

Community Forums are intended to provide an opportunity for local representatives to raise issues of importance to them and to reach consensus on preferred mitigations for HS2 Ltd. Attendance at a Forum does not indicate support by these groups for the scheme.

HS2 Ltd hosts and attends Community Forums, and has undertaken to record and publish issues, actions and requests raised during these events on their website. The matters raised by forum members are their views, and publication by HS2 Ltd should not be construed as acceptance or agreement with the sentiments expressed.

Dunsmore, Wendover & Halton Community Forum

13th November 2012, 7.30 – 9.30, Wendover Library

Draft note

Forum attendees

Independent Chair

Representatives of: -

Aylesbury Vale District Council
Bucks Local Access Forum
Chamber of Trade and Commerce
Chesham Society
Chiltern Countryside Group
Chiltern Ridges HS2 Action Group (CRAG)
Cholesbury PC
Churches together
Ellesborough PC
Great Missenden Parish Revitalisation Group
Halton Parish Council
HP22 6PN Wendover Action Group
Office of David Lidington
Speen Area Action Group (& AGAHST)
The Chiltern Conservation Board
The Chiltern Society
The Wendover Society
The Woodland Trust
Wendover Cricket club
Wendover HS2 Action Group
Wendover PC

Neil Cowie, Country South Area Manager – HS2 Ltd
Martin Wells, Country South Area Stakeholder Manager – HS2 Ltd
Mark Bailey, Country Environment Manager – HS2 Ltd
Charlotte Brewster, Country South Community & Stakeholder Advisor – HS2 Ltd.

1 – Welcome and introductions

The Chair introduced the meeting and introductions were made

2. Meeting note and actions

The following comments were made about meeting documentation:

R4 Meeting pack

- The R4 agenda omitted the following organisations: The Speen HS2 Action Group, Wendover Cricket Club and the Chilterns Society.

Notes from the last meeting

- There was further discussion about the section referring to bilateral meetings. It was felt that it didn't sufficiently reflect the discussion which took place in the meeting as there was a desire by certain members of the group to ensure that bilateral meeting minutes were shared. HS2 Ltd outlined that they would not be circulating bilateral meeting notes, however the group in question would be free to circulate their meeting notes should they so wish. They agreed to record that the request had again been made.

Actions

The following comments were made about the actions from the previous meeting:

- Action 24 was mis-represented and an additional report by Booze and Temple should have been included in the commentary.
- The papers circulated as part of agenda pack could not be added to the website due to copy write issues
- Action 29 has been missed from the actions log, so should be circulated as part of the R5 agenda pack

Actions

- **To circulate Booze and Temple tunnelling report**
- **To circulate Action 29 as part of the R5 agenda pack**

3. HS2 Property Compensation Consultation

HS2 Ltd asked the Forum how much detail they would like in a presentation on these proposals, or if they would simply like a question and answer session.

The forum requested for the highlights of the presentation followed by questions.

The property presentation tabled provided an overview of the recently launched property and compensation consultation. It detailed the proposed compensation measures for those living in the

safeguarding zone, a voluntary purchase zone (VPZ) and above tunnels. It also outlined the exceptional hardship scheme and the statutory conditions associated with Part 1 compensation.

A number of questions and comments were then posed, which included:

- The belief of forum members that the proposals didn't represent the 'generous' package which was originally suggested. Only a handful of houses would be eligible for the compensation packages described in the proposals. HS2 Ltd outlined that the proposals offered significantly more than the current statutory provision, but that the VPZ was limited to 120m either side of the line of route to prevent to the organisation owning swathes of the local area which could significantly affect the dynamic of local communities. Members of the forum also felt that a significant area was blighted anyway and that now there would be no compensation available to them other than Part 1 arrangements.
- Questions were posed about the safeguarding maps, and whether they illustrated all land required to build HS2. HS2 Ltd described how the land ultimately required to build HS2 Ltd didn't automatically extend to, or was limited to the safeguarding zone, but that the safeguarding zone was a planning tool which, when defined, triggered statutory blight provisions to ensure that the Secretary of State for Transport was included as a statutory consultee on all planning applications within that defined area. There was recognition amongst the forum that safeguarding was a planning consideration, but member felt that it should not be used as a basis for compensation.
- Questions were also posed about when safeguarding will formally come into play. HS2 Ltd described how it will not be formally set until the responses to the safeguarding consultation have been considered. HS2 Ltd outlined they would provide an update as to the precise manner in which safeguarding is initiated as part of the action log.
- There were criticisms of HS2 Ltd by a number of members of the forum for the venues chosen for the property events particularly as none were taking place in Great Missenden.

Actions

- **Provide clarification as to the manner in which a safeguarding is formally initiated**
- **To circulate the Property and Compensation Consultation presentation.**

4. HS2 Ltd work progress update

The environmental update covered the following issues:

- Licensing – 45 licenses had been agreed up until the date of the meeting and survey work was still taking place on both public and private land.
- Survey activity – It was explained that survey activity, especially covering ecological issues, were reducing as we moved into Winter. There would be a larger undertaking of work over the next few months relating to winter photography and assessments required for the landscape and visual impact assessment. HS2 Ltd clarified that further or ongoing survey activity will continue well into next year.

HS2 introduced the engineering update by explaining their approach to engagement over the 4 rounds of forums to date. This involved moving from discussions on issues and concerns (including specifics such as road realignments and rights of way) in the early forums to responding to requests for more detailed discussions on the evolving design.

The engineering update used both maps and charts to provide information about how route design was developing. The plans outlined current alignment, the extent of structural cut and fill and thinking around construction sites and substations. HS2 Ltd stressed that this was very much emerging thinking and was subject to change.

HS2 Ltd invited members of the forum to comment on the aspects of the route presented during the meeting. They explained how the comments provided would feed into the discussions taking place between HS2 Ltd and the local planning authority. Significant points made during the update include:

- Berwood Lane – Requirement for a small construction compound which will be there between 1.5 and 5 years and may house up to 50 people. HS2 Ltd couldn't currently comment on whether there would be living accommodation on the site.

Comments made by the forum as part of the update included:

- The access to the Berwood Lane construction compound should stretch across the fields as the field could be reinstated more effectively than the hedgerows which would be affected by the current plans.
- Concerns about impacts on the A413.
- Concerns that chainage 57 is a flood risk zone
- The key on the plans provided was difficult to decipher
- Concerns that the line would be used for freight. HS2 Ltd outlined that the line would not be used for freight at night, although freight which could be transported by the high speed trains such as post could be used during the day.

Discussion took place around the update which had been provided;

Construction sites - In answer to the questions posed, HS2 Ltd described how the construction compounds illustrated in the plans included parking provision and how temporary access roads would be required as long as the construction sites were in use – although in some cases once the cutting is formed, local construction traffic could begin to use the trace. Any concrete for structures would be transported via local roads as indicated and then via the trace as required. Construction compounds would be present for the majority of the construction activities, but possibly not towards the latter end of work when it is expected that the rail systems including catenary etc would be installed principally using the trace.

Public rights of way - HS2 Ltd described how they have tried to maintain all public rights of way and how the documentation circulated outlined how long they would be affected for and the perceived impact upon them at the end of the construction period.

Maintenance loops –HS2 Ltd detailed how maintenance would be required along the route and that the maintenance vehicles stored at Calvert would need to service the route at night when the high

speed train was not running. To facilitate this process, lengths of extra tracks would have to be built approximately halfway between Calvert and London to provide parking of the maintenance trains. The extra tracks would extend the width of the current trace by about 15m for approx. 800m length. Two sites were identified as potential sites for the extra track; at chainage 49, near South Heath and chainage 57 near Stoke Mandeville. These were both considered as they offered the combined necessity for the track to be level and straight where the maintenance loops were sited (to meet regulations). These proposals have considered and the location adjacent to Stoke Mandeville was identified as the preferred location. HS2 Ltd detailed that as this was all current thinking, the proposals were not yet present on the plans. Siting the maintenance loops near Stoke Mandeville also requires a vertical height change to the railway meaning that the railway would need to be lowered further into cutting where it emerges from the Wendover green tunnel and to the AONB boundary at Nash Lee Lane .

Actions

- **To circulate the schedules provided as part of the agenda packs with a 'comments' section**
- **To include suggested realignment of Rocky Lane onto maps and provide a report on the diversion**

5. Issues of concern

Forum members were asked to identify any further issues of concern which HS2 Ltd agreed to add to the table in Appendix A.

Specific updates and areas of discussion included the following:

Tunnelling – It was noted that mitigation proposals have been submitted for consideration by HS2 which outline tunnel through the whole of the Chilterns.

Landscaping - The forum were keen to ascertain whether the cost of compulsorily purchasing houses along the route would be taken into account when calculating the cost of the tunnels. There was also further discussion about the value aligned to land in the AONB in Webtag analysis.

Highways and rights of way - Improved plans were requested.

Noise and vibration - The forum wanted to see more information on the assumptions which have so far been taken regarding mitigation measures such as the size of barriers and bunds etc. The forum requested a clear explanation of how much noise comes from the pantograph compared to other parts of the train.

Socioeconomic Impacts The forum raised a number of questions relating to the undertaking of assessments on local businesses. HS2 Ltd confirmed that it was assessing impacts, mainly through questionnaire or interview for those business directly impacted by the alignment – largely due to their proximity to the railway. However, HS2 Ltd realised that there may also be businesses that are indirectly affected due to the route. An example would be a pony trekking business that relied upon a local bridleway that would be severed during construction of the railway. HS2 Ltd would also be

undertaking desk-based surveys looking at the likely impacts that might be brought about to businesses due to, for example, temporary road closure.

Flooding – The forum felt that the Wendover arm canal should be looked at

Ecology – A member of the forum was keen to find out whether the occurrence of large sections of chalk rock “boulders” within the underlying geology of the area would impact on HS2 during construction. An example was given of reported issues relating to the construction of the M40. HS2 Ltd confirmed that such features would not pose any problem for HS2 construction.

Actions

- **To provide a clear explanation of how much noise comes from the pantograph compared to other parts of the train.**

6. AOB

The following issues were raised:

Sound monitoring locations – HS2 Ltd explained the reasons why they had not been able to release the sensitive information about sound monitoring locations which had been requested by some Forums. However, they proposed an alternative which looked to address the root of local concern that representative sites may have been missed. HS2 Ltd stated that they would welcome four locations provided by local representative groups for each locality (village, town) within the forum area. HS2 Ltd would consider the proposals put forward and if the locations were not already represented in HS2’s current surveys then, if there were no access issues, these would be surveyed and the data added to the baseline information. HS2 Ltd described that they would be providing a follow-up e-mail with instructions outlining how to carry out this exercise and that they would be providing feedback on these submissions during the February round of Community forums.

Pylons – There were questions and discussion about the likelihood of moving the existing local pylons and whether these could be put underground. HS2 Ltd described that they are currently engaged with National Grid to understand their requirements.

Design – There were questions about the HS2 Design Panel, which was recently announced. HS2 Ltd described that this would be an independent panel that would be involved in the detail of the railway design elements. As a result, this was likely to be relevant to after the Hybrid Bill. HS2 Ltd agreed that it would keep members of Community Forums up to date with any developments.

Actions

- **To check whether the cost of purchasing properties would be taken into account when calculating the true cost of the tunnelling option.**

[Action Summary](#)

[31. To circulate Booze and Temple tunnelling report](#)

[32. To circulate Action 29 as part of the R5 agenda pack](#)

- 33. Provide clarification as to the manner in which a safeguarding is formally initiated
- 34. To circulate the Property and Compensation Consultation presentation.
- 35. To circulate the schedules provided as part of the agenda packs with a 'comments' section
- 36. To include suggested realignment of Rocky Lane onto maps and provide a report on the diversion
- 37. To provide a clear explanation of how much noise comes from the pantograph compared to other parts of the train.
- 38. To check whether the cost of purchasing properties would be taken into account when calculating the true cost of the tunnelling option.

Next meetings:

Tuesday 12th February – Wendover Bowls Club – 7.30 - 9.30pm

Tuesday 9th April – Wendover Bowls Club – 7.30 - 9.30pm

Appendix A

Grid of over-arching concerns discussed at forum meeting

Highways & Rights of way	Noise & Vibration	Health	Landscape & visual impact	Heritage & Culture	Socioeconomic	Flooding & Water	Ecology	Construction
The Ridgeway was of particular concern	That an optimal environmental line speed should be explored to meet AONB requirements	Impact on the health of local communities	Flooding	Heritage and Cultural	The impact on businesses in Wendover and associated concerns of the business community	The Wendover Arm Canal		Community input into the CoCP and LEPs
All other footpaths and rights of way were of significant concern	Concerns that the track- both in cutting and by viaduct will cause unnecessarily high levels of noise		Impacts on local ecology		Impact on tourism			
The impact of traffic on communities due to diversions and	Construction code noise impact and vibration - Highest best in class World standards to be applied		Compensatory purchase of land to provide screening		Highways patterns of use – impact of closing roads of on local economy – impact on local			

construction traffic					businesses and particularly tourism			
Provision for cyclists during construction	Reduction in speed for train and therefore consequent noise reduction in open section of AONB		Movement of Pylons – impact on electricity?					
Traffic diversion incl impact on schools	Tunnel mitigation		Visual impact and design					
Impact on access roads	Southern end of green tunnel – impact to Wendover and local area		Impact of gantries / pylons					
Works on	Effectiveness of		Access					

Ellesborough Road; impact on the community, businesses and schools	noise mitigation		agreements					
Process for dealing with local planning and highway authority			The size of bunds and landscaping features					
Access issues – severance of routes during constructio n								