

Euston OAPF Strategic Board – OSD Briefing

9th October 2014, 3.30pm – 5.00pm

Camden Old Town Hall, Judd Street

In attendance

Chair: Cllr Sarah Hayward, (SH), LBC - Board Member
 Alison Munro (AM), HS2 - Board Member
 Sir Edward Lister, GLA – Board Member
 Cllr Phil Jones (PJ), LBC
 Rupert Walker (RW), Network Rail
 Ed Watson (EW), LBC
 David Rea (DR), DfT
 Paul Gilfedder, (PG), HS2
 Ivan Stone (IS), HS2
 Donald Horner (DH), Network Rail
 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 de Cani. 	
<p>2. HS2 Additional Provision update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – AM outlined the position on the additional provision (AP) for Euston, and stated that the ambition to comprehensively redevelop the station remains. – Issues with the emerging level deck designs included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Phasing of construction – Train operations – Funding – level deck as it stood was not a fundable solution – Engagement – due to these issues there had been considerable delay in engaging with community – Rupert Walker has now been appointed jointly to HS2/NR to work on Euston as the Development Director 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All to note
<p>3. OSD options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – RW highlighted that the presentation to be given is based on the work done for the AP which has now been paused and has been designed to show issues affecting OSD. – DH presented the urban design context of the OSD work and emerging development quanta considered. – RW noted that both scenarios presented could not be made 	

	Action
<p>to work financially – there was no business case. To have a business case more development was required than that indicated in the EAP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – PJ asked whether LBC could see the figures which demonstrate the funding/business case issue. – RW responded that the figures have been costed twice by cost consultants and appraised by Deloitte's. – DH noted that building on a deck is very expensive and challenging. There could be potential to help the business case for a level deck by re-orientating Euston Square Gardens north-south as it is less expensive to build a deck over this area and it would free up space for development on less constrained land. – DH also noted that viability affected by affordable housing and knowledge economy proportions and asked how important the knowledge economy is to LBC/GLA compared to affordable housing. Development scenarios tested had 20% affordable housing. – RW asked what is appropriate and is there any flexibility in any of these issues to help with reconsidering a scheme for the station. – EW asked how the private sector partner would work. DH responded that it is capability based selection process. – SH asked about the assumptions used in determining that the schemes were unviable, how can Camden properly consider without sight of the work underpinning it? Not acceptable to present only one side of the story. – RW stated that they simply couldn't get the costs and benefits of the scheme to balance in an affordable way so designers have stopped work. Want to get them working again with fundamental information – it would be useful to know if there is any flexibility in the EAP in terms of affordable housing, knowledge economy, tall buildings etc. – SH stated that in order to provide NR/HS2 with the art of the possible in terms of planning, need to have information on what the art of the possible is from them in terms of viability. LBC expects policy compliance on key issues. – DH confirmed that the development profit assumptions would be the same whether NR stayed involved or not. Developers will be selected through an OJEU process and NR hope to issue a PIN notice in January and the selection will probably not be finally confirmed until the HS2 scheme receives Royal Assent. – EL asked about massing, viewing corridors etc – need more information on these scenarios to consider. – DH stated that it is assumed that the primary viewing corridors are sacrosanct. – In response to further questions about funding assumptions RW noted that the emerging level deck scheme was currently beyond additional support in terms of securing extra funding for it. – PJ highlighted serious concerns about the levels of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – HS2/NR to consider whether they can share more information on viability assumptions with LBC/GLA

	Action
<p>affordable housing being discussed. Affordable housing is a priority. Kings Cross Central managed to deliver 43% along with school, university, open space etc. although recognise this was a different time/context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SH noted that access to jobs at Euston for local people is a priority along with affordable housing on site. The amount of open space provided is more important than its location. LBC and local community expect policy compliance on all these issues. - EW highlighted that the values of knowledge economy uses would change over the years – is this factored in? - EL noted that the provision of new jobs (15,000) will be extremely important to the GLA, and offices are a big priority. But also understand LBC’s position on affordable housing. - SH stated that Camden loses jobs due to HS2, don’t want to replace them with a Canary Wharf style development which is a ghost town at weekends. - EL - Stratford is a good example of where job opportunities were built in. On affordable housing, 20% is not going to work, realise that 40% is difficult, but somewhere in between is where it needs to be. - SH stated that any scheme needs to give back to the local community and be fully reflective of local views and input. - EW noted that Kings Cross Recruit is a good example of a local employment scheme. Also highlighted that whilst re-orientating Euston Square Gardens might work, it won’t be easy as it is a protected London Square. - RW said that by bringing servicing up to deck level this would help with costs by reduces development space – would like to explore these challenges together. - SH – conversations would be ok but not without the background information on viability from HS2/NR. - EL highlighted that a GLA study found the biggest barrier to delivery was people doing designs who weren’t the developer – therefore need to get a development partner involved as soon as possible - EW asked if during the development partner selection process there could be a way of involving the community at some point. RW thought there might be a way of getting people involved in the identification of constraints and requirements feeding into the process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All to note discussions and priorities identified - NR/HS2 to consider how community could get involved in development partner selection process
<p>4. Network Rail/HS2 emerging thinking on engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RW stated that they wanted to start off by listening to people and speaking to stakeholders informally over the next 8 weeks to find out what sort of engagement they want. During this time they would be looking at outline requirements for the scheme, but designs wouldn’t be looked at until next year. Concerned that current engagement is not getting through to everyone in the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RW/HS2/NR to look at CINDEK for lists of community groups/organisation

	Action
<p>community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PJ noted that previous efforts to engage the community had been ineffective and this must be a priority. There would be value in opening out debates and trying to gather perspectives from a wide range of local people. - Proposing events in early December to look at where HS2/NR had got to with the AP work and the future direction of travel. - Suggested that LBC officer could attend NR/HS2 meetings or get involved more fully with the communications work and planning. SH replied that LBC can help in terms of advice on consultation, but the overall responsibility did not lie with LBC and any staff time would need to be compensated for. To find out about what community groups there are in the area, CINDEK can be accessed by NR/HS2. - SH noted that it's a good idea to ask the community about how they want to be engaged with, but to expect cynicism due to past experiences. HS2 will need to persevere. - IS stated that it is his job to do this, and he knows what to expect and that it will take time to build trust and traction. HS2/NR need to deliver against a clear set of expectations. - SH highlighted that people's concerns are valid and haven't been picked up using the Area Forum format. - Need to take time to explain the constraints and pitch information to suit different levels of understanding. - EW noted that the construction impacts of Crossrail 2 will impact on communities in the area and need to show HS2/NR have thought about this. - SH suggested that NR/HS2 use community organisers to help with contacting the wider community, including schools etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - s to meet in the next 8 weeks - LBC/RW to discuss offer for someone from LBC could come to some of the weekly NR/HS2 communications meetings etc. - RW/HS2/NR to write a plan and come back to the group for comment
<p>5. AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None. 	