

<b>Document Number:</b> LWM-HS2-EV-MRC-000-000056																	
<b>Meeting date:</b>	18 <sup>th</sup> April 2013																
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	<i>Arup, 13 Fitzroy Street, London</i>																
<b>Meeting Type:</b>																	
<b>Zone/Area References</b>	<i>Phase 1 Heritage Sub-Group</i>																
<b>GIS/Land Registry Ref. (if known)</b>																	
<b>HS2 Contact Person or Group:</b>	Helen J Glass																
<b>Stakeholder:</b>	English Heritage, Local Authorities																
<b>Topic Keywords:</b>	Terms of Reference, Draft ES, Built Heritage Assessment, Heritage Deed; Landscape Design Strategy																
<b>Attendees:</b>																	
H.J. Glass; M. Bailey (HS2 Ltd); A. Harris (URS); T. Armour (Arup)																	
M. Saunders (Solihull); A. Mayes (Warwick), C. Murray (Chiltern)																	
J. Ecclestone (Camden) E. Bird (TfL/GLA)																	
C. Welch, R. Thomas; S. Hickman (English Heritage)																	
A. Stocks (WCC); D. Green (BCC)																	
<b>Distribution:</b>																	
All Heritage S-G members. Notes will also be circulated to planning forum members.																	
<b>Future Agenda Items (For Decision)</b>	<b>Date</b>																
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Description &amp; Action</th> <th>Deadline</th> <th>Responsible</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>1.</b></td> <td><b>Introduction</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2.</b></td> <td><b>Draft Terms of Reference</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td> <p>Clarity was requested on the purpose of the route wide forum. The SMR has been widely consulted on already. The route wide forum is an opportunity to further discuss principles, share best practice and knowledge and possibly consider ideas for route wide roll out in terms of approach. Also is a learning opportunity on the structure of the bill process. It was requested by local authorities as an opportunity for them to meet to discuss routewide matters. It was suggested that the frequency of meetings be increased once the draft ES</p> </td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Description & Action	Deadline	Responsible	<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>			<b>2.</b>	<b>Draft Terms of Reference</b>				<p>Clarity was requested on the purpose of the route wide forum. The SMR has been widely consulted on already. The route wide forum is an opportunity to further discuss principles, share best practice and knowledge and possibly consider ideas for route wide roll out in terms of approach. Also is a learning opportunity on the structure of the bill process. It was requested by local authorities as an opportunity for them to meet to discuss routewide matters. It was suggested that the frequency of meetings be increased once the draft ES</p>			
Item	Description & Action	Deadline	Responsible														
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>																
<b>2.</b>	<b>Draft Terms of Reference</b>																
	<p>Clarity was requested on the purpose of the route wide forum. The SMR has been widely consulted on already. The route wide forum is an opportunity to further discuss principles, share best practice and knowledge and possibly consider ideas for route wide roll out in terms of approach. Also is a learning opportunity on the structure of the bill process. It was requested by local authorities as an opportunity for them to meet to discuss routewide matters. It was suggested that the frequency of meetings be increased once the draft ES</p>																

is available and possibly combine both subject matters, given timescales for bill submission.

It was clarified that members can contribute to agenda items; ToR to be revised slightly to make this clear

HS2 Ltd

**3. Composition of the Public Consultation on the draft ES**

MB presented on the Phase 1 environmental statement programme and the forthcoming consultation on the Draft ES.

Presentation is attached.

Noted the CoCP will be revised from its current format before going out to consultation

Clarification was given on the status of the draft ES and its consultation. People will be able to comment on the formal ES to Parliament once it is deposited.

**4 Assessment Process for Built Heritage**

AH outlined the assessment methodology for built heritage. Presentation is attached.

Built Heritage:  
The effects on the setting of assets will be reported as set out in the SMR.  
It was noted there will be 3 ZTV's – with and without trains and construction  
Non designated assets (including locally listed buildings) will be assessed within the area of land take and buffer zones

<p>(250m urban, 500m rural) Confirmation requested that double counting is not occurring between the LVIA &amp; ZTV.</p> <p>It was noted that the ZTV is not formally available yet so all designated assets up to 2-3km, as appropriate are being considered. This is far more work that is likely to be required.</p> <p>Noise will be assessed in the context of a 'heritage' asset with the notion of 'tranquillity' being developed as a definition.</p> <p>Discussion on the lack of access to some assets and the sensitivities around the issue.</p> <p>Cumulative environmental effects will be reported in the ES.</p>	
<p><b>5 Heritage Agreements</b></p> <p>AH outlined the arrangements for Heritage Agreements within the Hybrid Bill which will disapply Listed Building and Scheduled monument legislation. AH presented a HA from Crossrail to illustrate the process.</p> <p>Presentation is attached.</p>	
<p><b>6 Landscape, focusing on the integration with built heritage assets</b></p> <p>TA outlined the landscape design and assessment process, illustrating with examples from rural and urban locations on the route of the Proposed Scheme and also using examples from HS1.</p>	

<p>Presentation is attached.</p> <p>Discussion included comment on the complexity of developing mitigation in light of effects possibly caused by the mitigation itself, e.g. extended earthworks leading to more effect on archaeology. The integrated working within HS2 was highlighted with teams working very closely to iteratively develop proposals and mitigate conflict. This was particularly important in relation to the setting of buildings. Interest in proposals for excavated stone; some local authorities may have an opportunity to take a small stockpile for future maintenance needs.</p> <p>Discussion on options for viaduct mitigation; HS2 confirmed that EA designated flood zones are being challenged to reduce viaducts where possible, recognising they are difficult to mitigate. The EA is embedded in HS2 and working closely on the issue.</p> <p>The design of viaducts is also being developed. However the basic design is assumed for the purposes of the EIA work to ensure worst case impact is assessed.</p> <p>Archaeological risk model developed to support the EIA will be presented in the formal ES as a technical appendix, together with the accompanying archaeological character zones.</p>	
<p><b>7</b>      <b>Next steps and actions</b></p> <p>Actions are highlighted above. Next steps detailed below.</p>	
<p><b>8</b>      <b>Date of next meeting</b></p>	

<p style="text-align: center;">to be confirmed</p> <hr/> <hr/>	
<p><b>Future Agenda Items (For Review)</b></p>	<p><b>Date</b></p>
<p>Items suggested for discussion:</p> <p>Incorporation of survey results into the formal ES</p>	