

Euston OAPF Strategic Board

1st April 2014, 11.30am – 12.30pm

Camden Old Town Hall, Judd Street

In attendance

Chair: Cllr Sarah Hayward, (SH), LBC - Board Member
 David Higgins (DH), HS2 - Board Member
 Martin Scholar (MS), GLA – *Deputised Board Member on behalf of Sir Edward Lister*
 Cllr Valerie Leach (VL), LBC
 Michele Dix, (MD), 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

Meeting Note

	Action
<p>1. Welcome, introductions and apologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Apologies from Ed Lister, Board Member, Martin Scholar attending as his deputy. 	
<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 Submission – representations & responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MAL presented a summary of the representations received and the draft EAP team responses for review by the Board. – PG noted that they were broadly happy with the approach but may have some minor wording suggestions, which can be discussed prior to examination. – Board agreed with the suggested draft responses and approach taken and agreed the materials for submission for examination. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MAL to submit EAP, representations, draft responses and supporting documents to the Planning Inspectorate by 11th April
<p>4. EAP Programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MAL presented an updated programme for the EAP and potential examination timeframes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All to note
<p>5. HS2 & Network Rail updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The implications of the Higgins, HS2 Plus report and Growth Task Force reports were discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All to note

	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – RW noted that Network Rail were pleased with the HS2 Plus report and that better outcomes for Euston could now be possible. – PG highlighted that timescales were key and that in order to make changes to station design there is no clear path for timescales or mechanisms at the moment. – Agreed that next steps include getting the right people involved in the process – MD welcomed the change to station design, but PG clarified that the Bill scheme is extant until a new one replaces it. – MAL confirmed that changes in the station design would not have any impact on the EAP programme as it is designed to be flexible and includes both an OSD based around designs similar to the Bill Scheme and similar to the new potential level deck scheme. – RW dealing with the SoS instruction to remove the HS2-HS1 link from the Bill is massively complex. Would hope to be able to state at second reading that it is removed from the Bill as wouldn't want people to have to petition on this unnecessarily. – DR stated that the link will come out of the Bill. There will be additional provisions to the Bill later in the Summer where minor errors can be amended and if the link hasn't already been removed it can be captured here. – A supplementary EIA would be needed and then additional petitioning would be allowed. – Parties will need to petition on Euston Station design as at 2nd Reading as it will still be in the Bill until the additional provision on Euston is ready. Some people may also want to petition to keep the HS2-HS1 link. – SH questioned remit and decision making for the process. DH thought that new work would be taken to the Tripartite Board. – DDD2 work was discussed. RW highlighted that information from DDD2 is required before can assess whether it is technically possible. 	
<p>6. Future role of Boards and EAP implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EW presented options for future governance of the EAP/implementation of EAP process, recommending that the existing Strategic Board is retained and minor amendments are made to the structure to reflect the increased importance/relevance of landowners in the implementation stage. – MD questioned how many landowners there are here. EW noted that the HS2 CPO process would reduce the number. – MS highlighted that the VNEB governance structure doesn't need to be entirely replicated. – DH questioned whether Camden could be challenged if they were chairing the Board due to their role as planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All to note – MAL/EW to obtain

	Action
<p>authority and landowner. Chinese walls were in place at the Olympic Authority and different personnel were used. EW felt that this situation was different therefore Chinese walls should not be necessary, but that Camden's legal team will be checked with to confirm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EW suggested that the team should work to develop the implementation thinking further, including ideas on draft deliverables and workplans. - SH questioned the relationship with the Growth Task Force recommendations and the EAP Board implementation role, how would it work and who would fund? SH also confirmed that legal advice should be sought on the Chinese wall issue. - DH noted that there is a need to sort out who does what and how this will feed into the HS2/DfT/NR Tripartite structure and RW agreed to work on this. - The timetable for the implementation of a scheme and drawing up of the level deck option was questioned. DH highlighted that the Treasury would need comfort on the benefits of a level deck before confirming. 	<p>legal advice on the need for Chinese Walls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MAL to draft further thinking on implementation, workstreams and deliverables for consideration by the Board - RW to consider how the Tripartite Board relates to the EAP Boards
<p>7. AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RW requested implementation slides to be sent. 	<p>MAL to send slides to RW</p>