

Central Chilterns Community Forum

Minutes

Subject:	Central Chilterns Community Forum
Date and time:	25 th September 2012, start 19:00
Location:	Little Kingshill Village Hall, Windsor Lane, HP16 0DZ
Invitees:	All CF members & Cheryl Gillian MP (CG)
Other speaking parts	Martin Wells (MW), Charlotte Brewster (CB), Simon Hook (SH), Steve Rodrick (SR), Marilyn Fletcher (MF); apologies to the rest..

Item	Topic	Lead	Time
1. Welcome and Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction to the second community forum meeting and an outline of the agenda 	Chair	7.00
2. Meeting minutes, matters arising and actions	<div> <div></div> <div>Chair</div> <div>S Hook</div> </div> <p>Agree minutes of last meeting, matters arising and review of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The request for briefing notes, in advance, was repeated here (& at various points throughout the meeting) – so that a considered response could be made to HS2s contributions Request for an additional meeting (we are one short) – more bilaterals were offered The community must have the for a/ forums required to agree mitigation (CG) Approval of minutes was deferred; an independent minute taker was requested (noted).. <p><i>[2 Actions placed on HS2, but to which they had not consented, had been deleted from the Draft minutes. It would be appropriate to include both the actions, & the reasons for HS2s objection ??]</i></p> <p>Comments made on HS2 Ltd's response to questions posed at the previous meeting –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> these were considered unsatisfactory, lacking in detail & late The Design Speed in AoNB paper –was to be considered by HS2, but no response, as yet. What is happening ? (MF) <i>[See Engineering report ?? Not sure this was covered]</i> Other responses - unsatisfactory (SH) - want acknowledgement & date for a response 		7.05
3. Terms of Reference	Agree ToR (Terms of reference)	M Ladd HS2 Ltd	7.15

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ToR had not been agreed with HS2 – deferred 		
4. Bilateral meetings	Report and discussion	HS2 Ltd Forum	7.20
	<p>HS2 distributed a list of recent bilateral meetings. Publication of any notes was at the discretion (& the responsibility) of those attending, not of HS2.</p> <p>The meeting requested that HS2 obtain consent to report back briefly on issues raised at bilaterals, whenever appropriate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tunnel (through AoNB) :- (Barnaby) CRAG had considered two options similar to those rejected by ARUP / HS2, & two new options (tunnels with gaps required for bureaucratic safety reasons) Presented at bilateral meeting, awaiting a response from HS2 . This might be ‘Towards the end of the year ‘ (HS2 engineering rep) – had not been passed on for detailed design consideration. CG asked if Qs to the Secretary of State (for Transport) might result in a priority boost for considering these proposals... (Yes – MW) Provision of further tunnelling would reflect status of AoNB as a National Treasure (MF) and should be considered in the context of mitigation. HS2 repeated that they were developing the route announced in Jan 2012 (<i>only ??</i>) Chesham bilateral – any disruption to the Chiltern (or LUL) rail services has the potential to generate additional road traffic in the area 		
5. Specific items identified by the forum for discussion	Mitigation issues:	Forum	7.40
	<p>Current route more detrimental (to AoNB, than ‘consultation’ scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Briefing note .. 14 points made, 9km of route is worse, e.g. higher viaducts, longer & higher embankments, so more noise & visual impact.. Should HS2 go back to pre-Jan scheme (MW) ? No , but we consider statement that all changes are positive is misleading.. more listed buildings will be demolished We want the £300m saving used for mitigation in this area (MF) to offset decline in mitigation Land valuation assessment - assumes Mitigation will prevent degradation, which isn’t happening Simon White (HS2 environment manager) Need to balance factors to decide alignment.. spoil considerations etc etc Spoil is a (HS2) cost, not a mitigation issue. Could use (deeper) retained cuttings.. SM (HS2 engineer) : We are considering this SR (Chilterns board) - should have considered this earlier, it has been raised with SoS 		

	<p>Q (from Chair) - Will HS2 consider detailed design issues in this area , out of the forum ? and accept suggestions, not just state what has been decided (i.e. form a Bilateral meeting / Working party from this group) ??</p> <p>Will consider this - cant agree now, need to consult potential members (MW)</p> <p>Actions : SR to produce names (by end of week), HS2 to set up meeting, level of detail to be decided - date - in October - to be set by 5th October</p> <p>Mitigation issues (SH) Q when will mitigation document be discussed ??- A at pan-Chilterns forum ??</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is (any) mitigation on the table? Detailed designed discussions - yes but.. • Simon (HS2 Environment)- returned to the “developing published route” argument • Benefits of deeper route should be considered in parallel with efforts to mitigate existing route - • HS2 Corridor is set, but the route is not - letter from David Liddington to JG (or VV ??) • MW – this is unrealistic ? Significant variation needs adequate reasons .. Deeper is not necessarily better ? (Why not ? MF) • Q What happened to £300m saving? A The budget is for the whole line – there are no individual area budgets. • AoNB should not be target of cost cutting exercise.. (MF) • Mitigation can be achieved through design - (MW) • Landscape evaluated as arable farmland; if higher, the tunnel option would be 'cheaper' <p>AONB: Better protection for HS2 than for HS1</p> <p>Document will be appended to the minutes – changes to legislation imply a higher standard of mitigation is now required - Do HS2 agree ?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (HS2 Environment spokesman) we will comply with the law.. • Action ? HS2 to report back on actions to comply with Environmental legislation - <i>such as</i> ? But cant change route alignment . (<i>Back to tunnel discussion</i>) • HS2 representatives were invited to walk along route – Action- forum (<i>who</i> ?) to organise permissions where required (+ visits to off-route viewpoints)(MF) <p>SR –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We want to talk (elsewhere / at a higher level) about alignment; • We want best practice design / mitigation, • Will the Environmental Impact Assessment lead to route changes ? • National Ecosystem Assessment Methodology should be
--	--

	<p>applied - is it ? (HS2 environment man) – some work done before consultation used ‘Webtag’ approach – HS2 working to see if this is consistent with NEAM ? DFT & Defra are working on it</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will the NEAM approach be adopted ? (no Timescale suggested by HS2) • When will it be applied to budget calculations ? • CG will ask Qs (as requested by SR) to clarify these points <p>Landscape impact & visual sensitivity (<i>Out of time</i>)</p>		
6. Noise presentation	An introduction to HS2 Ltd’s approach to managing noise	Contractors	8.55
	<p>See slides.. Request for suggestions for noise monitoring stations – make these to CB or MW who will pass them on Questions – What is the target for maximum allowable noise increase ? A – There is no such target; mitigation is required for levels above 50dB during the day, 40dB at night – but no requirement as to its effectiveness AoS – suggested only 10 properties would suffer worse noise following route changes – is this credible ? A – Changes (Improvements ?) to methodology may also make a contribution</p>		
7. HS2 Ltd update	Discussion of updates:	Forum & HS2 Ltd	8.45
	<p>Engineering – report on construction sites etc.. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Major ?) Construction site in Mantels Wood – access from Chesham Rd or Hyde Heath Rd. • ‘Porus portals’ required for (green) tunnels at each end • C. Site for bridge & green tunnel, near Annie Baileys; other end access from Frith hill,(? or use tunnel for access - cutnCover) • Don’t know / wont reveal size of sites.. need to ask landowners first • Forum expressed concerns about Location, Size Access & population ? When will these be known ? • Kings Lane - diversion (for flexibility) • Leather Lane - divert towards Wendover at crossing point • South Heath- uninterrupted access requirements reiterated (SH) </p>		
Written reports expected – (<i>lack of time</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property compensation and safeguarding consultations • Code of Construction Ptactice 		
8. AOB		Chair	9:25
	<p>Outstanding items - Design issues and Rights of Way (questions but no replies) When will we get replies ? (SH) MW will confirm a date Items for the next agenda Not enough time allocated ; need more meetings (SR) Date and location of next meeting: 27th November, Little Kingshill</p>		