelling is undertaken from Euston end.

#### 4.3 Question b: Euston Square Gardens (ESG) West

- 4.4 **C:** DD explained the background to this and invited DH to share concerns. **C:** DH commented that there needs to be more about looking after the community and proper consultation on the tree panel. DH continued that tree felling should be paused until there is a clear plan of what will be happening in the area regarding to HS2 Euston Station plans. **C:** DH further commented that she had lodged a complaint with the HS2 Commissioner who said it isn't a complaint, but an enquiry, so was redirected to the Helpdesk. By the time a response was received, the tree felling (and stumps removal) has already taken place. **C:** DH continued to speak about the growth on the stumps of the previously felled trees and is very disappointed that this was included in this round of felling in ESG West.
- 4.5 **C:** HGT confirmed that she had a similar experience to DH when writing to the HS2 Commissioner. HGT suggested that herself and DH combine experiences to complain about the HS2 complaints process. **A:** DD reminded the group that complaints should be sent to the Helpdesk in the first instance and be escalated to the HS2 Commissioner if they have not been resolved to the complainant's satisfaction.

#### 4.6 Question c: Euston Integrated Community Engagement Plan

- 4.7 **C:** DD explained Ben White (BW) had previously spoken about The Euston Partnership (TEP) Engagement Plan and that this had been planned to be published in Q3 2024. At the September 2025 ECRG meeting BW had confirmed that TEP will not take this forward and the newly established delivery company will complete this task in 2026.
- 4.8 **C:** DD explained that in an email outside of the meeting he had used the term protest groups to explain the origins of the ECRG. JT and HGT had objected to this and DD had apologised explaining that he was speaking historically. DD explained that ECRG was separate from the wide engagement channels used by HS2 such as newsletters, meetings, engagement events and drop ins. Previously members of the Contact Group had been clear that they did not see it as a means of/replacement for wider engagement, more to hold HS2 to account as well as providing information.
- 4.9 **C:** JT stated that previously attendees have walked out of this group as HS2 were not engaging. JT noted that engagement is at the core of this group. **C:** JT further commented that he's discovered TEP has been recruiting paid members for their Community Review Panel, and he wants further information about this. JT stated his dissatisfaction regarding being redirected to TEP for questions related to them; as HS2 are on the TEP board JT believes HS2 should be able to answer his questions regarding TEP and HS2 branding. **A:** DD explained that there are various

lines of communications/engagement for the partners; the works being produced by TEP will not replace any other engagement taking place for example by HS2 or Network Rail, but it aims to coordinate the engagement. **Q:** JT asked if there was an NDA between HS2 and TEP or DfT regarding external information sharing.

- 4.10 C:** MB commented that the community had worked hard with HS2 to produce the Camden Area Engagement Plan ([Camden Local Area Engagement Plan - HS2](#)). Having seen the TEP engagement plan it is disappointing that this is no longer referenced.
- 4.11 C:** JT is not sure why HS2 cannot answer his questions relating to the TEP engagement strategy as it is a member of TEP. **A:** DD explained that the strategy was being led by TEP and therefore it was best placed to answer JT's questions about it.
- 4.12 C:** HGT stated that TEP is not under legal obligation to engage with ECRG members like HS2.
- 4.13 C:** MB thinks we should go back to the drawing board to reclarify the purpose of ECRG.
- 4.14 C:** SC agrees with everything that has been said so far. SC commented that since the group was set up ten years ago, there has been changes to the project and attendees. However, SC wanted it noted that the ECRG attendees are legitimate representatives of their community.
- 4.15 C:** SC suggested that we do start from scratch or reset and clearly outline what the statutory requirements are, explain who the organisations are, and inform what is unmovable and cannot be influenced. ECRG members are statutory engagement bodies, and he would like more information of where they sit within other organisations.
- 4.16 C:** HGT queried what the status of TEP was with Camden and referenced the response provided by email from MAL where she clarified LB Camden's understanding was that HS2 remains the statutory undertaker. MAL confirmed where Camden is unable to answer queries it receives it will redirect or pass these onto the relevant organisation.
- 4.17 C:** DD commented that he will have a discussion with the ECRG Contact Group regarding the purpose of ECRG. **ACTION 378:** The Contact Group to clarify the purpose of the group at the next meeting.
- 4.18 Question d: Gloucester Avenue/Parkway Borehole**
- 4.19 C:** HGT commented that Delancy Street is closed and is causing an enormous amount of chaos. **A:** It was noted that these were not HS2 works

#### **4.20 Question e: Meanwhile Uses**

**4.21 C:** JT stated that he is liaising with NK regarding surplus plants etc following the closure of the NTH Garden. The plan was to distribute further materials to local communities.

**4.22 C:** SC asked about the structure within the now closed NTH Gardens on Hampstead Road. **A:** NK stated that she is working with LB Camden to reuse the materials for street furniture on LB Camden's future healthy street schemes.

#### **4.23 Question f: Transfer times from Old Oak Common**

**4.24 C:** JT commented that KRH had provided documents to him re Action 357 (within HS2's Station Options exhibit) although he had received it some years ago and it wasn't the report containing HS2 information he requested referred to by Lord Hendy.

#### **4.25 Questions for the DfT (1)**

**4.26 C:** SC stated that he attended a deputation to a LB Camden Cabinet meeting regarding the proposed Housing development at Regents Park Estate North. Another item being considered at Cabinet was the Euston Area Plan Review which was extremely informative about future plans for Euston. SC further stated that he now knows things that HS2 may be unaware are about to happen.

**4.27 C:** SC thinks LB Camden should give a presentation on the revised Euston Area Plan. **C:** DH further stated that LBC plans are to build a high rise building in ESG West which suggests that this is the reason why the trees in ESG West were felled. **A:** MAL agreed that she will give a presentation at a future forum. MAL also stated that it is a strategic planning document and an update from the previously published plan which will be further explained during her updates. **ACTION 379:** MAL agreed to present the revised Euston Area Plan at the March 2026 Meeting. Given the timetable for consultation MAL offered to do an earlier session in January before the consultation period closes if preferable.

#### **4.28 Questions for the DfT (2)**

**4.29 C:** JT stated that BW only showed HS2's aerial view of HS2 Euston existing station site however this didn't give much information apart from the fact that it is a complex 'jigsaw puzzle'. JT stated that in 2024 ECRG had published a TEP station design plan scenario called Workstream2 which was not considered by BW's presentation.

**4.30 C:** JT commented that looking at the TEP board meeting minutes, a totally different picture is emerging to BW's presentation. JT also commented on the design process, specifically the sifting and selection process, and that options were being discussed in March 2025 under option Workstream1 1+. JT further explained that this has developed since the published option Workstream2 (preferred option.) **A:** DD said that what JT is referring to is spatial planning and not station design. **C:** JT said that spatial planning is design, and ECRG members should be informed about all steps of the statutory undertaker's design process.

**4.31 C:** HGT raised funding, HS2 was not mentioned at all this year: spending review, budget, party conference. HGT has shared an email received which said that government will not fund the station and they are looking overseas for private funding. **C:** HGT asked if this was funding from Parkway to Euston? **A:** DD confirmed that the government's position remained for the station to be privately financed. **Post meeting note:** After the meeting HGT asked DD to clarify what the position was for funding of HS2 from Parkway to Euston. Her recollection of the meeting was that he had said it was not publicly funded. DD did not recall exactly what he had said and apologised for any confusion caused. On checking, HS2 had confirmed that it was only the station that was not publicly funded and would be privately financed.

#### **4.32 Questions for the DfT (3)**

**4.33** To Note.

#### **4.34 Questions for the DfT (4)**

**4.35 C:** MAL commented that one of the options for the Euston Development Corporation was that it be locally led. The LB Camden Cabinet has supported the continuation of work to determine what this could look like. If this progresses there will be a consultation later in 2026. **C:** DH quoted a letter in the Camden New Journal regarding an amazing opportunity of development for the community in Euston. **Q:** DH queried if the norm is for the Mayor of London to be in charge of these things rather than the local authority. **A:** MAL stated that LB Camden would prefer this to be locally led as they know their community better.

**4.36 Q:** HGT asked if other organisations competing to set up the Development Corporation? **A:** MAL stated that this is very limited as a Development Corporation can only include Mayoral, Urban body or Locally Led.

**4.37 Q:** HGT and JT asked if the Department for Transport and the Euston Delivery Company could attend future meetings with papers/plans that can be perused and questions raised. **A:** DD confirmed that he will arrange their presence at future meetings.

## **5. Works Lookahead**

- 5.1 **Q:** JT requested that the Design Working Group be included in future papers stating that this group is suspended and we are waiting to resume this at an appropriate time. **A:** DD agreed it will be included going forward.
- 5.2 **Q:** SC queried if we are any further forward with bringing back working groups meetings and forums in person. SC further requested that the Community Traffic Working Group (CTWG) can meet in person. **ACTION 380:** SCS to consider making the CTWG in person or a hybrid meeting.
- 5.3 **Q:** DH asked if the Noise Insulation Working Group met in person? **A:** DD confirmed that it was held online.

## 6. HS2 Updates

### 6.1 Granby Terrace Bridge

6.2 **C:** RC gave an update on the plans for Granby Terrace Bridge including the ongoing utility diversions. RC confirmed that in late summer 2026 a proposed trial of an intermittently open temporary pedestrian route on Granby Terrace Bridge. RC stated that there are still significant security and operational safety concerns about this trial and that these are being worked through ahead of the trial start date. RC confirmed that plans will be discussed with members of the community, including those in this meeting.

6.3 **C:** RC further explained that this trial opening will be on an interim basis.

6.4 **C:** DH suggested that opening times of Granby Terrace Bridge should be based around when children are travelling to and from school. **C:** SC also commented that a pedestrian crossing would be beneficial to avoid conflict with site vehicles.

6.5 **C:** SD went on a safety walk around Regents Park Estate and can understand the concerns regarding walking routes, especially around HS2 hoardings. **C:** SC commented that in the House of Lords they were promised a cycling route on the previous scheme utilising the space used for the planned temporary utility bridges (not used in current scheme) . This is an example of the promises that have not come to fruition. With the addition of bus stop closures, walking routes are far more dangerous now.

6.6 **C:** SC stated that he witnessed a near miss between a scooter and a pedestrian on the crossing on Hampstead Road. SC stated that there is no advanced warning signs for traffic stating that there is a crossing here and this needs to be addressed. **ACTION 381:** SCS to review signage in the area (see November 2025 minute 6.6) and amend as appropriate.

## 7. Community Questions / AOB

7.1 **C:** NVK provided an update on the hoardings around Park Village East and explained that this will be refreshed using an alternative material as it provides a more durable product. **Q:** SC asked if the hoarding be the same height? **A:** NVK confirmed that it will be the same height.

7.2 **C:** NVK gave an update on improved traffic management on Mornington St Bridge and confirmed that changes will be installed from January 2026.

7.3 **C:** NVK confirmed that there were existing issues with the road and footpath at the junction of Mornington Street and Park Village East and these issues have not been caused by HS2 construction works. NVK further confirmed that extra monitoring has been in place in the area since 2022 which has further confirmed this, and monitoring will continue to take place.

**7.4 Q:** SC noted that bus stop J is closed again. **A:** DD confirmed that this is due to Thames Water emergency works. **Q:** SC can a group be set up to look at pedestrian routes? **A:** KRH confirmed that a meeting or walkabout will be organised soon to review pedestrian routes, bus stops and crossings.

## **8. Meeting Dates**

**8.1** DD thanked attendees and closed the meeting. DD advised that the next meeting date is **Thursday 19 March 2026** taking place in the Euston Community Hub on North Gower Street. The full list of dates for the coming year were noted:

Thursday 19 March 2026

Thursday 4 June 2026 (changed from 11)

Thursday 24 September 2026

Thursday 26 November 2026