

MEETING MINUTES

HS2 Chiltern AONB Review Group

Meeting Date / Time:	13 July 2017
Meeting Location:	Chiltern District Council Offices
Meeting Type:	Review Group Meeting #10
Organisations in Attendance:	Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC), Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC), Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB), Chiltern District Council (CDC), Department for Transport (DfT), Natural England (NE) & HS2 Ltd

Attendees:	Title, Organisation
Ben Robinson	Chiltern District Council (CDC)
Catherine Murray	Chiltern District Council (CDC)
Helen Hall	Programme Manager, Chilterns Conservation Board
Hanna Doyle	Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC)
Ifath Nawaz	Chiltern District Council (CDC)
James Gasson-Hargreaves	Senior Interface Manager, HS2 Ltd
Kim Royer-Harris	Panels Coordinator, HS2 Ltd
Liz Bingham	Natural England (NE)
Matt Dormer	Senior Town Planning Manager, HS2 Ltd
Miriam Baines	Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)
Neil Jackson	Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB)
Patrick Bateson	Chair, Department for Transport (DfT)
Seb Jew	Interface Manager, HS2 Ltd
Tom Hinds	Department for Transport (DfT)
Apologies:	Jackie Copcutt, Jonathan Bellars

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
A.	Introductions	
B.	<p>Review of Minutes and Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No comments on the minutes of meeting #9. The group agreed that action 1, 5 and 6 from meeting #9 could be closed. <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No action/s to note 	
C.	<p>HS2 Ltd Updates</p> <p>MWCC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> HS2 Ltd stated that the MWCC will be announced on Monday and the announcement will be followed by a 2 week stand down period. Stage 1 for 	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>the MWCC will last 16 months and there will be no notice to proceed until a target cost has been agreed.</p> <p>4. NE asked when discussions between LUC and the MWCC will take place.</p> <p>5. HS2 Ltd advised that the end of the year would probably be the best time for MWCC to arrange a workshop with LUC.</p> <p><i>Vent Shaft Workshop</i></p> <p>6. HS2 Ltd stated that a vent shaft workshop with the group has been confirmed but the timeframe for the workshop needs to be considered. The group should consider whether the workshop should take place with the relevant HS2 Ltd technical teams or the MWCC.</p> <p>7. CDC stated that it would be good to first arrange a workshop with the HS2 Ltd technical teams to understand the technical requirements.</p> <p>8. Helen enquired whether any further work has been done on the vent shaft designs since the last presentation was given to the group. She also asked whether HS2 Ltd wants the group to comment on the current vent shaft design work.</p> <p>9. HS2 Ltd agreed to inform the group about any further work that has been done on the vent shaft designs and to organise a workshop to discuss the technical requirements.</p> <p>10. The group requested that HS2 Ltd send to the group the comments that have been made on the Detailed Design Principles document.</p> <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 Ltd to inform the group about any further work that has been completed on the vent shaft designs • HS2 Ltd to organise a vent shaft workshop with the relevant HS2 Ltd technical teams • HS2 Ltd to send to the group the comments on the Detailed Design Principles document 	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
D.	<p>Update on Additional Projects and Workshop</p> <p>11. Helen informed the group that various community organisations attended the workshop including parish councils and wildlife organisations. She noted that a lot of interest was raised after the workshop.</p> <p>12. The main concerns that were raised included footpath severance and the loss of tourism to the area. A further concern that was raised included the view that some of the Additional Projects conflicted with the mitigation that will be provided by HS2 Ltd.</p> <p>13. Helen noted that many meetings have taken place with community organisations to discuss the Detailed Design Principles and they have requested to see the document.</p> <p>14. Helen advised that the next version of the Detailed Design Principles document should be presented to the community for a 4 week period. She suggested that the final version of the document can then be produced in November.</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>15. CCB noted that the Detailed Design Principles documents is for designers and planners. It was suggested that a more digestible format for the community should be produced.</p> <p>16. Helen advised that the Detailed Design Principles document was shown to community representatives at workshop II. She agreed that the document should include an introductory statement when it is disseminated publicly.</p> <p>17. Helen stated that a web version of the document could be produced but this would result in a lot of work. A better option would be to print out a few copies of the document to place in public locations.</p> <p>18. The Chair noted that it should be clearly stated that the document is for information and not for public consultation.</p> <p>19. CDC highlighted that they will have to take the document through governance before they can be permitted to display it publicly.</p> <p>20. Helen and HS2 Ltd agreed to develop a draft introductory statement to accompany the document when it is disseminated publicly.</p> <p>21. Helen noted that the public will be able to comment on the document using different channels, not just by email to ensure inclusivity. A timescale will be given to provide comments and the comments will then be consolidated.</p> <p>22. CDC enquired if it is an issue that the Detailed Design Principles does not only focus on key design elements.</p> <p>23. HS2 Ltd confirmed that the influence of the document is just as relevant for key and common design elements, and that this influence would be in line with the Assurances given by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>24. CDC expressed concerns that differences can't be requested for common design elements.</p> <p>25. Matt confirmed that common design elements aren't fixed. The MWCC will develop common design elements using information such as the Detailed Design Principles.</p> <p>26. Helen agreed to organise the public dissemination of the Detailed Design Principles.</p> <p><u>Action/s:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helen to organise the public dissemination of the Detailed Design Principles • Helen and HS2 Ltd to develop a draft introductory statement 	<p>HH</p> <p>HH and HS2 Ltd</p>
E.	<p>Additional Projects Criteria</p> <p><i>Draft Prioritisation Criteria</i></p> <p>27. Helen noted that clarification will be sought from LUC about what the 1-5 scores equate to in the draft prioritisation criteria.</p> <p>28. NE proposed that criteria 1 needs to be explained in further detail.</p> <p>29. The group agreed that the AONB purpose and CEIP vision criteria should be assessed as a yes/no question and the AONB management plan objectives criteria should be assessed with a 1-5 score.</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>30. Helen noted that criteria 2 needs to be condensed. She further noted that the feedback from the public indicated that they wanted projects to be considered that had an impact next to the route.</p> <p>31. The group agreed that criteria 3 should be kept separate to criteria 1. They further agreed that the title of criteria 3 should be amended to indicate the range of different benefits and services that could be delivered by each project.</p> <p>32. BCC highlighted that criteria 4 is a subjective criteria.</p> <p>33. HS2 Ltd noted that the group will have to make decisions on the Additional Projects that won't all have wide public consensus.</p> <p>34. The Chair noted that it is unlikely that the group will select a project that does not have any public support. He advised that a comment could be given for each project outlining the assessed stakeholder support.</p> <p>35. The group agreed that criteria 4, stakeholder support, should be included in criteria 5, deliverability.</p> <p>36. The group further agreed that criteria 5 should be included in criteria 7, long term management and sustainability.</p> <p>37. The Chair noted that criteria 6, value for money, is difficult to assess.</p> <p>38. CDC highlighted that value for money is important to the public and this factor could attract criticism.</p> <p>39. BCC noted that projects might be chosen that the public might not value such as ecological projects.</p> <p>40. Helen noted that criteria 8, time scale and spend profile, falls under governance and should be removed from the scoring criteria.</p> <p>41. CDC stated that the public could be unhappy if the projects take a long time to be developed and it would be advantageous if the deliverability of the projects could be spread over time.</p> <p>42. BCC advised that a column should be included to outline the deliverability dates.</p> <p>43. Helen agreed to amend the draft prioritisation criteria according to the changes agreed to by the group.</p> <p><i>Additional Projects Governance</i></p> <p>44. Helen noted that the lifespan of the group ends in March 2018. She further noted that there might be an underspend in the administrative budget which could be used to further extend the lifespan of the group.</p> <p>45. She stated that the projects that can't be developed at an early stage will still need to be worked on at a later stage and the management of the fund also needs to be considered.</p> <p>46. HS2 Ltd advised that CVRPP have agreed that one of their members will be accountable for managing the fund through a Funding Agreement. HS2 Ltd agreed to circulate the CVRPP proposed extension paper to the group.</p> <p>47. Helen noted that a group of some form would need to be responsible for the projects that remain after March 2018.</p> <p>48. CDC noted that reaching the design stage is necessary to understanding how the projects can be implemented. The meetings of the group could be deferred until a more advance level of design is in place.</p>	

Item	Title	Action/ Owner
	<p>49. Helen asked the group to consider the portion of the fund that they would like to save for projects that can be implemented at a later date.</p> <p>50. The Chair noted that there is consensus in the group to see how the detailed design will develop. He further noted that the prioritisation criteria could also assess which schemes can be developed at a later stage.</p> <p>51. Helen agreed to go through the Additional Projects and categorise the projects according to the timescales in which they can be delivered.</p> <p>52. CDC noted that there needs to be a clear steer from HS2 Ltd on the future of the Panel.</p> <p>53. The group agreed to send their estimated hours to HS2 Ltd for a further financial forecast of the administrative fund.</p> <p>54. The Chair noted that the administration of the fund would need to come out of the £3m budget.</p> <p>55. Helen asked the group to consider the structure for administering the fund.</p> <p>56. CDC agreed that they could manage the fund if they were provided with adequate funds for the required resources.</p> <p>57. CCB noted that it should be clearly agreed by the group the amount that is deemed as proportionate for the administration of the fund.</p> <p>Action/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helen to seek clarification from LUC on what the 1-5 scores equate to in the prioritisation criteria • Helen to amend the draft prioritisation criteria according to the changes agreed to by the group • HS2 Ltd to circulate the proposed CVRPP extension paper to the group • Helen to categorise the Additional Projects by deliverability timescales • The group to send to HS2 Ltd their estimated hours 	<p>HH</p> <p>HH</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HH</p> <p>All</p>
F.	<p>AOB</p> <p>58. NE enquired about the progress of the Woodland Fund.</p> <p>59. DfT noted that no part of the fund has yet been spent and a project manager is currently being allocated to manage the fund.</p> <p>60. Helen asked the group to consider whether they wanted to delay the next meeting to fall after the CDC committee meeting.</p> <p>Action/s: No action/s to note</p>	

Next meeting: TBC