Euston OAPF Strategic Board

10th July 2013, 11am – 12.30pm
City Hall, More London, SE1 2AA

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
Rupert Seebohm (RS), DfT
Colin Wilson (CW), GLA
Paul Gilfedder, (PG), HS2
Richard McGreevy (RM), TfL
Isabelle Adams (IA), TfL
Mary-Ann Lewis (MAL), Euston Area Plan PM

Meeting Note

	Action
1. Welcome, introductions and apologies − RM and IA attending in place of Michele Dix of TfL.	
2. Minutes of previous meeting − All noted the completed actions and notes from the last meeting and agreed to their publication on the EAP website.	− All to note
3. HS2 station design and EAP approach − EW noted that the draft EAP is largely based around the option 8 design for the station given that this is the option HS2 are currently progressing. However the document is a flexible framework which notes that the previous and other approaches to station design would likely have better compatibility with the EAP objectives.	− All to note
4. Draft EAP proposals and plans − MAL described the basis on which the EAP had been prepared – i.e. developed on the basis of the option 8 station but pushing the parameters to accommodate EAP objectives as much as possible. − MAL highlighted the key policies and approach of the EAP – four overarching sets of principles and area based	− All to note

Transport for London   **MAYOR OF LONDON**   **Camden**

	Action
- principles which can be applied to any station design which comes forward. - There is more work to be done on the approach to views, but the draft approach was noted as a reasonable one. - EL noted that he felt the draft EAP was a good plan. - RW and PG confirmed that they had provided comments on the emerging draft document and were content that not all of requests for changes had been made. HS2 and Network Rail can provide formal comments during the consultation process to pick up outstanding issues. - All agreed that the draft EAP should be published for consultation. - RW questioned how a joint approach to over site development above the station between Network Rail and HS2 would be achieved in terms of powers – would separate powers be needed for this? Would Network Rail issues be under the Bill? - RS responded that separating powers would be complicated. - EL asked why national infrastructure powers aren't being used? - PG confirmed they are not suitable for a project of this size. - RS noted the potential to use the planning application process. - DO noted that enabling works for development are a Network Rail issue. - SH noted that the limitations of HS2 powers (all powers necessary to build HS2, may include some minor works to the existing station) could block achieving the over site development potential at Euston. - EL questioned why the works to the existing station couldn't be built into the HS2 Bill as construction will be happening anyway. - RS noted that putting over site development/work to Network Rail station into the Bill would be a problem if for some reason it didn't go ahead. - EW highlighted the HS2 remit as an engine to growth. - RW reiterated the need to deliver a complete station through the Bill/HS2 process either together or separately – Network Rail happy to progress separately through planning application. - PG stated that coordinating the approach to station design would be key. - SH asked what difference it would make to include a comprehensive approach to station design as one big scheme in the Bill - RS noted that discussions between HS2 and Network Rail are ongoing about development. - RW noted that combined OSD would need a planning application to LBC. - DO highlighted that as long as the Hybrid Bill does not	- Next version of the EAP to include more detailed work on tall building potential - All to note, and also the potential to make formal comments on the draft EAP during the consultation process if required. - Draft EAP to be published for consultation subject to the outcome of Camden's Cabinet meeting on 24th July 2013.

	Action
– preclude OSD it should be ok. – RW reiterated that they don't want to end up with a solution for half the station. – DO noted that there is no reason why Network Rail can't start the planning process now. – SH asked whether a further letter to the SoS is required. – It was noted that the HS2 consultation on station design refinement process and the draft environmental statement provided the opportunity for this. All agreed to resubmit previous EAP Strategic Board report to the SoS on concerns about approach to station design with a fresh cover note explaining any changes in position – deadline of 11th July 2013.	– HS2 Hybrid Bill to ensure it does not preclude aspirations of the draft EAP/ over site development potential generally – MAL to draft a fresh cover letter and submit March 2013 Strategic Board Report to current HS2 consultations from SH and EL as members of the EAP Strategic Board.
5. Consultation process and Sustainability Appraisal – A brief description of the Sustainability Appraisal process and the difference it made to plan production was provided by MAL. – The proposed approach to consultation was summarised by MAL and agreed by all as appropriate. Agreed that the EAP Management Board should agree the consultation materials at their next meeting on 22nd July before finalisation and commencement of consultation on 29th July (subject to LBC Cabinet decision on 24th July). – EL requested that a launch event for the draft EAP should be held as close to the start of consultation as possible, and key stakeholders should be invited.	– All to note – Management Board to agree consultation materials on 22/07/13 – MAL to progress consultation strategy as outlined – MAL to pull together draft materials and options for launch event. Post meeting note: LBC and GLA agreed a launch event not necessary as other events adequate.
6. AOB – CW raised the issue that the approach to the LCR/HS2 development options work was confusing and that the internal architect teams at Grimshaw's (HS2's station designers and LCR/HS2 appointed development option architects) did not appear to be cognisant of previous conversations and requests from the EAP team.	– HS2 to ensure development options and station design work are closely linked and both informed by the draft EAP aspirations.

Transport for London

MAYOR OF LONDON

Camden