

<b>Document Number: LWM-HS2-EV-MRC-000-0000017</b>				
<b>Meeting date:</b>	22 <sup>nd</sup> January 2013			
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	<i>Arup Campus, Solihull</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, Buckinghamshire CC, Birmingham CC, Warwickshire CC, Northamptonshire CC, Staffordshire CC, Solihull DC, Warwick DC			
<b>Topic Keywords:</b>	Terms of Reference, Archaeology, Sampling Strategies			
<b>Attendees:</b>				
H.J. Glass; J. Lord (HS2 Ltd); S. Haynes (Arup)				
M. Saunders (Solihull DC); A. Mayes (Warwick DC)				
C. Welch, R. Thomas (English Heritage)				
M. Hodder (Birm CC); S. Kidd (Bucks CC); S. Dean (Staffs CC)				
A. Stocks (Warks CC); L-A Mathers (Northants CC)				
<b>Distribution:</b>				
Attendees + all other Heritage S-G members. Notes will also be circulated to planning forum members.				
<b>Future Agenda Items (For Decision)</b>				
<b>Item</b>	<b>Description &amp; Action</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Date</b>
1.	Introduction			
2.	<b>Draft Terms of Reference</b>			
	The draft ToR had been circulated and comments provided by WCC.			
	<i>Discussion</i>			
	How does the Heritage Sub-Group (the Sub-Group) feedback to HS2?			
	How does the Sub-Group relate to and receive feedback from other HS2 groups e.g. the National Environment Forum?			
	How does it link into other route-wide technical issues/disciplines, e.g. sound and vibration?			

<p><i>Objectives</i></p> <p>The objectives of the groups should include the assurance that heritage aspects will be integrated with other aspects of the design – e.g. landscape and architecture.</p> <p><i>Membership</i></p> <p>It was recognised that the Sub-Group would benefit from a representative for Historic Environment Record officers. SBlake from Staff HER was proposed.</p> <p><i>Record keeping and conduct</i></p> <p>The matter regarding decisions being made by assent caused issue with some local authorities (LAs) due to the stance of some LAs to the project; it was pointed out that the LA representatives as part of the Sub-Group couldn't bind their respective LA's to a decision made by this group.</p> <p>Membership of the group doesn't limit the autonomy of individual members.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd to provide clarification for matters raised and redraft ToR in light of discussions. 03.13 HS2 Ltd</p>	
<p>3. <b>Phase 1 Project Update</b></p> <p>HJG provided a review of project progress and current major workstreams.</p> <p><i>Scope and Methodology Report (SMR)</i></p> <p>The SMR for the ES has been published, following its consultation and has been presented at community and planning forums. Chapter 8 sets out how the cultural heritage works will be undertaken.</p>	

*Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)*

HJG outlined the ongoing research by the area Environmental Impact Area Consultants. (EIA's) EIACs had started their consultations with LA officers and those who had not been contacted to date would be soon as the EIACs progressed their research.

Sub-Group members were keen to share their knowledge and input into the process.

The snapshot of the design and a draft ES will be consulted on in Spring/Summer 2013.

The Sub-Group asked for clarification as to what this draft consultation would comprise, given the on-going work. HS2 Ltd to respond.

Following further design development, EIA research and the incorporation of comments the final ES will be deposited with the hybrid Bill in Dec 2013.

*Engagement forums and bilaterals*

HJG outlined the range of other engagement mechanisms that were on-going throughout the organisation.

Clarification was requested by the Heritage SG as to how it interacted with the National NGO and National Environment Forums.

HS2 Ltd to clarify mechanisms for information exchange.

*Draft Code of Construction Practice*

HJG outlined the draft CoCP, which all present had had the opportunity to

<p>comment on. This draft is available on the website and will form part of the Spring summer consultation.</p> <p><i>Hybrid Bill</i></p> <p>HJG outlined the sequence of the Bill process; what the Hybrid Bill seeks to achieve (including the right to construct, compulsory acquisition, outline planning permission; how to address the way Heritage issues will be handled); and the key documents that make up the Bill.</p> <p>CW requested clarification on the hierarchy of documents.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd to provide clarification for matters raised.</p>	<p>03.13</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p><b>4 Risk Based Approach</b></p> <p>HJG outlined the approach developed in response to EH’s presentation which recognised that traditional approaches tend to focus on what is already known. The risk-based approach is a direct response to the potential unavailability of land, building on EH and LA interpretation of archaeology character zones and the knowledge gathered for the EIA.</p> <p>The approach has been prepared as a technical note to inform the EIA process. The EIACs will assess the level of archaeological risk for each zone to consider whether a commentary can be provided and then to devise a field evaluation strategy based on the risk posed by each zone.</p> <p>CW requested sight of the EIACs commentary on the archaeological character zones.</p>		

HJG stated that these would be set out as an appendix in the final ES and would be discussed before then with the individual curators.

The Sub-Group requested sight of the technical note as this will allow them to understand the selection criteria for how decisions arrived at by the EIACs for evaluation locations. They stressed the importance of this in relation to the meaningful engagement with the EIACs as part of the consultation process. In conjunction with item 5, the Sub-Group discussed the need to be provided with advance information prior to meetings with EIACs to ensure meaningful discussions.

HS2 Ltd to seek internal agreement to release the technical note externally.

The Sub-group noted their understanding of the scale of the project and the need to be realistic and pragmatic about decision making. However, they felt that there was a need for HS2 Ltd to have in place a high level strategy for its archaeological (and built heritage) programme of works to provide confidence that the required works would be undertaken.

HS2 Ltd to explore the nature of such a statement in the context of the Bill submission and report.

HS2 Ltd to provide clarification for matters raised.

03.13

HS2 Ltd

<p>5</p>	<p><b>Route wide evaluation surveys</b></p> <p>Following on from the discussion above, HJG outlined the approach to route wide standards for evaluation</p> <p>Geophysical Survey: Following discussion with EH's geophysical specialists, HS2 has appointed GSB to provide a route wide specification for geophysical survey. This is being drafted and will be circulated for comment shortly.</p> <p>Field-walking: Where this technique is considered appropriate a route-wide specification would be developed and circulated for comment.</p> <p>Trial Trenching: Where this technique is considered appropriate a route-wide specification would be developed and circulated for comment.</p> <p>AS offered to send county generic specifications (Post meeting note: received with thanks).</p> <p>HS2 Ltd asked that other curators send their standard specifications for evaluation works to inform the development of specifications by HS2 Ltd.</p> <p>LAM raised concerns regarding the time allowed for comments on fieldwork proposals given the challenging programme.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd to provide a clearer understanding of the sequence and</p>	<p>03.13</p> <p>Sub-Group members</p>
----------	---	---------------------------------------

<p>programme of evaluation works as part of the EIA works.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd to provide clarification for matters raised.</p>	
<p>6      <b>Archive Storage</b></p> <p>HJG highlighted the issue of archive deposition drawing on the experience from HS1 – the lack of storage facilities along the route meant that it was difficult to deposit the artefacts and accompanying archive.</p> <p>HJG noted that HS2 will only ‘own’ legal title of the artefacts where they are recovered from areas of permanent land take. All other material will belong to the landowner.</p> <p>Along the route HJG noted that the same issues of lack of museum provision at county/city/district level were likely to be an issue. The forthcoming (now published) <i>Archaeological Archives and Museums</i> report will highlight the matter and make recommendations. HJG encouraged the early discussion of opportunities/solutions at the Sub-Group.</p> <p>SK noted that the Buckinghamshire Museum was developing plans for expansion and would investigate what that would mean locally.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd encouraged any similar information about local initiatives as this would inform future strategy options.</p>	
<p>7      <b>Next steps and actions</b></p> <p>Actions are highlighted above.</p>	

Next steps detailed below.	
8	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b> Thursday <b>18.04.13</b>, London (venue to be confirmed)</p>
<b>Future Agenda Items (For Review)</b>	<b>Date</b>
<p>The next Sub-Group will focus primarily on Built Heritage matters. Items suggested for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft ToR</li> <li>• Composition of the Public Consultation on the draft ES</li> <li>• Assessment process for Built Heritage</li> <li>• Heritage Agreements</li> <li>• Landscape, focusing on the integration with built heritage assets</li> <li>• LiDAR work</li> </ul>	