

MEETING MINUTES

HS2 Chilterns AONB Review Group

Meeting Date / Time:	15 July 2016
Meeting Location:	Aylesbury Vale District Council, The Gateway, Gatehouse Road, Aylesbury, Bucks, HP19 8FF
Meeting Type:	Review Group Meeting #3
Organisations in Attendance:	Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC), Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC), Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB), Chilterns District Council (CDC), Department for Transport (DfT), Natural England (NE), Wycombe District Council (WDC) & HS2 Ltd

Attendees:	Title, Organisation
Catherine Murray	Chilterns District Council (CDC),
Christoph Brintup	Landscape Design Technical Lead, HS2 Ltd
Jackie Copcutt	Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)
James Gasson-Hargreaves	Senior Interface Manager, HS2 Ltd
Jerry Unsworth	Planning Consultant to SBDC, CDC & WDC
Jonathon Bellars	Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC)
Kath Daly	Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB)
Kathleen Covill	Natural England
Neil Jackson	Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB)
Phil King	Senior Town Planning Manager, HS2 Ltd
Sebastian Jew	Interface Manager (Central C2), HS2 Ltd
Simon Gray	Chiltern District Council (CDC)
Steve Fancourt	Rural Landscape Manager, HS2 Ltd
Dave Buttery	Chair, Department for Transport (DfT)

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
A.	Introductions	
B.	<p>Review of Minutes and Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The action tracker as circulated prior to the meeting was discussed item by item. There was specific discussion about a few actions, as below: Action #9 from the 27/05/16 meeting: the group requested to see a broad programme of Sch17 applications, such as those being shared with local authorities in order to understand the volume and timing of consents throughout the construction programme. Action #15 from the 27/05/16 meeting: the group discussed the previously mooted overview plan. It was agreed that this could be a standing action of the group and the plan would be an output. The group discussed linking to the HS2 	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>design panel, all members agreed some direct engagement with the panel would be beneficial.</p> <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An updated tracker will be circulated with the minutes • HS2 Ltd to provide a broad programme of Sch17 applications as per discussion (item 2) • Arrange direct engagement with the Design Panel as per discussion (item 3) 	<p>HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd</p>
C.	<p>Terms of Reference (ToR) and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)</p> <p>4. The group agreed the ToR subject to the following changes being made within the document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include definition of the terms enhancement and additional integration • Omit the flow diagram <p>5. The group agreed the MOU as amended with the correct dates and attached non-disclosure agreement.</p> <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action/s to note 	
D.	<p>Independent Chair / Project Officer</p> <p>6. With reference to the letter sent to the Chair the previous day the group discussed their ambitions for the group's Chair and Project Officer.</p> <p>7. The Group agreed to continue with the Chair being provided by the Department for Transport and requested that as much continuity as possible be provided. This point was agreed by HS2 Ltd/DfT.</p> <p>8. The Group explained they would prefer to use the money available within the administration budget to appoint a Project Officer, similar to the role being provided on the Colne Valley Regional Park Panel (CVRPP). The Group see this role being crucial to the success of the group and the work required to develop the AONB design principles.</p> <p>9. The Group also requested that the funding arrangements for the AONB Group be the same as the CVRPP. There was discussion about extra budget being available in the CVRPP for the work required to develop the mitigation and enhancement plan, rather than this coming from the administration budget. HS2 Ltd agreed to investigate this with internal Governance and agreed to prioritise this decision process</p> <p>10. CDC agreed to lead on development of a Job Description and drive the recruitment process</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p><u>Action/s:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 Ltd to investigate (through internal governance) whether able to provide funding arrangements similar to that of the CVRPP Panel as per discussion (item 9) • CDC to draft a Job Description and lead on the recruitment of a Project Officer 	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>CDC</p>
E.	<p>Focus Group</p> <p>11.The group discussed the suggested members of the proposed focus group. It was agreed that a smaller, more focused group was required to drive the discussions and work stream that will develop the design principles, and the members were agreed as per the suggestion from CCB.</p> <p>12.The AONB Review Group would be required to review the output of the Focus Group and make decisions on proposals put forward. The Focus Group would be required to develop the work and the principles, with the help of the Project Officer and HS2 Ltd representatives.</p> <p><u>Action/s:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action/s to note 	
F.	15 Minute Break	
G.	<p>Landscape Design Approach (LDA)</p> <p>13.HS2 Ltd explained that a summary version of the LDA document had been published and was shared with the group in advance of the meeting. The rationale behind this document was that it would appeal to a wider and less technical audience. However, HS2 Ltd intend to share the full technical document with the Group, including those who had recently signed the non-disclosure agreement and hadn't received the document in April.</p> <p>14.The Group were keen to ensure both documents had a confirmed status and suggested it would be better if they carried separate names in order to identify which version was being discussed.</p> <p>15.HS2 Ltd advised that the technical version had been issued with the Invitations to Tender for the Main Works Civils Contracts (MWCC) and as such would form an integral part of the design undertaken by the contractors in due course.</p> <p><i>*Post meeting correction: The above statements about the LDA were corrected in an email to the group on 29/07/16 to clarify that the LDA had been condensed into one shorter version and the longer version no longer existed.</i></p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>16. There was discussion about the design approach feeding into the Sch 17 planning applications. The group noted that the specs within the technical documents don't overrule the statutory requirements under the planning regime.</p> <p>17. HS2 Ltd advised that the specs within the technical LDA should be used to inform the design principles the Group will develop which will in turn be passed to the MWCC.</p> <p>18. The Group noted the planned appointment of the MWCC in the spring of 2017 and questioned if the MWCC would have scope/remit to change or input into technical documents, such as the LDA. HS2 Ltd advised that the standards and specification set in these documents were a matter for the HS2 Ltd Technical Directorate and not for the contractors appointed to design and build the railway.</p> <p>19. The Group questioned what incentives would be in place for the MWCC to adhere to the high quality design standards set out in the LDA and expressed concern that these standards would be the first target if cost reduction exercises take place. The group want to see HS2 Ltd as client play a lead role in instilling these as design requirement on the contractors, rather than leaving the statutory approval process of the planning authorities as the sole arbitrator on matters.</p> <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action/s to note 	
H.	<p>Bridges Design Requirements</p> <p>20. A presentation was given to the group regarding the Bridges Design Requirements (BDR) document, by HS2 Ltd. The presentation is published alongside these minutes.</p> <p>21. The group welcomed the standards set out in the document and presentation and questioned the time they have to provide comments. It was agreed that comments on the document would be accepted for up to 3 weeks from the date of the meeting. HS2 Ltd reminded the group that the BDR is a route wide document.</p> <p>22. The group noted that each structure should complement the landscape in which it is set and that communities should be given the opportunity to engage with the design process. HS2 Ltd referred to the engagement process that will apply to Key Design Elements along the route, such as viaducts etc.</p> <p>23. Discussion took place around the roles of the HS2 Design Panel, HS2 Technical Directorate and Local Authorities in the design of the structures associated with HS2.</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p><u>Action/s:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action/s to note 	
I.	<p>AOB</p> <p>24. No items raised</p>	
J.	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>6. Next meeting to be held on the 9 September 2016</p>	

Next meeting: 9 September 2016 Time: 10.30hrs-13.30hrs, Venue: Chiltern District Council, King George V House, King George V Road, Amersham, Bucks, HP6 5 AW.