

# MEETING MINUTES

## HS2 Chiltern AONB Review Group

<b>Meeting Date / Time:</b>	25 May 2017
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	Aylesbury Vale District Council Offices
<b>Meeting Type:</b>	Review Group Meeting #9
<b>Organisations in Attendance:</b>	Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC), Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC), Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB), Chiltern District Council (CDC), Department for Transport (DfT), Land Use Consultants (LUC), Natural England (NE) & HS2 Ltd

<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Title, Organisation</b>
Ben Robinson	Chiltern District Council (CDC)
David McCann	Senior Project Manager, HS2 Ltd
David Smith	Civil Structures Lead, HS2 Ltd
Helen Hall	Programme Manager, Chilterns Conservation Board
Jackie Copcutt	Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)
John Woodhouse	Town Planner, HS2 Ltd
Jonathon Bellars	Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC)
Kate Ahern	Land Use Consultants (LUC)
Kim Royer-Harris	Panels Coordinator, HS2 Ltd
Liz Bingham	Natural England (NE)
Lucy Murfett	Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB)
Miriam Baines	Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)
Neil Jackson	Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB)
Patrick Bateson	Chair, Department for Transport (DfT)
Richard Hannay	Land Use Consultants (LUC)
Seb Jew	Interface Manager, HS2 Ltd
Tom Hinds	Department for Transport (DfT)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Action/ Owner</b>
<b>A.</b>	<p><b>Introductions</b></p> <p>1. The Chair introduced himself to the group and explained that he would be replacing Dave Buttery as the group's Chair.</p>	
<b>B.</b>	<p><b>Review of Minutes and Actions</b></p> <p>2. No comments</p> <p><b>Action/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No action/s to note</li> </ul>	
<b>C.</b>	<b>Additional Projects Update</b>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>3. Kate Ahern gave a brief summary of the workshop that was held on 23<sup>rd</sup> May. She stated that the purpose of the workshop was to identify and prioritise a longlist of additional projects.</p> <p>4. She explained that many of the projects need more information and funds could be used to carry out research in order to further develop the projects.</p> <p>5. HS2 Ltd noted that the group should consider whether they would like to use part of the £3m fund for further research.</p> <p>6. Kate noted that she would like the group to consider the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many projects should be in the shortlist?</li> <li>• The criteria for funding</li> <li>• The method HS2 Ltd will use for distributing the fund</li> <li>• Long term management and monitoring</li> </ul> <p>7. CCB highlighted the need for a coordination of the data that is already available as this could be used to further develop the projects.</p> <p>8. CDC advised the group to start considering the prioritisation of the projects.</p> <p>9. BCC agreed that spending part of the fund on further research would be beneficial.</p> <p>10. AVDC noted that they are interested in creating a legacy as a result of the projects and that there should be permanent ways of coordinating information.</p> <p>11. BCC stated that extra resources would be needed to perform the research and that external research services could be used, such as the research centre at Oxford University.</p> <p>12. Helen agreed to contact the research centre at Oxford University to find out more information.</p> <p>13. HS2 Ltd stated that they are happy to share their data but converting the data into an accessible format might be complicated.</p> <p>14. BCC noted that cost effectiveness is also an important aspect of the projects and this can be analysed by performing further research.</p> <p>15. The group agreed to send their data to Helen to enable her to devise a project brief.</p> <p>16. LUC asked the group to provide them with historic environment data.</p> <p>17. BCC agreed to ask their historic environment team for the required data.</p> <p>18. The Chair asked the group about the criteria that will use to evaluate the projects.</p> <p>19. LUC agreed to create a draft criteria by the next meeting.</p> <p>20. BCC suggested that the criteria should assess the different impacts that each project will achieve.</p> <p>21. AVDC stated that the projects should not be assessed on this basis as the best projects might have the same impacts.</p> <p>22. Helen noted that the process for deciding the project shortlist should be open and transparent to the public.</p> <p><b>Action/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group to send their data to Helen</li> <li>• Helen to produce a project brief based on the group's data</li> <li>• BCC to liaise with their historic environment team to acquire data for LUC</li> </ul>	<p>All HH BCC</p>

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LUC to develop a draft criteria to evaluate the projects</li> </ul>	LUC
D.	<p><b>Detailed Design Principles</b></p> <p>23. Richard Haney outlined the Detailed Design Principles document and asked the group to consider if it achieves the brief and client expectations.</p> <p>24. He stated that the document is now 80% complete. He also stated that the structure and logic of the document has now been agreed by the group.</p> <p>25. He noted that the introduction cross references different studies and he requested that the group inform him if there are any further studies that should be cross referenced.</p> <p>26. He further requested that the group send through photos linked to the design principles so that they can be included in the document.</p> <p>27. He noted that there is an enormous scope for potential within Bill limits.</p> <p>28. He stated that the document remains a live document and the group should send LUC any further information.</p> <p>29. The group agreed to send LUC their comments on the document by 19<sup>th</sup> June.</p> <p>30. BCC suggested that green bridges should be included as it could be too late to implement them during the design phase.</p> <p>31. HS2 Ltd stated that Schedule 17 submissions are for over-ground structures and the maintenance of such features need to be considered.</p> <p>32. LUC noted that green bridges are included in the design principles.</p> <p>33. AVDC noted that some of the detailed design principles could be applied routewide and this should be highlighted in the document.</p> <p><b>Action/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The group to inform LUC of any studies that need to be cross referenced in the introduction</li> <li>The group to send LUC photos to include in the document</li> <li>The group to comment on the document by 19<sup>th</sup> June</li> </ul>	<p>All</p> <p>All</p> <p>All</p>
E.	<p><b>HS2 Ltd Update</b></p> <p>34. HS2 Ltd stated that the MWCC should be announced at the end of July and this will be followed by a two week stand down period.</p> <p>35. HS2 Ltd noted that the MWCC might see the value in extended the lifespan of the group. The LUC scope might be amended to include two handover sessions for the MWCC.</p> <p>36. The Chair asked if a representative from the MWCC will be attending future meetings.</p> <p>37. HS2 Ltd noted that when the MWCC have been mobilised a representative can be invited. It was also stated that there could be two different contractors working for C1 and C2.</p> <p><b>Action/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
F.	<p><b>Programme Manager Update</b></p> <p>38. Helen Hall outlined LUC's programme.</p> <p>39. She noted that the group's second workshop would involve wider representation from parish councils and communities.</p> <p>40. She asked the group to suggest suitable representatives that could be invited to the next workshop. She also asked to group to inform her of their views on sharing the design principles at the next workshop.</p> <p>41. She gave a short summary of the group's budget and current spend. She also stated that based on estimates the group could have an underspend in terms of administrative costs.</p> <p><u>Action/s:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group to suggest representatives from parish councils and communities to invite to the next workshop</li> <li>• The group to inform Helen of their views on sharing the detailed design principles at the next workshop</li> </ul>	<p>All</p> <p>All</p>
G.	<p><b>Colne Valley Viaduct Specimen Design Presentation</b></p> <p>42. David Smith gave a presentation on the Colne Valley Viaduct Specimen Design.</p> <p>43. He outlined the aims, constraints and design aspirations of the Specimen Design. He also discussed the design process and final design.</p> <p>44. BCC asked if a costing exercise was carried out for the Specimen Design.</p> <p>45. David noted that that a costing exercise has been completed and this is something that will be discussed with the MWCC. He stated that any modest premium in cost could likely be offset by the reduced risk of delayed approval of the Design Panel and Colne Valley Regional Park Panel.</p> <p>46. CCB enquired why the winning OLE design of the RIBA competition was not included in the Specimen Design.</p> <p>47. David noted that the CVV Specimen Design had purposefully considered a bespoke OLE design as a holistic, integrated element of the overall design aesthetic. The OLE for CVV may well be different from that chosen for the rest of the route. This would be considered further by the MWCC. He noted that the cant required for the double curvature of the viaduct would dictate the OLE design.</p> <p>48. HS2 Ltd agreed to find out about the current status of the winning design of the RIBA OLE competition.</p> <p>49. NE noted that there will be a noise barrier on one side of the Wendover Dean Viaduct and enquired whether it will reflect noise on to the opposite side.</p> <p>50. David stated that noise barriers can be absorptive depending on their design (height, thickness, material and profile).</p> <p>51. David informed the group that he would give a presentation on overbridge parapets specimen design at the next meeting.</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p><b><u>Action/s:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 Ltd to find out about the winning OLE design of the RIBA competition</li> </ul>	HS2 Ltd
H.	<p><b>Vent Shaft Presentation</b></p> <p>52. David McCann gave a presentation on vent shafts. He outlined the comments received from the group, context solutions for each vent shaft and the next steps for design development.</p> <p>53. David stated that the comments from the group regarding the vent shafts have been reviewed.</p> <p>54. BCC enquired about the use of trees to provide visual screening for the vent shafts.</p> <p>55. David stated that different approaches would be used for different landscapes.</p> <p>56. AVDC noted that further work needs to be done on design development.</p> <p>57. HS2 Ltd agreed to circulate the vent shaft presentation to the group.</p> <p><b><u>Action/s:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 Ltd to circulate the vent shaft presentation to the group</li> </ul>	HS2 Ltd
I.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>58. No comments.</p> <p><b><u>Action/s:</u></b> No action/s to note</p>	

**Next meeting:** TBC