

## Euston Management Board

5<sup>th</sup> September 2017

5 Pancras Square

Time: 2pm – 3.30pm

**Attendees:** David Joyce (chair); Dushen Naidoo (NR); Isabelle Adams (Crossrail 2); Mary-Ann Lewis (LBC); Richard Wilson (LBC); Karen Galey (LBC); Martin Cowie (GLA); Umesh Gorasia (DCLG); Paula Hirst (HS2); Lucinda Turner (TfL); Dushen Naidoo (Network Rail); Kerry Bangle (HS2) Therese Gallagher (LBC – note taker)

<b>Welcome, introductions, apologies</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
Cavendish Elithorn (DfT); Tom Venner (HS2)	
<b>Minutes of the last meeting</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes agreed</li> </ul>	
<b>MDP selection process update</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 reported that on programme at the moment but recognise that it is challenging.</li> <li>• Dialogue due to continue into November, with successful MDP due to be appointed in Jan.</li> <li>• LBC and GLA dialogue session with MDP bidders, HS2 to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- send through dates and information by the end of this week.</li> <li>- LT asked whether TfL are included in briefing session. PH to take this request away.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>Euston Station Area Planning Brief – Programme Update</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed that programme is extended in order to incorporate results of masterplanning and added benefit of more time for involvement of MDP.</li> <li>• HS2 very supportive of giving time for MDP to input, and recognise that there needs to be a separate conversation about where extra funding would come from.</li> <li>• LT recommended that the extended timetable should allow for updated passenger modelling.</li> <li>• MAL highlighted that depending on the outcome of the masterplan and future work it may be desirable to update the relevant chapters of the EAP</li> <li>• Noted the importance of Crossrail 2 and TfL facilities.</li> </ul>	<p>LBC to present revised programme to ESB for endorsement</p> <p>Further discussions regarding funding to be arranged.</p>
<b>HS2 joint masterplanning – option selection and next steps</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PH provided an update on HS2’s masterplanning work, presentation included detail on masterplan: objectives; options; criteria; process and assessment results and scores. This was followed by a brief discussion and agreement of next steps.</li> <li>• Discussion included the following points:</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HS2 recognise that if there is an increase in level of development there may need to be an increase in the enabling works infrastructure than that proposed.</li> <li>- LT asked a question about loading on CR2 station box. Need to do further work to establish impacts.</li> <li>- HS2 acknowledged that layout of development plots needs to come early in the process.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Government must make decision on whether building over B1 station and tracks (need to agree funding) and approach to utilities provision and scope for design works</li> <li>• DJ questioned whether the detailed dialogue stage allows for the prospective MDP to input into enabling works?</li> <li>• LBC requested that the planning comments are updated to reflect the views of the planning authority, as those presented were not consistent with LBC views.</li> <li>• Request from all parties to see more detail on the financial assessment</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LBC highlighted the need for whatever masterplan option is progressed to not be dependent on Euston Square Gardens being reoriented as per commitment given to ESB.</li> </ul>	<p>PH reiterated commitment to circulate note on what assumptions have been made about CR2 box.</p> <p>PH to confirm</p> <p>Relevant sections to be updated.</p> <p>PH to review what financial information can be shared.</p> <p>HS2 to ensure that whatever masterplan option is progressed includes provision for ESG to be retained in current location.</p>
<p><b>AOB</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	

**Euston Management Board**

**25<sup>th</sup> October 2017**

**5 Pancras Square**

**Time: 2pm – 3.30pm**

**Attendees:** David Joyce (chair); Dushen Naidoo (NR); Isabelle Adams (Crossrail 2); Mary-Ann Lewis (LBC); Richard Wilson (LBC); Karen Galey (LBC); Martin Cowie (GLA); Paula Hirst (HS2); Lucinda Turner (TfL); Dushen Naidoo (Network Rail); Kerry Bangle (HS2); Daniel Knoll (TfL), Lorena Naylor (TfL); Karen Campbell (HS2); Therese Gallagher (LBC – note taker)

Welcome, introductions, apologies	ACTION
Tom Venner (HS2), Laurence Whitbourn (HS2), Lucinda Turner (TfL), Juliemma McLaughlin (GLA)	
Minutes of the last meeting	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be circulated for final review</li> </ul>	TG
Crossrail 2 update	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently undertaking value engineering exercise which is due to run until Dec. When this is complete project enters the start of the Hybrid Bill production process (stage A).</li> <li>• Have submitted the strategic outline business case (SOBC) and expect a response around the time of the Autumn statement</li> <li>• Planning for January consultation, which will also cover safeguarding</li> <li>• IA presented a summary of work to date</li> <li>• IA confirmed that Michelle Dix had made a presentation to ESSRB which highlighted that it was not feasible for non CR2 passengers to use the underground link between Euston and St P and that Phoenix Road is viewed as the best way to link Euston and King’s Cross/ St P (HS1/ HS2 link).</li> <li>• Discussion about what happens if Crossrail 2 is not given the go-ahead followed. CE reiterated the DfT’s view that CR2 is not needed for HS2 phase 2 and reminded the board that the strategic case for CR2 will include strategic alternatives to the scheme and that they could look to share this information post an announcement of the scheme.</li> <li>• Need to work with NR on strategic viability work</li> </ul>	
Network Rail Feasibility work update	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DN reported on the work that Network Rail have completed to date, including an outline of:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the reasons for redeveloping the station (assets need replacing in next 5-10 years, 3rd in ranking of worst customer experience)</li> <li>○ Critical success factors</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The process for completing the feasibility work (Sifts). Sift one complete – proposed three families of options based on platforms and concourse</li> <li>○ Relationship to masterplanning – especially in relation to central concourse. Will be noted in masterplan as a point in time</li> <li>○ Noted that correcting derogations – will have big impact on cost perhaps without much benefit</li> <li>● SOBC             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ to be submitted in Feb. It is difficult to estimate how long it will be before a response is provided until the size of the ask is known</li> <li>○ Probably more than one option to be included in SoBC</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Masterplanning and design update and next steps</b>  <b>Surface transport at Euston – discussion</b></p>	
<p><i>HS2 joint stations masterplanning options</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presentation from PH which:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Outlined the sub variables included in the masterplan for surface transport</li> <li>○ Highlighted that base scheme remains as AP03, that further work is needed to find the best solution and the MDP will be able to propose changes once appointed</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>RIBA2 HS2 station design progress &amp; relationship with NR feasibility work</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Discussion and questions included the following:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Given Network Rail’s initial feasibility work which is looking at a central primary concourse, LBC are keen to understand what scope there are for changes to the concourse and provisions for people movement?</li> <li>○ PH explained that the Masterplan summarises work at a point in time and that if NR’s feasibility work proposes an alternative solution for HS2 design then there would need to be a change process in order for that change to be considered and progressed.</li> <li>○ There was a discussion about the importance of the brief for the next stage of station design and LBC repeated their request to be fully involved in this process.</li> <li>○ KB confirmed that the HS2 requirements from DfT is for the NR and HS2 stations to operate independently.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Shared GLA group and LBC priorities for surface transport and future work</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● In response to a question from CE, LT confirmed that TfL will be looking at Euston Road in the future – recognising that it is part of the strategic road network and the inner ring road.</li> <li>● Presentation by LT and DK summarised the work to date and highlighted future opportunities to develop more innovative proposals for each of the transport modes.</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In response to a question about whether this work needed to be on the agenda for the ESSRB, CE suggested that needed to be clear what decision we would be asking them for – if only for information can be provided as part of the written update and be clear when coming back for a decision.</li> <li>• It was agreed that both workstreams needed to be cognisant of one another and work together to share information.</li> </ul>	
<p><i>Final masterplan report</i> PH outlined the main differences between C and C1.</p> <p><i>Future decision making</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PH confirmed that:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the land owners are not expecting endorsement from the board and partner organisations – rather the masterplan is seen as a baseline scheme to be passed onto the MDP for further development.</li> <li>○ Further work is needed and the masterplan needs to recognise this and provide appropriate caveats.</li> <li>○ Initial feasibility studies will be passed to MDP.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>MDP opportunities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DJ referenced the correspondence between Cllr Gould and Mark Thurston which sets out commitments to work with the LBC as the LPA to explore opportunities to optimise development and placemaking opportunities.</li> <li>• In response CE set out what he thought were the two main challenges faced (where there was a difference of opinion between stakeholders:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Euston Square Gardens and</li> <li>ii) the location and quantum of OSD and the relationship to placemaking</li> </ul> </li> <li>• RW highlighted a further area of concern – permeability of the site. This includes the location of the concourse and E/W routes.</li> <li>• It was recognised that there were limited opportunities to resolve and explore options through the MDP procurement process but there should be more when the MDP is on board.</li> <li>• PH confirmed that the MDP will only hear the detailed view of the LPA on the masterplan once appointed. HS2 have some proposals for how the MDP feeds into governance and boards – request for this to be shared and discussed.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Euston Strategic Board Agenda</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be circulated for comment</li> </ul>	
<p><b>AOB</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KB highlighted the piece of work that is underway to look at integration and interaction of construction amongst partners. Following an initial workshop last week, the intention is to take a paper to ESSRB with a recommendation that someone is</li> </ul>	

remitted and resourced to take forward this piece of work in the longer term.	
---	--

## Euston Management Board

5<sup>th</sup> December 2017

Camden Council, 5 Pancras Square, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor, Room 11.13 (Hawley)

Time: 2pm – 3.30pm

**Attendees:** David Joyce (chair); Tom Venner (HS2), Dushen Naidoo (NR); Isabelle Adams (Crossrail 2); Mary-Ann Lewis (LBC); Richard Wilson (LBC); Martin Cowie (GLA); Paula Hirst (HS2); Kerry Bangle (HS2); Karen Campbell (HS2); Therese Gallagher (LBC – note taker); Patrick Jones (LBC);

Welcome, introductions, apologies	ACTION
<p>Laurence Whitbourn (HS2), Lucinda Turner (TfL), Gareth Bradford (DCLG); Juliemma McLaughlin (GLA); Karen Galey (LBC)</p>	<p>DCLG to confirm who will be replacing Gareth Bradford. All to remind named rep of attendance</p>
Minutes of the last meeting	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be circulated for final review</li> </ul>	
Network Rail Feasibility work update	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DN provided a brief update on the sift process, including sift workshops and detailed meeting with stakeholders</li> <li>• Reported that a draft of Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) will be ready for the end of the year when it will start the internal NR sign off process before submission to the SoS in the first part of 2018</li> <li>• In response to DJ's questions about how NR's feasibility work links into HS2's masterplanning and HS2's station design work, DN confirmed that:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The more formal documentation and feedback will start early next year but HS2 team had fed into the process so far.</li> <li>○ MDP aware that this is at an early stage of conceptual design</li> </ul> </li> <li>• DN also reported all the options will need to be refined in order to meet NR requirements.</li> <li>• Progressing feasibility work – reviewing process at the minute. Single family selection in next 6-9months, and then selection of options following this.</li> <li>•</li> <li>• CE reflected that if the different objectives of the organisations are not refined there is a danger that nothing will happen.</li> <li>• Questions were raised about:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OSD –is it expected to pay for the station?</li> <li>○ Phasing</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	





<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Schedule 17 (what is needed and what is the distinction between main works and enabling works)</li> <li>● Governance – agreed at ESB that will relook at this when MDP on board</li> </ul>	
<b>Euston Growth Strategy - update</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Growth Strategy looks at what growth is associated with the redevelopment of Euston in the wider area:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Working with knowledge quarter to explore funding for an update and what new work needs to be commissioned.</li> <li>○ Linked to HS2’s benefits realisation work</li> <li>○ There will be a difference in skills needed during construction and in operation and we will need to prepare for this</li> <li>○ No boundary for work</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Currently, demand in the wider area and specifically in places like Camley street can’t be satisfied for space associated with the knowledge quarter.</li> <li>● The board highlighted similar studies that may be helpful::             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ City of London have looked at the future of the workplace</li> <li>○ Skills for London</li> <li>○ Getting the best out of Britain</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>IA – to provide contact at Crossrail2</p>
<b>Euston Strategic Board Agenda</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To be agreed by correspondence</li> </ul>	LBC to circulate
<b>AOB</b>	
None	