

Inspector's question 26

The representation from High Speed 2 Ltd appears to give rise to no issues of soundness but it does make observations on certain points of accuracy or correction. Would the Council confirm that it will deal with these through minor changes as appropriate?

AVDC Response

The relevant points made by the representation from High Speed 2 Ltd are set out and addressed below.

- *"P.16 para 1.17 - It is the HS2 Act that will require HS2 to be suitably mitigated, rather than the Local Plan."*

The referred to part of the VALP currently states "It is important to mitigate the effect of new transport infrastructure, such as the proposed HS2. The Council will utilise the Local Plan to deliver suitable mitigation." The Council acknowledges that it is the HS2 Act that will require HS2 to be suitably mitigated. The Council will propose that the quoted passage is changed by a minor modification to "It is important to mitigate the effect of new transport infrastructure, and the Council will utilise the Local Plan to deliver suitable mitigation."

- *" P27 refers to working with partners to deliver broadband/telecoms along the HS2 route. It should be noted that the Department for Transport led on this matter, as the recommendation was essentially aimed at Government, rather than HS2 per se. The Government response to the House of Commons Select Committee final report - see: <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/hs2/Report/dft-response-hs2-select-committee-march-2016.pdf> - responded to the recommendation in paragraph 113, and essentially said that DfT would work with DCMS on the issue."*

The Council notes that HS2 will not directly be responsible for the provision of telecommunications along the HS2 route, and that the responsibility for this is likely to lie with the Department for Transport and the Department of Culture, Media and Sport. It is still the case that the Council will seek to work with its partners as set out under objective 3 of the VALP Strategic objectives (which would include the DfT and DCMS) to secure timely and well-located infrastructure provision. The text is therefore considered to be accurate and, as such, no alteration to this part of the document is necessary.

- *"7.14 "Work on cycle route design and how it interacts with the HS2 will be completed to maximise benefits and connectivity between communities and the countryside". This statement would be more accurate by referring to route wide cycle commitments that the Promoter/HS2 Nominated Undertaker have made through formal Undertakings and Assurances to the Cycling Touring Club of Great Britain."*

The Council notes that there are route wide cycle commitments made by the HS2 Nominated Undertaker and agrees that the current wording does not clearly indicate that the reference is to work to be done by the LPA, not the work to be done by HS2 Ltd. Therefore the words 'Work on' at the start of the sentence will be replaced with 'The council will aim to ensure that'.

- *"P.78 points i-o this list of requirements is relatively standard, but onerous for any developer to comply with in practice. If any developer were to implement all of this*

they should only need to engage with HS2 Ltd with regard to our current design for infrastructure and mitigation to ensure it is appropriately incorporated and accounted for in their masterplan, particularly if they want to change any of the proposed mitigation.”

The Council notes the point made by HS2 Ltd., but propose no change to the referred to text as the developer of the site will need to engage with both HS2 and numerous other parties as part of any planning application for the site AGT2 under policy D-AGT2 South west Aylesbury.

- *“Policy T2 on P.205 looks reasonable, except for its expectation that HS2 will “preserve sites of archaeological or historic interest”. Arguably this is an academic point in light of the HS2 Act”.*

It is already acknowledged in policy T2 that the preservation of sites of archaeological or historic interest is “subject to being within the provisions of the Act”. As such, no changes are proposed in regard to this point.

- *“P.276 - Glossary - having achieved Royal Assent for Phase One of the railway in February 2017, awarding our main works civils contracts, depositing the hybrid Bill for Phase 2a and announcing the route for Phase 2b it should be recognised that High Speed 2 is going ahead.”*

The Council acknowledges this point and proposes the removal of the word ‘proposed’ from the first sentence and rewording “The Council is working with Buckinghamshire County Council and other partner organisations to minimise its impact if it does go ahead” to “The Council is working with Buckinghamshire County Council and other partner organisations to minimise its impact.”

- *“From checking the Environmental Statement, the only correction (Box 6.4) would be that HS2 works have commenced in 2017 (rather than expected to commence).”*

The Council notes the point made regarding the Sustainability Assessment and the wording of box 6.4: Strategic transport infrastructure on page 23

(https://www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/sites/default/files/VALP/Examination/CD.SUB_.004%20Sustainability%20Assessment%20Report%20%28AECOM%2C%20Sep%202017%29.pdf). The referred to part of the text relates to construction works within Aylesbury Vale, rather than elsewhere, which have not yet commenced. As such, no changes are proposed by the Council.