

Euston OAPF Strategic Board

5th March 2013, 2.00pm – 3.00pm

Committee Room 3, 1st Floor, Camden Old Town Hall, Judd Street, WC1H 8EQ

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
 Rachel Stopard (RS), LBC
 Ed Watson (EW), LBC
 Michele Dix (MD), TfL
 Rupert Walker (RW), Network Rail
 Jonathan Sharrock (JS), DfT
 Colin Wilson (CW), GLA
 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"> – No apologies to note. 	
<p>2. Minutes of previous meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All noted the completed actions and notes from the last meeting and agreed to their publication on the EAP website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All to note
<p>3. Euston Area Plan consultation results, Historic Area Assessment and background research, resulting emerging masterplanning work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EW reflected on the recently amended agenda to reflect the emerging HS2 station design revisions. – MAL presented a summary of the work undertaken to inform the preparation of a draft version of the Euston Area Plan which included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – consultation on initial objectives, for which there was general support from the public; – preparation of a Historic Area Assessment, which highlighted areas of historic sensitivity and key issues to consider as part of the plan development; – emerging work on an economic vision for the area, informed by property market research, retail assessments and initial viability work; and – initial masterplanning work based on the work above. 	

	Action
<p>The masterplanning work is still draft and represents the maximum extent of development possible and needs to be refined to reflect detailed policy and viability considerations if progressed further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MAL highlighted that if anyone had any specific comments on any of the documents supplied to let her know. MD questioned whether there was a specific target for homes which made the scheme viable. EL asked whether the viewing corridors were taken into account. MAL confirmed that more detailed work on the heights and numbers of homes is required in relation to viability and policy conformity. – DO and RW questioned the number of respondents to the consultation. SH suggested including comparator information to consultation on other planning documents at this stage. – All endorsed the direction of travel to date. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MAL to investigate including comparator consultation information in the final consultation report. – All to note.
<p>4. Evaluation of the baseline and emerging HS2 station designs against EAP objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EW outlined the current HS2 station design context, reusing the existing station building and highlighted that the EAP Management and team were briefed on the change in design direction on Monday 25th February therefore masterplanning work to date does not reflect this. – EW also noted that as a result of the discussions at Management Board it was agreed that the EAP team would meet regularly in the next few weeks with HS2 designers to discuss ways of improving the HS2 emerging reuse scheme’s performance against the EAP objectives and design principles. – SH questioned the flexibility and parameters of the decision making process for the Minister and also the timescales involved. PG/DO confirmed that the decision will be made this month and that the SoS will be presented with both the baseline scheme and the reuse scheme to decide which one to progress and assess in the Environmental Statement. – RS questioned how a decision can be made if the detailed work has not been done yet, is there potential to push back the HS2 programme to allow the original baseline scheme to be progressed? DO stated that it is a programme for the delivery of HS2 and delays have implications for the whole line. – SH noted that two weeks to develop a new scheme is very challenging. DO expressed the need to work together and create an integrated team to look at how to rework the design. – EW questioned when HS2/DfT would write the report to be given to the SoS. – MD asked where over site development could be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All to note. As a result further work on the development of this masterplan will be suspended whilst the EAP team work on assessing the implications of the new station design work as it emerges.

	Action
<p>accommodated and where the EAP fundamentally important through routes could be realised within the new designs as at the moment these aren't shown?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DO confirmed that the tracks cannot be lowered on the Network Rail side and that collaborative work was required to work through these issues. – RW stated that Network Rail have previously had aspirations to redevelop Euston Station with over site development and this remains. RW confirmed that the cost and time to dig out spoil to create lowered tracks was too great. RW confirmed that the approach to over site development at the classic station and HS2 station needs to be considered as part of the masterplanned approach. – SH stated that the new design fundamentally changes what you can achieve at Euston, whereas HS2 could previously have helped to achieve decking to secure regeneration and development opportunities this is now not the case. – MD noted her concern about the approach being discussed as it is not a joined up approach and therefore it will be difficult to achieve a joined up approach to development in line with the emerging EAP aspirations. Need a guarantee that individual bodies will deliver in a joined up way. – EL highlighted that the new station design therefore doesn't prevent over site development. But EW asserted that the permeability and at grade routes would not be provided. – PG indicated that an audit of what the new design can achieve against the EAP objectives needs to be carried out, and that HS2 are willing to pay for additional viability/economic work to inform this assessment. JS concurred that this would be a helpful approach. – EL asked whether the shorter programme and cheaper approach would mean there is only one way in which the SoS decision will go? EW asked what the driver for the opening date of 2026 was? DO stated that every additional year added to the programme costs a vast amount. EW asked whether other elements of the design could be left out to reduce the overall cost? JS stated that a number of issues need to be considered. – SH pressed HS2 to clarify progress on the double deck option for Euston and whether it is still an option being considered as requested by Camden Council. After discussion, SH then questioned why HS2 were still meeting with local groups about a double deck station option if HS2 are no longer pursuing this option. DO was unaware of any HS2 meetings discussing the double deck option with local groups. 	
<p>5. Next steps and implications for the EAP and masterplanning process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Board agreed to meet again on Friday 15th March to review and discuss the outcomes of the collaborative approach to the HS2 station design and evaluation of its 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EW/MAL to send invitation to next meeting, 10am, 15th

	Action
<p>performance against the EAP objectives and to discuss reporting back to the SoS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – RW offered to share previous plans for Euston with the EAP team to assist the understanding of over site development potential for Euston Station. – DO reassured that if Network Rail redevelop the station they would seek to do this at the same time as HS2, although it won't be through the hybrid bill process, as no OSD is. 	<p>March</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MAL and EAP team to meet with HS2 designers to discuss refinement of the current station design. – MAL and EAP team to produce an evaluation of the final revised station scheme against the EAP objectives for consideration by the Board. This will include information on economic implications supplied by GVA at an additional cost to HS2. – RW to supply copies of the previous Network Rail plans to MAL
<p>6. AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MD highlighted that consultation on route options for Crossrail 2 would be carried out in May, and this includes a new combined St Pancras Euston station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All to note.