

Euston OAPF Strategic Board

2nd September 2014, 3.30pm – 4.30pm

Camden Old Town Hall, Judd Street

In attendance

Chair: Cllr Sarah Hayward, (SH), LBC - Board Member
 Simon Kirby (SK), HS2 - Board Member
 Sir Edward Lister, GLA – Board Member
 Cllr Phil Jones (PJ), LBC
 Richard McGreevy, (RM), TfL
 Ed Watson (EW), LBC
 Rupert Walker (RW), Network Rail
 David Rae (DR), DfT
 Paul Gilfedder, (PG), HS2
 Mary-Ann Lewis (MAL), Euston Area Plan PM
 Rafal Hejne (RH), LBC

Meeting Note

	Action
<p>1. Welcome, introductions and apologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Apologies from Michele Dix, Richard McGreevy attending in place. 	
<p>2. Meeting minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Meeting minutes were reviewed and confirmed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All to note
<p>3. EAP Proposed Modifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MAL presented a summary of the proposed modifications to the EAP and how these related to examination discussions. MAL also set out a timetable for consulting on these proposed changes and requested Board agreement to publishing these within the timescales set out in order to meet the EAP timetable. – Network Rail requested a day to review the changes to check content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agreed to the publication of the Proposed Modifications to the EAP on 8th September for review until 20th October. – MAL to hold off printing documents for an additional day to allow NR time to review.
<p>4. EAP Programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MAL presented an updated programme for the EAP and potential adoption timetable if the Inspector’s Report finds the plan sound. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All to note

	Action
<p>5. Implementation and Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MAL presented a summary of a draft Implementation and Governance paper to the Board for discussion. – The Governance options included retaining the Strategic Board with amended membership, including a community representative. SH reiterated LBC’s strong concerns over previous efforts to engage with the community over the station. RW felt having a community representative on the Board mixed up roles and responsibilities. LBC have responsibility to bring community views to the Board through the EAP consultation process, whereas HS2 has responsibility for gathering community views on the HS2 project. – EL reminded the Board that there were no community representatives sitting within the governance structures for any other OAPFs, and that if included it may change the nature of conversations that take place. He also questioned whether any other landowners needed to be involved in the governance structure. – SK noted that the community would be involved through the Hybrid Bill process in the HS2 project. PG noted that involvement in station design for Crossrail was a separate process that largely followed the Bill. – SH noted that it is LBC’s responsibility to challenge Network Rail and HS2 on nature and extent of community involvement in the HS2 scheme, not our role to do the consultation. Noted that the governance structure with a community representative is LBC’s preferred suggestion. There is potential for the Terms of Reference (ToR) to be amended for the Board to set out how partners in the Board take responsibility for community involvement, everyone needs to undertake their own processes. – SK agreed with this approach. – SH noted that to be effective LBC, GLA and TfL need to understand HS2/NR’s plans for the station. – SK highlighted that plans will depend on which station design is progressed, and there could be no definitive answer for 2 years whilst Bill progresses/development partners are selected. – EW noted that landowner involvement should be clarified when the development partner/s is known and at that point membership of the Board can be reviewed. – SH confirmed that no landowners invited to be members other than those suggested in paper at the moment. SH questioned what the Board’s conclusion was in terms of community representatives on the Board. – SK stated that HS2’s preference would be to make individual elements accountable to specific Terms of Reference for community involvement, and recognised that HS2 have not always been a good example of this previously. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All to note. MAL to consider how the EAP ToR could be amended to reflect organisational responsibilities for community involvement

	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SH asked if this amount of development supported the business case for the scheme and the importance of background figures being shared with LBC. - SK noted that the numbers still don't stack up but that these needed to be looked at in more detail. - EW questioned the amount of affordable housing included and whether it took into account policy from the EAP? - RW stated that more affordable housing makes the business case worse. - SH asked if LBC/GLA/TfL could have any answers on the assumptions used to get to the OSD options that will be considered by the Treasury? - RW stated that there are no numbers yet, and agreed that a conversation would need to be had, but that they are not ready for this yet. - SK said that LBC should be bought up to speed on the numbers. - SH highlighted that it appears that the options on OSD would be going to Treasury in 4-6 weeks, if LBC/GLA/TfL want to raise views on issues like proportion of affordable housing and viewing corridors how can this happen? - SK suggested an extraordinary meeting of the EAP Strategic Board to discuss which RW agreed. - EL reiterated the need for a conversation to discuss options as in all OAPFs the GLA has never been able to get numbers to stack up until later, therefore need to look at potential options such as business rates etc. The GLA and LBC recognise that might not get 100% of what they want, but need to have the conversation. - SH noted that LBC understands that compromise will be needed, but shouldn't be forced into a predetermined outcome and must recognise LBC planning policy. - SK confirmed that NR/HS2 would look to set up an extraordinary meeting to discuss these issues and that it was likely to be after 25th September. RW noted that it's a very tight business case. EL believed that its good news that designs have moved this far. - EW suggested that the Planning brief discussion could be deferred to this extra meeting. - EL questioned whether OSD would be one development/developer? DR noted that phasing is key to the financial model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HS2/NR to liaise to organise a slot for an EAP Strategic Board Extraordinary Meeting in first two weeks of October
<p>7. AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MAL questioned whether approval of final EAP documents following the Inspectors Report could be done by email with the Board. - EL requested that any documents for the Extraordinary meeting be circulated before the meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Board agreed. Final EAP documents to be circulated to Board for approval. - HS2/NR to note.

