

MEETING MINUTES

HS2 Chiltern AONB Review Group

Meeting Date / Time:	7 September 2017
Meeting Location:	Chiltern District Council Offices
Meeting Type:	Review Group Meeting #11
Organisations in Attendance:	Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC), Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC), Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB), Chiltern District Council (CDC), Department for Transport (DfT), Natural England (NE) & HS2 Ltd

Attendees:	Title, Organisation
Ben Robinson	Chiltern District Council (CDC)
Catherine Murray	Chiltern District Council (CDC)
Helen Hall	Programme Manager, Chilterns Conservation Board
Ifath Nawaz	Chiltern District Council (CDC)
Jackie Copcutt	Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)
Jonathon Bellars	Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC)
John Woodhouse	Town Planning Manager, HS2 Ltd
Kath Daly	Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB)
Liz Bingham	Natural England (NE)
Miriam Baines	Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)
Neil Jackson	Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB)
Patrick Bateson	Chair, Department for Transport (DfT)
Seb Jew	Interface Manager, HS2 Ltd
Sarah Stacey-Armstrong	Natural England (NE)
Apologies:	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
A.	Introductions	
B.	<p>Review of Minutes and Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The minutes from the previous meeting were agreed. 2. The RG question when the OLE design presentation would take place. HS2 to follow up. (Action 10). 3. No further comments on actions or minutes. 4. HS2 advised there is now a vacancy in the Panel Co-ordinator post. 5. The Chair emphasised the need for the members of the Group to invoice in order for remaining funding to be forecasted. 	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
C.	<p>Detailed Design Principles – 2nd draft & consultation process</p> <p>6. LUC had completed the 2nd draft of the Detailed Design Principles, after receiving and reviewing a number of comments that had been made by members, HS2 Ltd, and stakeholders.</p> <p>7. Introductory text setting out the status of the document has been provided by HS2 Ltd and incorporated in order to provide explanation of how the document will be used moving forward.</p> <p>8. Comments on the 2nd draft are required by 18/09 in order to feed into the final version to be issued for wider public information.</p> <p>9. A focus group meeting was provisionally set for 18/09 to discuss any remaining areas of issue or clarification required.</p> <p>10. The group agreed to 28 days of public display and would review comments received after this was complete. There was discussion surrounding tracking comments received by the public. HS2 noted that the main audience for this document was technical designers and local authorities approving Schedule 17 consent submissions. HH agreed to circulate details of where the DDP would be deposited and where it would be available to view.</p> <p>11. It was agreed that the 2nd draft should be issued to HS2 MWCC designers in the interim in order to provide early view of the direction of the document, in advance of formal submission in November.</p> <p>12. The group discussed engagement with landowners for sections of the document that fall within the Additional Projects options, i.e those outside Operational limits. HS2 agreed to help with background engagement and contact details.</p> <p>13. The group discussed the publication process for the DDP. It was agreed that member organisations would publish on their website, and printed copies would be made available in Great Missenden and Wendover libraries, together with AVDC and CDC Offices.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <p>HS2 to confirm date the DDP is required by MWCC in order to be aligned with design process. HH to circulate details of where the DDP will be available to view</p>	<p>HH</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
D.	<p>Additional Projects Criteria & Governance</p> <p>14. The group discussed the recent submission from LUC which set out criteria and scoring process for assessing and short-listing Additional Projects to be funded by the £3m fund.</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>15. It was agreed the screening process would be limited to include criteria 1 on the purposed of the AONB and to move the HS2 additionality criteria into a prioritisation criteria and not for screening.</p> <p>16. The principles of the scoring sheets were agreed although reversing the approach so a high score, not a low score, would be the better option.</p> <p>17. The group discussed whether there was a need to consult local residents and groups on the scoring criteria. It was agreed that the group’s members had been given responsibility for the fund and that wider engagement on seeking additional project ideas in accordance with the criteria was more appropriate.</p> <p>18. Discussion took place about the potential for early delivery of Additional Projects, and whether this should be considered as a scoring criteria. It was agreed that timeframes should be considered in discussion, but not as a score, as it may potentially rule out good projects options.</p> <p>19. HS2 Ltd advised that the MWCC programmes for design in the respective areas would help to provide insight to the design timetables for works.</p> <p>20. There was discussion surrounding the Governance of the £3m fund. A LA member could be the recipient of the agreed target cost for each Additional Project when it was ready to procure and deliver each project.</p> <p>21. The RG stated their desire for the full fund to be transferred to a LA member, rather than applying to draw down each from the fund for each project, to reduce the erosion of the funds value over time.</p> <p>22. HS2 advised that they would seek to invite CEK to the next RG meeting.</p>	
E.	AOB - none	

Next meeting: TBC