

## EUSTON STRATEGIC BOARD (ESB) ACTIONS

11th December

Time: 2.30pm – 4pm

Camden Old Town Hall, Committee Room 2

Chair: Cllr Georgia Gould (Leader, LBC)

The following were in attendance at the meeting:

Camden	Cllr Georgia Gould (GG)	Leader
Camden	Cllr Danny Beales (DB)	Cabinet Member for Investing in Communities
Camden	David Joyce (DJ)	Director of Regeneration and Planning
DfT	Cavendish Elithorn (CE)	Strategy Director, High Speed Rail
GLA	Jules Pipe (JP)	Deputy Mayor of London - Planning
GLA	Martin Cowie (MC)	Strategic Planning Manager - Euston
HS2 Ltd	Tom Venner (TV)	Commercial Development Director
HS2 Ltd	Kerry Bangle (KB)	Euston Sponsor
Network Rail	Neil Kirkwood (NK) (conference call)	HS2 Integration Director
TfL/ CR2	Isabelle Adams (IA) (first part of meeting)	Sponsor
TfL/ CR2	Lucinda Turner (LT) (second part of meeting)	Director of Borough Planning
Independent design panel	Sadie Morgan (second part of meeting)	HS2s Design Panel lead and Co-Chair of the Euston Design Panel
Camden	Therese Gallagher (TG)	Principal Planner, Euston team (note taker)

COMMENTS	ACTION	DEADLINE/ STATUS
<b>Apologies</b> - Gareth Bradford, DCLG		
<b>Minutes of the last meeting</b> - To be circulated for final review	TG	
<b>Crossrail 2 update</b> - IA confirmed that discussions are ongoing with the Treasury to establish what further work is needed, meanwhile work continues at Euston. - Subject to any news from Government on the business case, CR2 would seek to prepare for a public consultation exercise sometime in 2018.		
<b>Network Rail Feasibility work</b> - NK provided an update on Network Rail's feasibility work, thanking everyone for their part in the process and all present agreed that it had been a very useful, robust and		

COMMENTS	ACTION	DEADLINE/ STATUS
<p>collaborative process. He outlined the minimum and maximum envelopes for each of the 3 'Families' – 1) Refurbishment, 2) Redevelopment (platforms and end-loaded concourse) and 3) Redevelopment (platforms and top-loaded/central concourse) which would feed into the SOBC.</p> <p>NK noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Envelopes are not intended to demonstrate all possible opportunities</li> <li>- All options were technically feasible and came within the original cost envelope.</li> <li>- The station would have to meet both long-term network and station capacity requirements but fully recognised the priorities in respect of place-making and regeneration.</li> </ul> <p>A brief discussion took place covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some of the potential key trade-offs that might exist in considering the options going forward as part of GRIP 3 and the SOBC such as OSD/ASD (adjacent to station development) along Eversholt Street and on the Euston Road frontage against platform capacity/basement servicing/concourse location/impact on Euston Square Gardens.</li> <li>- The relatively high costs of the refurbishment options which offer fewer wider benefits</li> <li>- The interfaces with HS2 are identified as critical, a group which would bring together the key station and OSD design workstreams and respective stakeholders would need to be set up next year.</li> <li>- The role that ESSRB will need to play in managing trade-offs.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>HS2 Masterplanning final report and station design next steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HS2 gave an update on the Masterplan and went through the landowners preferred Option and emphasised that this was simply a baseline to assist bidders and eventually the appointed MDP. It very much represents the start of the masterplanning process.</li> <li>- LBC highlighted queries/comments from an initial review of the masterplan, importantly that the report as issued did not reflect the position presented to the board by HS2, i.e. the report needs to be clearer about it being a <i>baseline</i> based on the <i>landowners</i> preferred option.</li> <li>- Other issues raised included that report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o does not include enough information available to assess policy compliance and that there were some elements which did not appear to be in line with policy.</li> <li>o does not therefore reflect the position of the Planning Authority</li> <li>o does not specifically pick-up the concerns of stakeholders (including LBC's strong reservations with regard to Euston Square Gardens).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>LBC/ all to send comments on masterplan report to HS2</p>	<p>05/01/2018</p>

COMMENTS	ACTION	DEADLINE/ STATUS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question raised about the process going forward in respect of how and when key trade-offs/decisions would be made in addition to what assumptions had been made on preferred Option and what we could realistically expect any appointed MDP to deliver.</li> <li>- TV confirmed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The report could be amended to pick up on these points and that wording could be agreed between HS2 and LBC.</li> <li>o he expected the MDP bidders to be progressive and ambitious in their approach since a substantial element of the evaluation matrix had been allocated to innovation.</li> <li>o The MDP could propose any change to the baseline masterplan and he expected them to do so whilst engaging closely with stakeholders as Euston.</li> <li>o Preferred option is base requirement for station design – if change proposed by MDP it will need to go through the formal change process, which is more lengthy and different to design development.</li> <li>o There is no contractual window for the MDP to do this – assess for cost and programme implications at whatever stage (likely to increase with time).</li> </ul> </li> <li>- CE expects the MDP to focus on what is possible over B1 over the first half of next year.</li> <li>- He referred to key discussions that needed to take place exploring the commercial implications of various options and the need to look at what other stakeholders could contribute in order to deliver all aspirations. This could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o looking at the wider area development opportunities;</li> <li>o thinking creatively around the approach to surface transport (i.e. need for a bus station and the treatment/use of the Euston Road and local network longer-term).</li> </ul> </li> <li>- GE highlighted links to the plan to refresh the Euston Growth Strategy.</li> <li>- LT reminded HS2/DfT of its commitments/assurances given to TfL under the Protective Provisions Agreement (PPA).</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Euston Design Panel Feedback</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SM updated the Board on the Panels views of the latest position regarding the design process and masterplanning, reading from a letter from the Panel to the Director General's of the DfT and the DCLG</li> <li>- SM voiced frustration about the design process to date and the potential that the lack of focus on place could result in missed opportunities to create a meaningful new piece of city. She raised concerns about the 'process driving the process' and the need for a design champion to be involved in decision making. She highlighted the need for a clear and shared vision and the importance of focusing on the</li> </ul>		

COMMENTS	ACTION	DEADLINE/ STATUS
<p>'place', stating that the panel remains extremely concerned with the absence of a robust narrative and vision for the place to direct the station design team and MDP starting in 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LBC, GLA and CR2 shared these concerns and it was noted that a workshop was being arranged in order discuss the role and responsibilities of the design panel in future.</li> <li>- CE confirmed that the Design Panel's remit should include the NR staion and OSD in order to ensure a comprehensive approach.</li> <li>- It was noted that SM (or another rep form the design panel) would be part of the MDP bidder evaluation.</li> <li>- JP emphasised the need to see Euston as a place and not just a transport interchange referring to it as a major opportunity for change in an area that happened to be well-connected.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Growth Strategy – next steps</b> Deferred.</p>		
<p><b>AOB</b> None</p>		

Note taker: Therese Gallagher