

EUSTON STRATEGIC BOARD (ESB) ACTIONS

1st February 2017

Room 10.10 (Kiln), Camden Council, 5 Pancras Square, N1C 4AG

Time: 4.30pm – 6.00pm

Chair: Cllr Sarah Hayward (Leader, LBC)

The following were in attendance at the meeting:

Camden	Cllr Sarah Hayward (SH)	Leader
Camden	David Joyce (DJ)	Director of Planning & Regeneration
Camden	Jessica Gibbons (JG)	Director of Community Services
DCLG	Simon Ridley (SR)	Director, Cities and Local Growth
DfT	Cavendish Elithorn (CE)	Strategy Director, High Speed Rail
GLA	Jules Pipe (JP)	Deputy Mayor of London - Planning
GLA	Fiona Fletcher-Smith (FF)	Executive Director – Development, Enterprise and Environment
GLA	Martin Cowie (MC)	Strategic Planning Manager - Euston
HS2 Ltd	Stuart Westgate (SW)	Programme Development Director
HS2 Ltd	Martin Gray (MG)	OSD Sponsor
HS2 Ltd	Kerry Bangle (KB)	Euston Sponsor
HS2 Ltd	Sabina Nizamuddin	Euston Station OSD
HS2 Ltd	Tom Venner	Commercial Development Director
Network Rail	Rupert Walker (RW)	Head of High Speed Rail, Network Rail
Network Rail	James Appleby (JA)	Project Manager, Network Rail
TfL/ CR2	Michele Dix	Managing Director, Crossrail 2
TfL	Lucinda Turner (LT)	Acting Director of Borough Planning
Camden	Neale Coleman (NC)	Consultant to Camden (Observing)
Camden	Therese Gallagher (TG)	Principal Planner (Notes)

COMMENTS & ACTIONS	OWNER	DEADLINE/ STATUS
Apologies None		
Minutes of the last meeting The minutes of the last meeting were confirmed. These are on the EAP website.	TG	
Network Rail Strategic Station Design Options Review The agenda was re-arranged to allow this as the substantive item to be taken first. JA gave a presentation on Network Rail's strategic concepts and explained that the level deck option is not considered viable for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The interventions on the transport network necessary to deliver level deck are estimated to run until c.2040 and are 		

COMMENTS & ACTIONS	OWNER	DEADLINE/ STATUS
<p>not able to accommodate the number of passengers on the network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction phasing would result in many small phases of work, within constrained construction sites and supported by many substantial but ultimately temporary retaining walls. • The level deck station design limits WCML platforms to 12, which does not support Network Rail's future timetable provision • The construction period and environmental impacts in Camden would be prolonged to 2040 and beyond. • Extra costs associated with level deck scheme (over and above the split level redevelopment scheme) are estimated to be £2bn, with the extra development generated only estimated produce an extra c.£350m in receipts. <p>While the attendees were reluctantly accepting that level deck was not feasible they were very clear that refurbishment of the existing station would not deliver on stakeholders objectives for the station and the wider area, including the delivery of EAP objectives. There was discussion about the inclusion of refurbishment as an option and seeking reassurance that its inclusion shouldn't be the default position, as the starting point should be an aspiration to comprehensive redevelopment. JP expressed concern that, if included, refurbishment will be the option that is taken forward.</p> <p>RW stated that refurbishment isn't what Network Rail want to see delivered as this would be a missed opportunity. He highlighted that it is in everyone's interest to ensure that there is a robust business case for the redevelopment of the station.</p> <p>JA added that the business case should be helped by the inclusion of whole life costs and the need to plan for future capacity growth.</p> <p>MD and LD noted that a refurbishment option should only be included in order to provide a base case and should not become the default option should there be problems with split level redevelopment in the future.</p> <p>SH highlighted concerns with the RAG rating used in the report.</p> <p>JA explained that there are different ways of meeting the requirements, for example you can meet passenger growth by decreasing the passenger retail offering, but that this would need to be assessed holistically as part of the wider scheme.</p> <p>SH highlighted the need to be more forthright about the risks associated with the 'do nothing option' and questioned what costs, returns and timescales had been considered.</p> <p>JA explained that they used the numbers from the 2014 business case for level deck. This scheme included the delivery of the</p>		

COMMENTS & ACTIONS	OWNER	DEADLINE/ STATUS
<p>completed station in 2034 and would have involved a severely reduced service at Euston. Huge operational risks and impacts were identified for the proposals and would require the WCML- Crossrail link and a significant reworking of the wider rail network. Work of the rail industry steering group indicates that the rest of the network would not be able to cope with such a reduction in capacity at Euston. The only option for constructing the level deck therefore is to reduce the work into ever smaller chunks, therefore extending the construction programme and increasing costs.</p> <p>CA suggested producing FAQ's around the process which could be published and would provide a helpful reference point for interested parties.</p> <p>DJ highlighted the importance of ensuring that when costs are discussed, benefits are also considered.</p> <p>SH agreed that the board needed to be clear about what we expect if willing to rule out level deck.</p> <p>SR highlighted from central government's perspective there are wider objectives than delivering the railway and delivering homes and jobs will be key.</p> <p><i>It was agreed that all parties should contribute to the production of a robust business case to support the whole sale redevelopment of Euston station as this is the strong preference of the board.</i></p>	All + NR	
<p>Updates</p> <p>HS2 – Euston Mitigation Measures/Throat Optimisation</p> <p>KB provided an update on EMM for HS2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gradient issue is still being worked on but confident can find solution. - Solutions will need to stay within the bounds of the EMRs - EMM is looking at providing an improvement for the travelling public - Nothing proposed as part of the EMM should preclude any options for B2 - EMM will have impacts on OSD and lead to some changes to the overall balance although expect quantum to be roughly the same. - <i>Due to provide an update on EMM to February ECRG</i> <p>HS2 – Stations Masterplanning remit</p> <p>Tom Venner, the new Development Director at HS2 introduced himself and explained that he will be managing development for both HS2 and Network Rail.</p> <p><i>Agreed to share the brief for the four stations masterplan before the next ESSRB and welcomed stakeholders input on this.</i></p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>TV</p>	<p>In advance of 07/03/17 (next ESSRB)</p>

