

MEETING MINUTES

HS2 Colne Valley Regional Park Panel

Meeting Date / Time:	10 May 2017
Meeting Location:	South Bucks District Council Office, Capswood, Oxford Road, Denham
Meeting Type:	Panel Meeting #13
Organisations in Attendance:	Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC), Chiltern District Council (CDC), Department for Transport (DfT), 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) & HS2 Ltd

Attendees:	Title, Organisation
Ben Robinson (BR)	Principal Planner, CDC
Billy Ahluwalia (BA)	Senior Project Manager, HS2 Ltd
Claire Gregory (CG)	Environment Lead, DfT
Daniela Eigner (DE)	Programme Manager, Groundwork South
David Smith (DS)	Civil Structures Lead, HS2 Ltd
Ella Davies (ED)	Interface Manager, HS2 Ltd
Ian Thynne (IT)	Principal Environmental Officer, LBH
Ifath Nawaz (IN)	Project Solicitor and Manager, SBDC and CDC
James Gasson-Hargreaves (JGH)	Senior Interface Manager, HS2 Ltd
Jane Griffin (JG)	Principal Planner, SBDC and CDC
Jenny Foster (JF)	Senior Planning Officer, HCC
Jim Barclay (JB)	Independent Chair
John Woodhouse (JW)	Town Planner, HS2 Ltd
Josie Allen (JA)	Land Management, NE
Julia Carey (JC)	Environmental Records Centre, BCC
Kimberley Royer-Harris (KRH)	Panels Coordinator, HS2 Ltd
Mathew Frith (MF)	Director of Conservation, LWT
Peter Simons (PS)	Senior Planning Officer, TRDC
Ricardo Arroyo (RA)	Environment Manager, HS2 Ltd
Simon Gray (SG)	Landscape Officer, SBDC and CDC
Steve Fancourt (SF)	Rural Landscape Manager, HS2 Ltd
Stewart Pomeroy (SP)	Colne Valley Managing Agent, Groundwork / CVP CIC
Tom Day (TD)	Head of Living Landscapes, HMWT
In attendance:	Tony Burton, Deborah Denner, Martin Knight, Charles Crawford, Charlie Mitchell
Apologies:	Sarah-Jane Scott

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
A.	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>1. The Chair welcomed Tony Burton, Deborah Denner and Martin Knight to the meeting.</p>	
B.	<p>Review minutes and actions of meeting #12 – March 2017</p> <p>2. No comments on the minutes of meeting #12.</p> <p>3. ED thanked the Panel for sending through their invoices. She stated that a further panel budget update can be given at the next meeting.</p> <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 Ltd to add panel budget update to June meeting agenda 	HS2 Ltd
C.	<p>Chair's Update</p> <p>4. The Chair thanked the Panel for their recent email contributions which enabled the time of the meeting to be extended, and also to start teasing out some of the issues that would be discussed at today's meeting.</p> <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	
D.	<p>Design Panel Presentation</p> <p>5. Tony Burton and Deborah Denner gave a presentation on the role of the Design Panel and the work that it has been involved in.</p> <p>6. Tony discussed future opportunities that could strengthen the link between the Panel and the Design Panel. He stated that there is scope to schedule meetings to discuss the issues and concerns raised by the Panel.</p> <p>7. JF stated that she had requested that the portal should be a key design element. JW confirmed that the South Portal is a key design element.</p> <p>8. Tony stated that the Design Panel is keen to investigate Phase 1 portals as a thematic issue.</p> <p>9. The Chair noted that the Panel is a good representation of the key stakeholders in the Colne Valley Regional Park area and a workshop made up of Panel members could be created to inform the Design Panel. Tony Burton noted this proposal.</p> <p>10. Tony stated that the landscape approach document is published on the HS2 government website.</p> <p>11. JC asked if gantries will be included in the Design Panel's scope as they are key to design.</p> <p>12. Deborah informed the Panel about the gantry competition run by RIBA.</p> <p>13. Martin Knight advised the Panel that Network Rail is progressing the prototypes of the top three designs.</p> <p>14. JW agreed to update the Panel on the gantry competition and to present on common design elements (as presented to the Planning Forum) at a future meeting.</p> <p>15. Tony stated that the Design Panel will attend Panel meetings when appropriate and that he will be the main member attending.</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 Ltd to update the Panel on the gantry competition • HS2 Ltd to give a presentation to the Panel on common design elements 	<p>HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>E.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd Programme Update</p> <p>16. JW gave a short presentation on HS2 Ltd works planned in the Colne Valley during the next 6 months.</p> <p>17. JC asked if HS2 Ltd will share its survey data and when this will occur.</p> <p>18. RA agreed to find out how the survey data will be disseminated publicly.</p> <p>19. DE asked when discussions would need to take place regarding the Tilehouse Woods project based on planned Schedule 17 applications.</p> <p>20. JW noted that the AMP project sheets have been sent to the EWC and discussions have taken place with them regarding the AMP's aspirations in the design of the Tilehouse Lane woodland creation.</p> <p>21. The Panel asked for the presentation slides to be circulated.</p> <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 Ltd to find out how survey data will be disseminated • HS2 Ltd to send a copy of the presentation slides to the Panel 	<p>HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>F.</p>	<p>AMP Update</p> <p>22. Charles Crawford outlined the progress of the AMP since the appointment of LDA.</p> <p>23. Charles stated that most of the Panel's comments on the project sheets have been incorporated in the AMP by making simple amendments to the projects. He further stated that some of the comments emailed by the Panel would apply to Stage 5.</p> <p>24. Charles noted that the purpose of the AMP in their work to date has been to further mitigate the effects of HS2, but comments from the Panel questioned whether some projects are truly mitigation and not enhancement.</p> <p>25. TD and JA stated that the AMP should clearly state which projects have a mitigating or enhancing impact.</p> <p>26. JF noted that the AMP has been produced to guide HS2 Ltd and the contractors as to how best to mitigate the scheme in the Colne Valley, and the AMP is not an exclusive document for the £3m fund.</p> <p>27. JF also noted that the AMP will need to be reviewed in time as not all the projects or parts of the projects will be feasible and better projects may arise as the scheme develops. She stated that the AMP is a live document that will be given to the MWCC as a current guide to the projects that they may deem appropriate to take up in the final restoration of the scheme.</p> <p>28. DE stated that all the 14 Stage 4 projects will be included in the AMP but the Stage 5 budget can only focus on a shortlist of AMP projects.</p> <p>29. JW noted that the AMP could be used by a number of stakeholders and that Stage 5 is about adding detail to the projects that will be funded by the £3m.</p> <p>30. JA stated that the original assurance refers to ecological and landscape mitigation and noted that some projects will have residual effects beyond this.</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>31. RA noted that some of the projects contain mitigation that doesn't go above the mitigation that will be provided by HS2 Ltd.</p> <p>32. The Chair noted that the Select Committee would expect the projects to result in additional mitigation.</p> <p>33. IN stated that the Panel should carefully consider the objectives, budget and future of the Panel.</p> <p>34. The Panel agreed to discuss the future of the Panel at a future meeting.</p> <p>35. DE stated that AMP projects and their detailed design aspects could be better addressed at Stage 5.</p> <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	
<p>G.</p>	<p>AMP discussion</p> <p>36. Charles acknowledged that there is consensus from the Panel on the merit of all of the Stage 4 projects. He stated that a few of the projects include elements of mitigation as well as enhancement.</p> <p>37. The Chair stated that this is a crucial point in the development of the AMP. He also stated that a number of the projects will need to be discussed with the MWCC and therefore the AMP should be ready by MWCC appointment.</p> <p>38. JW stated in terms of how the AMP interacts with the HS2 programme, that certain projects will be relevant to and could be supported by the EWC. He stated that the design stage of MWCC will start from late 2017 for 12-18 months and that the MWCC will not commence physical work until late 2018.</p> <p>39. JW noted that the AMP projects can be developed in phases, with part pre-construction, part during and part post-construction.</p> <p>40. The Panel agreed that scoring or prioritisation criteria should be devised to select the AMP projects that will be developed at Stage 5 and moving forward.</p> <p>41. TD suggested that quality over speed should be the deciding factor when voting for the Stage 5 projects.</p> <p>42. JG suggested that the scoring criteria should be simple.</p> <p>43. MF suggested that some factors should be weighted in relation to other factors.</p> <p>44. IT advised that deliverability should also be a key factor as some projects have unknown constraints, such as being subject to planning application refusals.</p> <p>45. JF stated that the AMP should not identify match funding opportunities from only one source, and should clearly state that the AMP is open to all match funding and is transparent in this.</p> <p>46. The Chair stated that only when the AMP is final will the information be disseminated for funding purposes. He also stated that scoring should be done remotely before the next meeting and that a supplementary workshop could be arranged if there are big discrepancies between the project scores.</p> <p>47. The Chair asked the Panel to send their final comments on the draft AMP to LDA by 19th May. The AMP will then be finalised by the start of June.</p> <p>48. The Panel agreed that the prioritisation criteria for the projects should include the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 8 objectives of the Panel 	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation against direct and indirect impacts (direct impacts weighted) as well as reputational harm/enhancements • Delivery timeline <p>49. The Chair stated that DE will circulate the scoring criteria to the Panel on 19th May for comment. He requested that the Panel send their comments on the scoring criteria by 2nd June. Once the criteria is finalised, populated scoring criteria should be sent back to DE by 16th June.</p> <p>50. TD stated that he was uncomfortable that the information gained from the public exhibitions would not be explicitly considered when selecting the AMP project shortlist.</p> <p>51. The Chair requested that all the relevant Panel documentation be included in the AMP including the outcomes of the technical subgroup workshops.</p> <p>52. JF stated that the title of the AMP should be changed to include the word 'Panel' and that permission should be sought before using the heron logo.</p> <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel members to send their final comments to LDA by 19th May • DE to send the scoring criteria to the Panel by 19th May • Panel members to comment on the scoring criteria by 2nd June. DE to send out updated proforma sheets by 5-6th June and Panel members to return populated scoring matrix to DE by 16th June. 	<p>All</p> <p>DE</p> <p>All</p>
H.	<p>AOB</p> <p><i>Terms of Reference</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JF stated that the ToR should be amended to reflect the current Panel. She also further stated that the ToR can't legally supersede the assurances given to the Panel. • The Chair agreed that a discussion regarding the ToR and future of the Panel should take place at the July Panel meeting. He requested that a senior DfT representative should attend to advise the discussion. • ED stated that HS2 would share its position on the future working and funding of the Panel before the July meeting for discussion. • ED agreed that an update on this would be given in the June meeting. <p><i>Schedule 17 Applications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JA asked for an update on the process of the Panel commenting on Schedule 17 applications, as per JW's presentation to the Panel. • JW stated that any comments will not replace the formal Schedule 17 process with local authorities. <p><i>Future meetings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed that there is too much of a gap between the July and October meetings. <p>Items to be added to agenda for future meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion on future of the Panel and updating terms of reference (July) 	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on above (June) • Presentation on common design elements <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel meetings to be moved to reduce gap between July and October meetings. 	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

Next meeting: 21 June 2017, from 10.30am. Venue: South Bucks District Council Office, Capswood, Oxford Road, Denham