

## EH Subgroup Minutes

|                             |                                                                          |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Meeting date</b>         | Thursday 28 <sup>th</sup> May 2026, 14:30 to 16:00                       |
| <b>Meeting location</b>     | Microsoft Teams                                                          |
| <b>Meeting title</b>        | Environmental Health (EH) Subgroup Meeting #64                           |
| <b>HS2 contact or group</b> | <a href="mailto:planning.forum@hs2.org.uk">planning.forum@hs2.org.uk</a> |
| <b>Stakeholder</b>          | Environmental Health Subgroup to Planning Forum                          |

### External Attendees

Independent Chair

Planning Forum Chair

### Nominated Undertaker Attendees

Air Quality Manager – HS2 Ltd

Environment Graduate – HS2 Ltd

Head of Noise Assessment – HS2 Ltd

Noise and Vibration Lead – BBV

Noise and Vibration Manager – HS2 Ltd

Noise specialist – ASC

### EH Attendees

Birmingham City Council (BCC)

Buckinghamshire Council (BC)

Cherwell District Council (CDC)

London Borough of Camden (LBC)

London Borough of Ealing (LBE)

London Borough of Ealing (LBE)

Staffordshire County Council (SCC)

Three Rivers Council

West Northamptonshire Council (WNC)

Westminster City Council (WCC)

### **Apologies**

Air Quality Manager – HS2 Ltd

London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (LBHF)

Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC)

### **Item 1 – Chairman’s Introduction and Apologies**

The Chair called the meeting to order and provided an overview of the meeting etiquette. The Chair welcomed attendees and asked for introductions to be made in the chat function. Apologies were shared by the Chair and the Environment Graduate. The meeting was recorded to aid with minute taking, attendees were notified.

### **Item 2 - Review of Minutes from Previous Meeting**

A review of the March 2026 meeting minutes was undertaken.

There were no further comments and the meeting minutes for March 2026 were agreed.

### **Item 3 – Noise barrier insertion loss for HS2 trains– BBV/EKFB**

BBV’s Noise and Vibration Lead presented on the aims, test setup, methodology and analysis approach for the noise barrier testing. The study tested three different barrier tops in total and comparatively analysed the reflective and absorptive scenarios. Key findings included ground conditions between the train, and the barrier have negligible influence on the noise reduction. One of the key outputs was that the absorption on the upper parts of the barriers is critical to the acoustic performance, particularly in terms of the level of absorption. ASC Noise specialist presented on the results of the barrier top devices. The results showed that absorption benefits have been quantified and reinforces higher levels of absorption are important in achieving the predicted insertion loss.

#### **Questions/Comments:**

(Q) BC: Would you expect the same type of insertion loss from trains running at 320 Km/h?

(A) ASC Noise specialist: It would be expected that insertion loss would improve, although the extent of this improvement is uncertain.

(Q) BC: Can the raw data be recalculated to account for pantograph noise, which was not included in the original test?

(A) ASC Noise specialist: There are no plans currently to recalculate the raw data.

(Q) BC: Will the new prediction algorithm for insertion loss be used in the noise modelling?

(A) ASC Noise specialist: The report is yet to be finalised. Only after it has been finalised will this be considered

(Q) Planning Forum Chair: Why was slab track compared with ballast track, and how was this assessed?

(A) BBV Noise and Vibration Lead: Ballast was not specifically investigated. To simulate potential ground absorption effect, absorption material was placed between the track and barrier as an exaggerated test scenario. Results showed a small benefit for low-level sources, but overall, the impact on total noise levels was negligible. The test was carried out to assess whether applying absorptive treatment in this area would provide any benefit.

(Q) Planning Forum Chair: Given Device 1 showed better performance, will this be implemented for HS2 barriers?

(A) ASC Noise specialist: The purpose of this study was only to look at the acoustic aspects and clearly provide the findings to HS2.

#### **Item 4 – Project Updates**

Head of Noise Assessment gave a verbal update on the new cost and schedule announcement that was made by the government on the 19<sup>th</sup> May 2026. It was highlighted that HS2 CEO has written individually to each council, acknowledging the announcements and offering to speak in person to each council. Before the next meeting LA's will be able to provide any questions or concerns around the update.

(Q) BC – Will the reduction in speed affect the work that is being done to reduce Pantagraph noise?

(A) Head of Noise Assessment – There are slower speeds at night in other areas other than Buckinghamshire. There is no intention to scale back the works on the pantagraph.

A general update of Phase One construction works and highlights of the latest environment specific and programme wide press releases provided by HS2's Environment Graduate.

#### **Item 5 – Other updates**

Planning forum chair summarised Topics from the Planning Forum Subgroup meeting held on the 21st of May 2026. The 21st of May agenda had no more anticipated planning forum notes, discussed the Government announcement and asked one of senior leadership to provide an update in the next meeting.

#### **Item 6 - Ongoing Construction and Section 61 & Schedule 17 Experience**

Independent Chair gave thanks to HS2 for providing complaint reports on a regular basis

#### **Item 7 - Action Log / Forward Plan / AOB**

The Chair reviewed the action log, which has been updated to reflect items that remain open and those which are now closed.

Head of Noise Assessment gave a update on LBHF question from the last meeting regarding back-up power supplies at Old Oak common (OOC) station. OOC has 2 power supplies, if power fails the design incorporates various stand-alone batteries. There is also a back up power supply from West Ruislip available.

The Chair closed the meeting.