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
1.	Welcome, introductions and apologies	
	 Apologies from Michele Dix, Richard McGreevy attending in place. 	
2.	Meeting minutes	
	 Meeting minutes were reviewed and confirmed. 	 All to note
3.	 EAP Proposed Modifications 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. 	 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.
4.	EAP Programme	
	 MAL presented an updated programme for the EAP and potential adoption timetable if the Inspector's Report finds the plan sound. 	 All to note





_		Action
. /	mplementation and Governance	
-	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	 All to note. MAL to
	community representatives on the Board.	consider how the
-	SK stated that HS2's preference would be to make	EAP ToR could be
	individual elements accountable to specific Terms of	amended to reflect organisational
	Reference for community involvement, and recognised that	responsibilities for
	HS2 have not always been a good example of this	community
	previously.	involvement

MAYOR OF LONDON

Transport for London



	Action
	Action
 EW suggested that the governance diagram in the Paper is rejigged to remove the community representative on the Strategic Board but confirm formal arrangements for a community steering group to feed in views to the Board. RW questioned why a Planning Brief was needed. MAL and EW explained the potential benefits of a Planning Brief, including more detailed and up to date information on massing and appearance of over site development related to more detailed information on station design. The potential for increased developer certainty, to inform development partners and the government on expectations of development, and providing a shared vision between GLA, LBC and TfL, with technical endorsement from NR/HS2 would also provide a good basis for a planning application to be developed. 	 MAL to amend Governance diagram to remove Community representative on EAP Strategic Board but add more details on how a steering group feeds into the EAP decision making process All agreed that the Strategic Board should continue as
 SH highlighted that it would provide more surety for developers and reiterate LBC's objectives on key issues like local jobs and genuinely affordable housing. SK stated that extra information on station design is unlikely to be available until 2016 therefore there would not be any additional station design information to inform a Planning 	the implementation governance body subject to these amendments.
 Brief next year. EW noted the timing issue, although highlighted that preparing a Brief sooner would be helpful. EW suggested that the conversation needed to be evolved offline. EL asked what the redevelopment value is for OSD etc and 	
 how heights have been considered. He noted this would be a very political discussion and a long ongoing conversation. SK stated that this is a long process in terms of looking at funding, business case and scale of receipts for OSD. He recognised that a conversation is needed on this before the 	– EW/MAL to
 Additional Provision to the HS2 Bill is deposited. – EW noted that a brief is a vehicle for some of these discussions on height and viability. 	Brief timetable in discussion with HS2/NR through
 SK stated for now the exercise is a mathematical one to inform the Treasury, OSD etc will be finessed later. SH assumed that Treasury sign off on a level deak 	EAP Management Board
 SH assumed that Treasury sign off on a level deck approach would be soon, and therefore if a deck is built something must be built on top. Surety through a planning brief is therefore helpful? 	
 SK agreed but timing is an issue. SH noted that all agreed to the preparation of a planning brief, but that timing needs to be clarified through the Management Board process. 	
6. HS2/NR station design update	
 PG presented early work on the latest station design/OSD. This was indicative only and amount of development is EAP compatible. 	– All to note
 EL asked if the scheme respected the Mayor's Viewing Corridors? PG confirmed it did, but impacts on background views. 	



MAYOR OF LONDON



		Action
_	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	 HS2/NR to liaise to
	extraordinary meeting to discuss these issues and that it was likely to be after 25 th September. RW noted that it's a very tight business case. EL believed that its good news that designs have moved this far.	organise a slot for an EAP Strategic Board Extraordina Meeting in first two
_	EW suggested that the Planning brief discussion could be	weeks of October
_	deferred to this extra meeting. EL questioned whether OSD would be one development/developer? DR noted that phasing is key to the financial model.	
AC	DB	
_	MAL questioned whether approval of final EAP documents following the Inspectors Report could be done by email with the Board.	 Board agreed. Final EAP documents to be circulated to
—	EL requested that any documents for the Extraordinary meeting be circulated before the meeting.	Board for approval. - HS2/NR to note.





MAYOR OF LONDON







