

## Euston OAPF Strategic Board

**20<sup>th</sup> November, 3.30pm – 5.00pm**

Camden Old Town Hall, Judd Street

### In attendance

**Chair:** Cllr Sarah Hayward, (SH), LBC - Board Member  
 Douglas Oakervee (DO), HS2 - Board Member  
 Sir Edward Lister (EL), GLA – Board Member  
 Cllr Valerie Leach (VL), LBC  
 Ed Watson (EW), LBC  
 Rupert Walker (RW), Network Rail  
 Alun Hughes (AH), DfT  
 Colin Wilson (CW), GLA  
 Paul Gilfedder, (PG), HS2  
 Alex Williams, (AW), TfL  
 Mary-Ann Lewis (MAL), Euston Area Plan PM

### Meeting Note

	Action
<p><b>1. Welcome, introductions and apologies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GLA and TfL representatives not present at the start of the meeting – to join later, no other apologies received. Agreed to discuss specific Camden/HS2/Network Rail outstanding issues around EAP wording prior to the core agenda items as these did not require GLA/TfL presence</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2. EAP - Outstanding issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MAL set out the EAP wording which HS2 requested to be altered and which Camden did not agree should be reworded. Wording was in relation to the severity of the impact of HS2 around Maria Fidelis and Drummond Street (Section 2.4, 3.2, 4.7 and 4.4).</li> <li>DO stated that they felt the impacts on these could be dealt with by the Environmental Statement mitigation measures and the Bill process. PG added that text could be further amended when the ES is published.</li> <li>EW suggested that delegated powers enable minor wording changes through the next stages of plan preparation if evidence of impacts becomes clearer.</li> <li>SH stated that the final wording is down to Camden to decide as local planning authority. The impacts are locally important.</li> <li>PG stated that HS2 do not accept the language around the neighbourhood centres at Drummond Street and Eversholt Street being a risk as a result of prolonged HS2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All to note</li> </ul>

	Action
<p>construction. There is no evidence in the HS2 Environmental Statement to support this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– LB Camden were clear that the EAP is a planning document and therefore, along with TfL and GLA they wish for the wording to remain as it is, to reflect local priorities. HS2 wished for their objections to the wording to be recorded, and to note that they reserve the right to object or make representations to the effect in the next stages of the EAP process.</li> <li>– PG noted that notwithstanding their objections to these sentences, HS2 were pleased with the EAP process and feel it has helped to push for a better station design.</li> <li>– RW noted the EAP changes made in response to Network Rail outstanding issues (requesting flexibility on the approach to tall buildings, development quantum, open space and 24 hour access to station routes) and agreed that Network Rail could challenge remaining issues through any planning application process for the station. RW can accept 24 hour access to routes in the station as an aspiration, but it is not currently something Network Rail would be able to facilitate.</li> <li>– RW also echoed that Network Rail were pleased with the EAP approach, and consider the approach as an example of best practice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– HS2 objection to wording at 2.4, 3.2, 4.7 and 4.4 to be noted. No changes to be made to EAP proposed submission version.</li> <li>– All to note HS2 reserve the right to object to these parts of the plan formally through the examination process.</li> </ul>
<b>EL, CW, AW joined the meeting</b>	
<b>3. Meeting minutes</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Meeting minutes were reviewed and confirmed once EL, AW and CW arrived.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– All to note</li> </ul>
<b>4. Euston station context update</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– RW reiterated that the best way to deliver a good station design is through the HS2 Hybrid Bill process, and Network Rail are working on over site development potential alongside the Hybrid Bill process. The work on options for station design has involved feedback from officers in TfL, GLA and LBC – awaiting formal feedback on the draft final report.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– MAL to collate response to draft final Hs2/NR Development Options report and issue as soon as practicable.</li> </ul>
<b>5. EAP revisions</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– MAL presented a summary of key consultation comments, key changes proposed in the EAP and options for station design.</li> <li>– SH confirmed with all that the Board was happy for the EAP to progress to LBC Cabinet and to be published subject to the outcomes of this process and Mayoral sign off.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– All to note</li> <li>– MAL to circulate presentation slides to Board for reference</li> <li>– MAL to agree any final non material amendments etc through the EAP</li> </ul>

	<b>Action</b>
	Management Board/delegated powers in Camden
<p><b>6. Publication &amp; programme</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– MAL set out the documents for publication, the proposed publication period and purpose of this period and summarised the long term programme for the EAP production.</li> <li>– All agreed the proposed publication period and approach, and the long term programme.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– All to note</li> </ul>
<p><b>7. Hybrid Bill process &amp; compatibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– PG summarised the timetable for the HS2 Bill, noting that the Hybrid Bill was anticipated to reach Select Committee in the Summer.</li> <li>– EL questioned how we can attract the right occupiers/developers to the Euston site and achieve comprehensive development and momentum to deliver.</li> <li>– SH highlighted that the Board could now potentially move into an implementation role.</li> <li>– There was broad agreement to this proposition and EL suggested that at the next Board this should be a proper debate.</li> <li>– EW suggested that the Board in late March/April should be used for technical sign off of the EAP and representations to go for examination and agreeing process for setting up an implementation body.</li> <li>– DO noted that this matches HS2's role which is moving more towards implementation now.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– All to note</li> <li>– MAL to organise next EAP Strategic Board and note agenda items for discussion.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– None</li> </ul>	