

# MEETING MINUTES

## HS2 Colne Valley Regional Park Panel

<b>Meeting Date / Time:</b>	18 July 2017
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	South Bucks District Council Office, Capswood, Oxford Road, Denham
<b>Meeting Type:</b>	Panel Meeting #15
<b>Organisations in Attendance:</b>	Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC), Chiltern District Council (CDC), Colne Valley Park Community Interest Company (CVP CIC), Hertfordshire County Council (HCC), Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust (HMWT), London Borough of Hillingdon (LBH), South Bucks District Council (SBDC), Three Rivers District Council (TRDC) & HS2 Ltd, London Wildlife Trust, Fusion, Natural England

<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Title, Organisation</b>
Caroline Hutson (CH)	Environment Consultant, Fusion
Daniela Eigner (DE)	Programme Manager, Groundwork South
Ian Thynne (IT)	Principal Environmental Officer, LBH
Ifath Nawaz (IN)	Project Solicitor and Manager, SBDC and CDC
Jane Griffin (JG)	Principal Planner, SBDC and CDC
Jackie Copcutt (JC)	Senior Project Manager, BCC
Jenny Foster (JF)	Senior Planning Officer, HCC
Jim Barclay (JB)	Independent Chair
Josie Allen (JA)	Land Management, NE
Julia Carey (JC)	Environmental Records Centre, BCC
Julie Hughes (JH)	TRDC
Katherine Frost (KF)	TRDC
Kimberley Royer-Harris (KRH)	Panels Coordinator, HS2 Ltd
Mathew Frith (MF)	Director of Conservation, LWT
Ricardo Arroyo (RA)	Environment Manager, HS2 Ltd
Stewart Pomeroy (SP)	Colne Valley Managing Agent, Groundwork / CVP CIC
Tom Day (TD)	Head of Living Landscapes, HMWT
<b>Apologies:</b>	Ben Robinson, Claire Gregory, Sarah-Jane Scott

<b>Item</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Action/ Owner</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	
<b>B.</b>	<p><b>Review minutes and actions of meeting #14 – June 2017</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments on the minutes of meeting #14.</li> <li>The Chair informed the Panel that he had not received any further information regarding the news item that had been drafted for the Design Panel.</li> <li>HS2 Ltd agreed to find out about the progress of the news item and to circulate it to the Panel.</li> <li>CH informed the Panel that further Schedule 17 applications will be submitted for early works mitigation planting, one application will affect the Colne Valley.</li> </ol>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>She also stated that future works will include utility diversions and advanced planting works.</p> <p>5. She agreed to circulate a programme of future works to the Panel.</p> <p>6. HS2 Ltd agreed to include a programme update as a standing item for each meeting.</p> <p>7. DE informed the Panel that she is awaiting the final version of the AMP from LDA before she contacts affected stakeholders.</p> <p>8. The Panel agreed to provide DE with information regarding affected stakeholders. The Panel also agreed to send their comments on the Western Valley Slopes design.</p> <p><b>Action/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 Ltd to find out about the progress of the news item for the Design Panel and to circulate it to the Panel</li> <li>• CH to circulate a programme of future works to the Panel</li> <li>• HS2 Ltd to include a programme update as a standing item for each meeting</li> </ul>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>CH</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
C.	<p><b>Chair's Update</b></p> <p>9. Nothing to report.</p> <p><b>Action/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
D.	<p><b>HS2 Ltd Updates</b></p> <p>10. RA noted that the MWCC have been announced and this is being followed by a 2 week stand down period.</p> <p>11. The Chair highlighted that it would be very useful for the MWCC to engage with the Panel at an early stage.</p> <p>12. DE queried when the Specimen Design document will be made public now that the MWCC have been appointed.</p> <p>13. HS2 Ltd agreed to report back to the Panel on the publication of the Specimen Design document.</p> <p><b>Action/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 Ltd to report back to the Panel on the publication of the Specimen Design document</li> </ul>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
E.	<p><b>LDA Stage 5</b></p> <p>14. DE informed the Panel that the Stage 5 brief for the AMP has now been received from LDA.</p> <p>15. She asked the Panel to consider how they would like to manage and monitor the spending of the £3m fund. She also asked the Panel to consider the governance of the fund.</p> <p>16. She noted that funds need to be used to acquire data sets to develop the AMP projects.</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>17. JF stated that a lot of information and data could be acquired from Panel members. She further stated that baseline information and data could be acquired from HS2 Ltd.</p> <p>18. DE noted that a separate licence is needed to acquire certain data.</p> <p>19. SP stated that the £3m fund should purely be used for mitigation and any surveys should be funded from the administrative budget.</p> <p>20. JF stated that HS2 Ltd should provide further funds for surveys.</p> <p>21. TD noted that surveys and planning applications require funds and this is part of the mitigation process.</p> <p>22. IN noted that the lifespan of Chiltern AONB Review Group is not being extended and it has been decided that one member of the group will administer their fund.</p> <p>23. JF stated that the lifespan of the Panel has to be extended in order for the Panel to fulfil the role outlined in the Assurances.</p> <p>24. The Chair advised the Panel that they could use funds from the administrative budget to fund initial preparatory works for the projects.</p> <p>25. JG noted that the Panel should work with HS2 Ltd to ensure that no survey work is duplicated.</p> <p>26. JC noted that the area covered by the AMP is much larger than the area covered by HS2 Ltd surveys.</p> <p>27. RA informed the Panel that HS2 Ltd survey data is provided on an ad hoc level and it is easier to get data for focused areas rather than larger areas. He informed the Panel that he would work on providing ecological data for the Colne Valley Park.</p> <p>28. JF asked HS2 Ltd to provide the Panel with their data before the next Panel meeting.</p> <p>29. TD stated that the HMWT are able to coordinate the data for the AMP.</p> <p>30. The Panel agreed that funds could be used from the administrative budget to fund the survey and data coordination costs.</p> <p>31. DE and the Chair agreed to authorise expenses of up to £1000 per item from the administrative budget to fund the work. Any expense that exceeds £1000 would need approval by the Panel. DE will give an update of any spending at the next Panel meeting.</p> <p>32. JF queried whether any organisations had contacted HS2 Ltd asking for information regarding the Panel.</p> <p>33. HS2 Ltd agreed to investigate this and report back to the Panel on this topic.</p> <p><i>LDA Stage 5 Brief</i></p> <p>34. DE informed the Panel that LDA have produce a brief outlining how the projects can be developed to Stage 3. She stated that the work outlined in the brief would use up all of the remaining budget for LDA.</p> <p>35. DE noted that Stage 3 is suitable for a planning application and the work outlined in the brief is focused on consultation, desk studies and site visits.</p> <p>36. TD stated that he is disappointed with the Stage 5 brief provided by LDA. He further stated that the brief focuses on easy access points to the park and does not include a lot of ecology work.</p> <p>37. JA agreed that brief does not deliver on ecology and this is a factor that was scored highly by Panel members when shortlisting the projects.</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>38. SP noted that the ideas that are being developed in the workshops could help LDA improve the brief.</p> <p>39. DE highlighted that LDA did not budget for surveys in their original tender.</p> <p>40. JA noted that consultation could be carried out by Panel members.</p> <p>41. DE asked the group to consider how LDA's resources can be used in the most effective way.</p> <p>42. JG stated that the concerns of the Panel should be conveyed to LDA before a further decision is made.</p> <p>43. IN noted that SBDC is the owner of the contract with LDA. She agreed to review the contract to investigate the conditions in the contract and report back to the Panel.</p> <p>44. The Chair asked the Panel to consider whether it would be beneficial to choose another consultant within the remaining budget.</p> <p>45. JG noted that LDA could use the expertise of the Panel in a more effective way.</p> <p>46. JF agreed that the Panel should first engage with LDA to explain their concerns and then the contractual requirements should be applied.</p> <p>47. JG expressed concerns that if another consultant was chosen the Panel would have to go through tender and governance processes.</p> <p>48. DE noted that if the Panel wishes to do so, LDA could focus on developing more strategic projects e.g. 'Recreational Routes' and a specialist consultant could be appointed to develop 'Broadwater Area' or 'Tilehouse Lane Woods'.</p> <p>49. JG noted that the projects would contribute to HS2 Ltd's no net loss and the Panel could request further funding for this.</p> <p>50. JA enquired whether the mitigation red line in the ES can be amended.</p> <p>51. RA stated that the Panel should wait for the MWCC designs as following this the mitigation that will be provided will be clearer.</p> <p>52. DE asked the Panel to provide specific examples of how LDA should approach the projects. A more specific response from the Panel to LDA would be useful in agreeing the best way forward.</p> <p>53. SP noted that the Tilehouse Lane Woods project is easier to implement compared to the Broadwater Area project. He stated that the knowledge of the Panel could be used to further develop the projects.</p> <p>54. JG agreed that more money should be spent on the Broadwater Area project compared to the Tilehouse Lane Woods project.</p> <p>55. IT noted that to determine the planning requirements a better level of detail needs to be developed.</p> <p>56. The Panel agreed to send their comments on the brief to Daniela by midday on Friday.</p> <p>57. DE agreed to send the Panel's comments to LDA.</p> <p>58. CH confirmed that all the comments have been collated for the Schedule 17 application for the Tilehouse Lane Woods mitigation planting. She agreed to circulate Fusion's response to the comments and the final drawings for the Schedule 17 application to the Panel.</p> <p><i>Workshop Update</i></p> <p>59. DE informed the Panel that the working group for the recreational routes and access workshop considered the development of strategic routes and location</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>specific proposals. She asked the Panel to consider whether the project should be further developed using part of the AMP budget.</p> <p>60. SP stated that clarity needs to be acquired from HS2 Ltd regarding their plans for the development of strategic routes.</p> <p>61. SP and DE will work on an amended version of the workshop notes to demonstrate clearly which proposals would be funded by the AMP budget and which projects should be taken on by HS2 Ltd.</p> <p>62. JG noted that BCC has a fund for the development of footpaths.</p> <p>63. SP agreed to investigate the costings for the strategic route proposals and development options.</p> <p>64. The Panel agreed to send to SP any information regarding funding.</p> <p><b>Action/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 Ltd to investigate whether any information has been requested regarding the Panel</li> <li>• Panel members to send to DE their comments on the Stage 5 brief by midday on Friday</li> <li>• DE to send the Panel's comments on the brief to LDA</li> <li>• CH to circulate Fusion's response to the comments on the Tilehouse Lane Woods mitigation planting and share the final drawings of the Schedule 17 application</li> <li>• HS2 Ltd to share ecological survey data (in GIS format) with the Panel, information to be sent to DE</li> <li>• DE and SP to prepare an amended version of the workshop document for discussions with HS2 Ltd and the MWCC</li> <li>• SP to investigate the costings and development options for the strategic route proposals</li> <li>• Panel members to send to SP any information regarding funding for the strategic route proposals</li> </ul>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>All</p> <p>DE</p> <p>CH</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>DE and SP</p> <p>SP</p> <p>All</p>
F.	<p><b>Future of the Panel</b></p> <p>65. JF stated that it was understood that the Panel would be funded for the lifespan of the HS2 project and that a programme manager should also be funded for this time period. She noted that smaller sub-group meetings could be organised in the future to discuss smaller items.</p> <p>66. She further stated that the Panel needs to review Schedule 17 applications and that the ToR don't supersede the assurances.</p> <p>67. The Chair noted that DfT has confirmed that the ToR don't superseded the assurances.</p> <p>68. DE noted that public engagement is important and a programme manager is needed to coordinate the AMP, identify funding opportunities and provide updates on the progress of AMP delivery.</p> <p>69. JF stated that funding for future Panel meetings and a programme manager should not come out of the £3m fund.</p> <p>70. The Chair stated that it would be wise for HS2 Ltd to use the resources that are provided by the Panel.</p> <p>71. JF enquired why the Panel is not able to view indicative mitigation designs in advance.</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>72. IT noted that indicative mitigation designs are for information only and HS2 Ltd is not required to provide detailed plans.</p> <p>73. The Chair agreed to draft a response on the Panel's views for the future of the Panel. He noted that he would circulate the draft response to the Panel for comment.</p> <p><b>Action/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair to draft a response on the future of the Panel and to circulate to the Panel for comment</li> </ul>	<b>Chair</b>
<b>G.</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>74. JF enquired further about the indicative mitigation designs that will be presented to the Panel.</p> <p>75. The Chair agreed to add Schedule 17 applications and indicative mitigation designs to the agenda for the next meeting under HS2 Ltd Updates.</p> <p><b>Action/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 Ltd to add Schedule 17 applications and indicative mitigation designs to the agenda for the next meeting</li> </ul> <p><b>Items to be added to agenda for future meetings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme update</li> <li>• Schedule 17 applications and indicative mitigation designs</li> </ul>	<b>HS2 Ltd</b>

**Next meeting:** 13 September 2017, from 10.30am. Venue: South Bucks District Council Office, Capswood, Oxford Road, Denham