

# MEETING MINUTES

## HS2 Colne Valley Regional Park Panel

<b>Meeting Date / Time:</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> January 2016, 10.00am
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	Colne Valley Park Visitor Centre Denham Court Drive, Denham Buckinghamshire UB9 5PG
<b>Meeting Type:</b>	Panel Meeting
<b>Stakeholders:</b>	Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC), Bucks, Berks and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT), Chiltern District Council (CDC), Department for Transport (DfT), Environment Agency (EA), Colne Valley Park Community Interest Company (CVP CIC), Hertfordshire County Council (HCC), Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust (HMWT), London Borough of Hillingdon (LBH), London Wildlife Trust (LWT), Natural England (NE), South Bucks District Council (SBDC), Three Rivers District Council (TRDC)

<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Title, Organisation</b>
Jackie Copcutt (JC)	HS2 Lead Project Officer, BCC
Jane Griffin (JG)	Principal Planner, SBDC and CDC
Jenny Foster (JF)	Senior Planning Officer, HCC
Josie Allen (JA)	Lead Adviser, Thames Valley Team, NE
Mathew Frith	Director of Conservation, LWT
Michael Hurn (MH)	Chair, DfT
Paul New (PN)	Senior Interface Manager, HS2 Ltd
Peter Simons	Senior Planning Officer (Transport and Policy), TRDC
Phil King (PK)	Senior Town Planning Manager, HS2 Ltd
Rebecca Perdrix (RP)	Team Administrator (minute taker), HS2 Ltd
Robin Jones (RJ)	Strategic Manager, Groundwork / CVP CIC
Roy Stokes	Project Manager, EA
Stewart Pomeroy (SP)	Colne Valley Managing Agent, Groundwork / CVP CIC
Tom Day (TD)	Head of Living Landscapes, HMWT
Tomas Garcia (TG)	Lead Bridge Engineer Technical Directorate, HS2 Ltd

<b>Apologies</b>	<b>Title, Organisation</b>
Ian Thynne (IT)	LBH
Jales Tippell	Consultant, LBH
Jennifer Clarke	HCC
Jerry Unsworth	Planning Consultant to SBDC and CDC
Jim Kitchen	EA
Julie Hughes (JH)	TRDC
Kathleen Covil	NE
Raj Alagh	Solicitor, LBH

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
1.	<p><b>Introductions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chair welcomed members to the 3<sup>rd</sup> HS2 Colne Valley Regional Park Panel (the Panel) and commenced introductions.</li> <li>2. Chair suggested discussions begin with meeting agenda item 2; the presentation on the Colne Valley Viaduct - Employers Reference Design (ERD) and Draft Design Approach for Bridges and Viaducts.</li> <li>3. Chair explained there are two parts to the presentation, first Paul New (PN) will talk through the detail process and timelines, the second part will be presented by Tomas Garcia (TG) outlining the design requirements.</li> <li>4. Chair suggested, as TG is a guest at the Panel, he provide a brief background of his work. TG stated he is the Lead Bridge Engineer, Technical Directorate department at HS2 Ltd and has designed approx. 60 bridges throughout his career, including Olympic Park.</li> </ol>	
2.	<p><b>Colne Valley Viaduct – Employers Reference Design and Draft Design Approach for Bridges and Viaducts</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. PN referred to his power point presentation and began to talk through Part 1 the sides.</li> </ol> <p>HS2 Design Stages</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. PN detailed the design stages for phase one infrastructure, explaining HS2 Ltd are currently working on Level 2, Specification Design and Level 3, Employer Requirements Design at the moment. Level 4, Scheme design and 5 detailed design are future work to be done by the civil contractors. PN stated that Level 4 is the scheme design stage, which is the design submitted for planning consents. Level 5 is the detailed construction stage.</li> </ol> <p>Timescales</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. PN moved on to the timescale slide and explained that between spring 2017 (Scheme design) and mid-2018 (submissions for planning consents) are very important stages. JF commented, from her understanding from the Planning Forum, the satellite compound construction is scheduled to begin before these works. PK responded yes, that is correct and the satellite compound is part of a separate contract where they will be doing other work to tie in with the Colne Valley Viaduct.</li> </ol> <p>ERD main objectives</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. PN outlined the Employer’s Requirements Design (ERD) objectives, which covers engineering designs to further define the concept. JG asked at what stage of the design process noise barriers are included. TG answered the noise barriers will be included in the initial design requirements. JG stated it is important that the noise barriers be included into the design rather than added on after the design is complete. PN explained the noise barriers are a part of the integral design. JF asked if the noise frequency is considered at this stage of the design. Chair answered yes, noise frequency is considered. There are 18 trains per hour each way (36 total). TG added that noise frequency is considered and included in the initial designs.</li> </ol>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>9. RS asked what is established in the initial design and does it include any ecological effects. PN responded that all issues are covered, which will include ecological effects.</p> <p>Constraints to Design Development</p> <p>10. PN explained a constraint in the design development is lack of access to land to carry out surveys, such as ground investigation, bathymetric, ecological and water extraction survey and monitoring. Prior to Royal Assent, HS2 Ltd cannot force landowners to grant access to their land. Without access, it limits the information available for detailed design.</p> <p>11. MF asked about gantry design. PK responded that last year HS2 Ltd held a competition for the design of catenaries, however does not know the outcome of the competition. PK to find out the result of the catenary design competition and share with the Panel.</p> <p>12. Chair commented these are very important discussion points for HS2 Ltd to continue to consult with the Panel to gain their input.</p> <p>13. JG asked at what stage is the Design Panel involved. TG responded the Design Panel are involved at key parts to consider different design stages when they see appropriate to do so.</p> <p>Invitation to Tender (ITT)</p> <p>14. PN explained the tender process and stated HS2 Ltd will be requesting Tenders to submit key design and construction designs which will form part of the evaluation process to demonstrate their capabilities. JG asked will the Panel have sight of the designs. Chair stated HS2 Ltd will take this away and consider engagement with the Panel regarding tender designs as it is a fundamental point for this Panel.</p> <p>15. JA stated the presentation is viaduct process/detail focussed, will tender designs cover other sections of the railway trace (Sectors). PN explained there will be other tenders and key design challenges for other Sectors.</p> <p>16. JF asked if there are many companies who design bridges. Chair responded there are a number of companies, with some making joint ventures and several others companies usually team up with smaller companies to work on large projects like the Colne Valley Viaduct.</p> <p>Part 2 – Bridges Design Requirements</p> <p>17. TG stated HS2 Ltd have employed top tier architects, Grimshaw and Atkins to provide top level designs. TG stated his slide presentation has taken a few key images from the Bridge Design Library document, rather than showing the entire document, which is quite large. The images selected have been chosen to provide a feeling of what HS2 Ltd envision for the designs, however are mindful not to restrict the designers to use their innovativeness and creativity.</p> <p>18. TG presented on images of acceptable and unacceptable designs. Made a point regarding rainwater management that the piping will be incorporated into the design and not placed on the outside pillars as an afterthought. TG thanked the Panel members and stated that is the end of his presentation.</p> <p>19. Chair stated the Bridge Design Requirements document TG presented on will be shared with the Panel with views and comments to be heard at the next Panel meeting. PK added the document will need to be treated as confidential as it</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>will form part of the tender documentation for the Main Works Civils Contract and therefore should not be shared externally until the tender process begins. PK stated he will email the Panel after today's meeting asking for confirmation the document will be treated as confidential.</p> <p>20. Chair stated a review of the document will be added to the 2nd March Panel meeting agenda and would like to see the ITT reflect the Panels comments.</p> <p>21. PN added he will check the timescales to make sure the Panel comments at the next meeting can be incorporated into the ITT. [Post meeting note from PN: Any significant comments made at the next CVRP Panel meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> March would be in time for consideration, ahead of final sign-off at end of March.]</p> <p>22. PK asked is there anything fundamental the Panel wishes to see regarding the design. JG responded the noise barriers will be useful to see. TD asked about the parapet designs. TG stated the parapets are a separate design.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Review minutes and actions from 10 Dec 2015</b></p> <p>23. Chair stated comments from JU were received regarding the draft minutes from 10 December meeting and suggested to go through them together.</p> <p>24. Paragraph 10: suggestions by JU are accepted and will be amended.</p> <p>25. Paragraph 14: JU made comment that at this stage the Panel expressed their view that a Design Competition was the appropriate technique for the viaduct design. Chair stated the matter was discussed at the 10 December meeting and noted the views of Panel members.</p> <p>26. Paragraph 16: Chair stated he accepts JU's removal of 'up to' £3million for the contribution made by HS2 Ltd. JG stated she is unsure how the cost of HS2's mitigation for the Colne Valley was arrived at. An FOI request for the put the cost of this mitigation at approximately £23 million and asked if the Panel will have any engagement on that. PK responded he will add this to the next Panel meeting agenda to explain further. The design development process will define the mitigation process. JG asked if it is in the remit as a part of this Panel to discuss that mitigation. PK stated it is fundamental to the discussions.</p> <p>27. Chair asked for any final comments. Chair acknowledged the Panel's no comment as the minutes being agreed to. Chair stated the adjustments will be incorporated and a final version re-issued.</p> <p>28. Chair moved discussion on to the actions. PK stated there that everyone should have a paper copy of the actions tracker spreadsheet which was placed on the table at the beginning of the meeting.</p> <p>29. PK started with open action 1 and stated the applications for the Panel Chair position closed last Friday. Five candidates were identified and the selection process will begin with phone interviews and in-person interviews aiming to be held during the first week of February. PK explained there will be a representative from HS2 Ltd, Department for Transport and ideally one or two representatives from the Panel. JF asked where the interviews are planning to be held. PK suggested perhaps at South Bucks District Council (SBDC) as their office is in the area. JG responded, that on behalf of SBDC, she is happy to accommodate the interviews at their office.</p> <p>30. Chair asked if the Panel has decided who will sit on the interview panel. JF asked for the location and time of interviews to be confirmed, then she will know if</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>she could represent the Panel. JG stated she will be one representative. SP commented he is happy for JG to represent CIC. TD added he does not think it crucial for the Panel to have two representatives and is happy for JG to be on the interview panel, also stated his thanks and appreciation for HS2 Ltd involving the Panel in the process.</p> <p>31. Chair acknowledged the Panel's agreement for JG to be on the interview Panel. Chair stated their objective is to have the Chair position appointed by the next Panel meeting.</p> <p>32. Action item 2: Panel minutes to be uploaded to website. PK stated the minutes and public documents will be located in the design development section on the HS2 Ltd website. The CVRP Panel section is currently under construction and when it becomes live, will share the link with the Panel. PK stated the HS2 Ltd IT team have advised a target date by the end of January.</p> <p>33. Action item 3: Individual MOUs: Chair referred to the email sent on 14 January from JF on behalf of HCC, regarding comments on the MOU and ToR. Chair stated he will begin with the MOU comments then address the ToR.</p> <p>34. Chair stated he will come back to the Panel on the MOU via email.</p> <p>35. Chair referred back to JF's email to address the termination of MOU point. Chair explained the MOU will expire when the Panel finishes. RJ commented the wording needs to reflect the end date and allow for flexibility of time, perhaps less frequent meetings, but the MOU should still cover them and members be paid for their attendance.</p> <p>36. Chair stated in terms of 'Activities', the MOU refers to activities as detailed within the ToR. JF's email outlines the ToR does not have any activities listed. Chair stated he can cross reference the list of Activities to the MOU.</p> <p>37. Chair referred back to the 14 January email from JF and the comments regarding the ToR. Chair stated this was discussed at the previous Panel meeting and the wording from the Select Committee was looked at. Chair stated he can amend the ToR to reference the Assurance provided to SBDC on the 8<sup>th</sup> June, 2015 and asked if that would be acceptable to the Panel. JF responded that yes that would be acceptable and useful. JG added that the ToR supersedes the assurance, which should be made clear and also detailed to the new Chair person. Chair responded he will provide a full hierarchy and the background of the Panel will be explained to the new Chairperson to ensure continuity. For clarification, the Chair stated the ToR takes precedence over the 8<sup>th</sup> June assurance to SBDC.</p> <p>38. Chair moved onto the email request for a pre-meeting to be included in the ToR. Chair expressed his concern with this request as he sees the Panel as an open, engaging and trusting forum and with the appointment of an independent chair, there should be no need for a pre-meet. JF responded by explaining the background to the request. JF explained that over the previous few weeks there have been numerous emails back and forth between panel members and thought perhaps it would be easier to have a pre-meet to agree on items before the Panel. JG added it would only be needed on an exceptional basis and not before every meeting. JG added she does not think it needs to be formalised and does not want the meetings to develop into an 'us and them' mentality. Discussions continued regarding a pre-meeting and if they felt it would be necessary, however all agreed it would be on their own time and unpaid as it</p>	<p>Chair</p>

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>would be their own decision to meet. Panel agreed not to include a pre-meet into the ToR.</p> <p>39. Chair addressed the email request for a Local Council Member to sit on the Panel. JF stated the request had been discussed since the email was sent and is happy for it to be removed.</p> <p>40. PS stated he is at the Panel representing the Council as a petitioner and not as an LPA and would not want some items discussed in the Panel to be made public. PK responded the intentions of the creation of the Panel was to include and engage with the LA's for the design and collaborative approach for the design of the viaduct, the Colne Valley Regional Park and Additional Mitigation.</p> <p>41. PK added that as a part of HS2 Ltd's risk mitigation, they will engage with both the Panel but will also engage with local planning authorities separately on planning submissions under Schedule 16 of the Bill. It was recognised that just because the Panel may view an idea as a good design, it does not automatically follow that the LPA will have the same view. JG stated she would hope the LA's would recognise the importance of the Panel and what is discussed and agreed to. PS stated it is important to him to make this point clear. PK stated the design would still require a pre-application discussion with HS2 Ltd.</p> <p>42. Action item 4: PK thanked the Panel for their email responses to the area of interest map and stated he has extended the boundary as requested by the Panel. The original map had the boundary stopping at the M25. PK stated this is a broad boundary and not to be used as a hard line as some mitigation areas may fall slightly outside. SP responded that the broader mitigation area might be too broad and would prefer the area of interest to remain as the Colne Valley Regional Park Boundary. PK asked the Panel if they would prefer the boundary to remain as the Park boundary, as the Select Committee referred to. The Panel agreed. PK to re-issue the area of interest map to reflect the Park boundary.</p> <p>43. Action item 5: Chair stated the ToR have been discussed and can move on.</p> <p>44. Action item 6 &amp; 7: PK advised that the Design Panel meeting minutes are uploaded to the website. PK stated he will share the link directing the Panel to the Planning Forum website where the documents are located.</p> <p>45. Chair asked if there were any other points the Panel wished to discuss at this time.</p> <p>46. JG pointed out that an action from the 10 December meeting was to have a member from the Design Panel attend today's meeting, however there is no representative here today.</p> <p>47. PK responded the intention was to have a Design Panel member in attendance today, unfortunately a conflict arose and they could not attend. PK stated he asked if the Design Panel meeting minutes and documents could be made publically available, the Head of the department advised PK the Design Panels discussions are of a confidential nature at the moment as they are discussing the designs for the tender stage. The minutes and documents are not suitable for circulation at this time. However, the Design Panel will be releasing case studies the capture what is being discussed and PK will share these with the Panel when available.</p> <p>48. PK stated Sadie Morgan, Design Panel Chair will be attending the CVRP Panel meeting. PK added, for the Panel's information and in the importance of transparency, there will be a Design Panel meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> February and they</p>	Chair

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>will be considering what has been discussed at this Panel. They will also be having a site visit to familiarise themselves with the area.</p> <p>49. Chair stated he thinks it is important that a member(s) of the Design Panel do attend the CVRP Panel to ensure collaboration and that both visions are in line. JF asked how many Design Panel members are there, as she thinks that at least one should have been able to attend today's Panel meeting. TG stated there are approx. 47 members. PK restated that a Design Panel member will be attending the next CVRP Panel meeting.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Response to Additional Mitigation Letter</b></p> <p>50. PK stated HS2 Ltd will be reporting back to the Select Committee next week with an update on the Panel and stated that Councillor Tett's response letter on 15 January in regards to the £3 million contribution is very positive.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Resources – CVRP Panel Chair / Support Officer Role</b></p> <p>51. Chair stated the Panel has already discussed the Chair position, so will discuss the Support Officers role. PK stated he has reviewed the updated document from the Panel and has no comments. The next step is to progress with the advertisement ASAP and is mindful to keep the momentum.</p> <p>52. SP suggested a phone call outside of the Panel meeting would be useful to finalise the next steps and confirm the Job Description. SP asked about the funding for the position. PK responded he will provide confirmation on the funding and will confirm details outside of this meeting.</p> <p>53. SP stated the timeline in the task notes document is a broad timeline and is based on a having the position filled by April.</p> <p>54. PK asked if all Panel members have provided their feedback on the Support Officer role. SP responded yes, all panel members comments are incorporated into the latest document. SP stated the task notes in relation to the Support Officer, some of the key tasks that need to be looked at before the position is appointed. He has not received any comments on this so can assume the Panel agrees. Panel responded yes, they agree. SP asked for the costs to be confirmed. PK stated he will confirm that all costs are committed to by HS2 Ltd and will be reimbursed for all. PK stated he will call SP to discuss in further detail.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Memorandum of Understanding</b></p> <p>55. Chair stated Agenda item 6 has been discussed and will move onto item 7, the forward programme.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Forward Programme</b></p> <p>56. PK stated the cost of mitigation and HS2 Ltd mitigation in the Colne Valley Regional Park area will be added to the agenda for the 2<sup>nd</sup> March meeting and will ask for an HS2 Ltd Environmental specialist can attend to explain the mitigation in further detail. [Action captured in action item 6 in table below].</p> <p>57. RJ referred to the Forward Programme of Activities table in the slide presentation and suggested those activity timelines should align with the Panel meetings.</p> <p>58. Chair stated the next Panel meeting will cover: 58.1. Discussion on HS2 Ltd Mitigation (not additional mitigation)</p>	



Item	Title	Action/Owner
	<p>58.2. Additional Mitigation for the CVRP</p> <p>58.3. Review of Bridge Design Requirements document</p> <p>58.4. Finalise the MOU</p> <p>58.5. Hope to welcome the new Chair</p> <p>59. TD stated, for information of the Panel, there is a biodiversity meeting this afternoon to initially discuss mitigation.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd updates</b></p> <p>60. PK provided an update on the Select Committee Programme, with only 10 sitting days remaining there are still approx. 288 petitioners to be heard. The expected last sitting day is the 4<sup>th</sup> February, subject to change.</p> <p>61. PK wanted to provide the Panel with a brief update on HOAC, however as he is not fully up-to-speed on the details, asked if JG would mind briefing the Panel. JG stated HOAC is at the pre-application stage at the moment and there was a site visit yesterday. JG explained initially HOAC was required to submit two applications, however only one is required now, which is good news. TD added that it would be useful to look at the biodiversity at the current HOAC site and see what can be done there. Chair commented that is a perfect example of additional mitigation usage.</p>	
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>62. Chair asked the Panel if there was any other business they wished to discuss. RJ asked when the final report from the Select Committee is released. Chair responded the report is scheduled for release mid-February. RJ asked if there are any further SEF and BLEF announcements. PK responded he is unsure, and will add them as a standing item to the HS2 Ltd Updates slide.</p> <p>63. RJ asked, if a new Chair is not appointed by the next Panel meeting, is Michael Hurn available to continue as Chair position until such time and also ensure continuity of information for the new Chair. Chair responded yes, he will continue to Chair until the new Chair is appointed and will ensure there is a full handover.</p>	
<b>10.</b>	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>64. Next meeting confirmed for 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016 at 10am at South Bucks District Council offices. PK expressed his thanks to JG for holding the next two Panel meetings at the SBDC offices.</p> <p>65. Panel members commented that the 2<sup>nd</sup> March and 20<sup>th</sup> April calendar invites have disappeared. RP to re-send invites.</p>	

### Meeting Actions

#	Action	Owner
<b>1.</b>	PK to find out the result of the gantry design competition and share with the Panel.	HS2 Ltd
<b>2.</b>	HS2 Ltd to take away and consider engagement with the Panel regarding tender designs.	HS2 Ltd
<b>3.</b>	PK to email Panel members asking for confirmation the Bridge Design Requirements document will be treated as confidential.	HS2 Ltd



4.	Add to 02 March Agenda: Review of Panel comments on Bridge Design Requirements document.	HS2 Ltd
5.	PN to check the timescales to make sure the Panel comments on the Bridge Design Requirements can be incorporated into the ITT at the next meeting.  [Post meeting note from PN: . Any significant comments made at the next CVRP Panel meeting on 2 <sup>nd</sup> March would be in time for consideration, ahead of final sign-off at end of March.]	HS2 Ltd
6.	Add to 02 March Agenda: Explanation of HS2 Ltd Mitigation and costs and invite HS2 Ltd Environmental specialist to attend to explain in further detail.	HS2 Ltd
7.	Issue final 10 Dec Minutes to Panel.	Chair
8.	Cross reference the ToR to the list of Activities to the MOU.	Chair
9.	Amend the ToR to reference the 8 <sup>th</sup> June 2015 Assurance provided to SBDC. Make clear that ToR takes precedence over the 8 <sup>th</sup> June assurance to SBDC.	Chair
10.	Re-issue area of interest map to the CVRP boundary.	HS2 Ltd
11.	Share the link directing the Panel to the Planning Forum HS2 website where the minutes and documents are located.	HS2 Ltd
12.	Share Design Panel case studies when available.	HS2 Ltd
13.	PK to confirm Support Office funding and final job description with SP via phone call and advertise position asap.	HS2 Ltd

**Next meeting:** Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2016, 10:00 am. South Bucks District Council Office  
Capswood, Oxford Road, Denham, Bucks, UB9 4LH