

MEETING MINUTES

HS2 Chiltern AONB Review Group

Meeting Date / Time:	8 th March 2018
Meeting Location:	Chiltern District Council Offices
Meeting Type:	Review Group Meeting #13
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, Fusion

Attendees:	Title, Organisation
Ben Robinson	Chiltern District Council (CDC)
Ifath Nawaz	Chiltern District Council (CDC)
Helen Hall	Programme Manager, Chilterns Conservation Board
Jackie Copcutt	Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)
Jonathon Bellars	Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC)
Vernon Ioo	HS2 Ltd
Nisha Devani	HS2 Ltd
Lucy Murfett	Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB)
Neil Jackson	Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB)
Tom Hinds	Chair, Department for Transport (DfT)
James Boag	Senior Interface Manager, Central Area HS2 Ltd
Sarah Stacey-Armstrong	Natural England (NE)
Liz Bingham	Natural England (NE)
Imogen Parker	Natural England (NE)
John Simmons	AECOM
Elaine Richmond	Fusion
Caroline Hutson	Fusion
Apologies:	Miriam Baines

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
A.	Introductions	
B.	Review of Minutes and Actions 1. Minutes from meetings #11 and #12 approved. 2. Action tracker was presented and Chair requested members to review their actions ahead of the next meeting. 3. No further comments on actions or minutes.	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
C.	<p>HS2 Engagement Plans</p> <p>4. HS2 provided an update to the RG on Engagement Plans: Early Works Contractors have engagement plans for Habitat and Haul roads</p> <p>EK have been engaging local communities on viaducts and bridge design.</p> <p>5. HS2 provided a summary on recent LPA meetings, with the feedback being that the LPA's wished to see more input to the Design. The Design Panel was being used as the 'check' on what EK and Align are designing.</p> <p>6. CCB questioned the engagement as information giving.</p> <p>7. HS2 advised that they didn't have time in the design programme to weigh up every element of feedback, so the Independent Design Panel was intended to provide this check assurance.</p> <p>8. CDC advised that the local communities must have a say and that HS2 should carry on with their consultation.</p> <p>9. HS2 described what Align/EK are doing to present why designs can and can't be brought forward.</p> <p>10. The Chair asked to see the process of engagement plans and more detail on how to provide feedback over a 12 month plan.</p> <p>11. AVDC advised that LPA's are being consulted, but there was a missing bit about how to engage with Local Parishes, and requested that more information is provided on the meetings to be held</p> <p>12. HS2 advised that the intention was every 6 months they would send engagement plans on the Common place website with notices of engagement planned. HS2 agreed to send engagement plans.</p> <p>Actions: HS2 to send the RG engagement plans</p>	<p>HH RG HH</p>
D.	<p>Funding Agreements</p> <p>13. CDC outlined the process for how the funding agreement would potential work. The RG members would have the final agreement. CDC estimates half a days work a week to service the AONB part of the agreement with a 10% admin cost per project.</p> <p>14. HH asked that the process be simplified to reduce the admin costs</p> <p>15. The Chair also asked that it be reviewed to avoid two public bodies auditing and double checking project costs</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>16. HS2 advised that the RG would have collective sign off and self approve by the panel to ensure no mis-appropriation of funds. The funds would be signed off by HS2 Area Central.</p> <p>17. The Chair highlighted the Road Safety fund to the RG and how this HS2 had a light touch, relying on an LPA approval process.</p> <p>18. CDC will circulate the Funding terms to HH for comments</p> <p>Actions: CDC to circulate Funding terms to RG</p>	
E	<p>KESWMP</p> <p>19. Fusion provided a presentation to the Group about the Environmental Management plans, there are five across the route, with the Chilterns having one. They detail the opportunities for enhancement and have been out to consultation with NE. It is a live document and is updated every 6 months. Park Hill and Berry Farm are both S17, looking at field trenching and advance planting for Leather Lane and Jones Hill.</p> <p>20. AVDC asked if the early plans for planting are thought through with final designs not finished, would it be effective long term mitigation? Raising a concern that they should be speaking to LPA's early to avoid wrong planting for mitigation.</p> <p>21. CDC asked if the design aspirations of the DDP had been looked at?</p> <p>22. Fusion advised it hadn't and they were basing their designs on those provided by HS2</p> <p>Actions: HH to provide Fusion with a link to the DDP</p>	
F	<p>Haul Road</p> <p>23. Fusion presented details about the designs for the temporary Haul Road at Great Missenden. It was being started to allow for the National Grid pylon move in 2019. The concept designs are going through review with a view to commencing construction in summer. The road is temporary for 10 years with the intention to turn it back to grazing pasture. The main aim has been to retain the materials on site</p> <p>24. CDC asked for the local issues raised to be shared with RG members</p> <p>25. Fusion agreed to do this, there were about 20-30 comments and questions received</p> <p>26. It was confirmed that the construction compound would be very temporary for the haul road</p> <p>27. CDC asked if the compound would be removed?</p> <p>28. Fusion advised that it was for EK to decide on the use of the compound following completion of the haul road</p> <p>29. CCB asked about security fencing and if it would be better to have a gate closer to the road to reduce the need for security grade fencing and just have stock proof fencing</p> <p>Actions</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
Fusion to share issues raised by local residents		
G	<p>Bat House</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30. AECOM presented details on the proposed bat mitigation house that would be located approximately 80m from existing roost site. The building would be over 5m high, with roof space for brown long-eared bats and hipped roof structures for Pipistrelle. Solar panels would be needed for heating for the maternity roost and they have looked at the AONB Design guide. 31. AVDC asked that materials from the existing structures be re-used on site as cladding to the block structure, and also to avoid using shingles. 32. CCB asked if an alternative location for the solar panels could be considered to reduce the visibility 33. Fusion, in response to questions about alignment, advised that this couldn't be changed, unless the design for the embankment changes and it would need to be built late summer 2018 	
H	<p>Review of Key Design Elements to date</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 34. The Review Group reflected on designs presented to them to date 35. For mass haul it was felt by CDC that more spoil could be distributed around the green tunnel area 36. HS2 advised the plans were to reduce the haulage on the roads, by spoil placement closest to source 37. AVDC advised that they wished to see a landscape driven design not a haulage reduction design, also to avoid displacing spoil just to AVDC 38. On the viaduct designs NE stressed the importance now of colour and material usage in the design 39. AVDC talked through the updates to the pier designs for Westdene viaduct, the Group discussed the different design presented. 40. There was a discussion about the headhouse designs seen to date and how the contractors appeared to be following the Principles so far set out in the DDP, by looking at reducing mass and scale of the structures in the AONB. CDC still expressed concern about the noise barrier locations. BCC advised that the Independent Design Panel has been questioning the design and need of the security fencing as important to the final design. 	
I	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 41. CCB raised a point about being able to contribute to future design work would require funding from the RG admin fund. 42. CDC and AVDC expressed some concern about this as the pace of engagement with the LPAs was so frequent it would be difficult to sustain and that the RG was responsible for implementing the DDP. 	

Next meeting: TBC 3rd May 2018