

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

| | | |
|------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Title: | Independent Phase One Planning Forum for HS2 – Phase One | |
| Date & Time | North & South Meeting Thursday 11th January 12:30 – 17:15 The Council Chambers London Borough of Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 9UD | |
| Chair | Ted Allett | Independent Chair |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Promoter Attendees: | Paul Gilfedder Matt Dormer Dominic Moore James Mumby Emma Palmer Ryan Ward Sam Tarling Suzanne Crouch Julie King Jim Crawford Mike Lyons James Boag Christian Bonard David Smith | HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd |
| Local Authority Attendees: | Bill Nicholson Susan Kitchen Doug Lee Rachel Best Laura Leech Ifath Nawaz John Nicholls Gideon Whittingham Bob Duxbury Jenny Foster Sean Coghlan Dorothy Barratt Esme Cushing Michael Drake Richard Warren | Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) Birmingham City Council (BCC) London Borough of Brent (LBB) Bucks County Council (BCC) Chiltern District Council & South Bucks District Councils London Borough of Camden (LBC) London Borough of Camden (LBC) Cherwell District Council (CDC) Jenny Foster (HCC) Lichfield District Council (LDC) North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) OPDC Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) |

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| | <p>Julia Sykes Claire Bishop Denis Winterbottom Sarah Mallen Debbie Prince Sara Louise Lee Matthew Williams Adam Ralton</p> | <p>Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) South Northants Council (SNC) Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Warwick District Council (WDC) Warwickshire County Council (WCC) Warwickshire County Council (WCC) Three Rivers District Council (TRDC)</p> |
| Guests | <p>Gareth Epps Adrian St John Ben Addy Olivia Perkins</p> | <p>Interim Construction Commissioner CEK CEK (Moxon Architects) CEK</p> |

| Item | | Action Owner |
|----------|---|--------------|
| 1 | Introductions | |
| | Introductions were made. | |
| 2 | Review of notes from last meeting & outstanding actions | |
| 2.1 | The minutes of the November meeting were agreed. | |
| 2.2 | <p>March 2017, Item 2: HS2 confirmed that since action log was printed the Design Team have confirmed that the Design Panel reports will be published: an update on the CDE report will be sent out after the meeting.</p> <p>June 2017, Item 5: HS2 Ltd said that a contract for web site design had been awarded and progress would be shared with LAs at a later date. HS2 Ltd offered to expand further on this item during the Phase One update.</p> <p>November 2017, Item 5: CDC/ SBDC questioned whether the HS2 Helpdesk has been briefed on the Schedule 17 process, as site notices put up by the Council provided the Helpdesk number.</p> <p>Post meeting note: the Helpdesk has now been briefed on the Schedule 17 process. The Helpdesk can respond to questions on HS2 and proposed designs but cannot be the conduit for comments on a specific Schedule 17 submission. These should be directed to the planning authority.</p> | |
| 3 | Phase 1 Construction update - Jim Crawford, Phase One Managing Director, HS2 Ltd | |
| | <p>Jim Crawford (JC) introduced himself, thanked members for his invitation and presented slides on behalf of Phase One at HS2 Ltd.</p> <p>The slides included the following (please refer to them for further detail):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 Ltd.'s guiding principles in making decisions • HS2 Ltd.'s executive structure | |

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• HS2 Ltd.'s Phase 1 Structure: broken down into 11 sectors which correspond with each geographical area on the route, plus route-wide systems which cover the whole route• Area updates• Current topics: Service Level Agreements, Common Design Elements and Emergency Services Liaison Group <p>HS2 Ltd expanded on the OLE item which had been raised under item 2: the OLE contract would define how the railway system should perform rather than what the design would look like. SNC asked if HS2 Ltd could give an indication of the timeline for this contract. HS2 Ltd said that the contract would be awarded at the end of 2019 and that this time was appropriate because of the programme which design will be available.</p> <p>SNC asked how the communities would be engaged in tracking the railway systems design. HS2 Ltd said that there was a number of Design Panels along the route and that an approach could be to review those Panels in the future, but at this point engagement with communities has to be restricted because HS2 Ltd are in the procurement stage whereby contractual information is sensitive.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd acknowledged that the SLAs were a sore topic and said that progress had been slow from HS2 Ltd's side because of required processes to ensure transparency and legal compliance. HS2 Ltd reiterated that this was paramount and that evidence is required to demonstrate that taxpayer's money is spent wisely. The Chair asked members to raise their hands to highlight who had a signed SLA. Three hands were raised. JC said he understood that five SLAs had been signed, and they were investigating why others had not yet been signed.</p> <p>JC told the Forum that an individual had been appointed at HS2 Ltd to lead the interface with emergency services and that Area North had met with these services, LAs and other departmental representatives. Areas South and Central would have similar meetings in due course.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd reiterated that the Common Design Elements presentation being shown at the meeting that day demonstrated the progress that had been made since the designs were presented to the Forum last year and that the Forum's engagement was pertinent to the Schedule 17 programme. HCC said that the engagement with the Forum was inconsistent. HS2 Ltd said they share concept designs with stakeholders when they are available as it ensures HS2 Ltd are an informative client. HCC acknowledged this principle but reiterated that in practice this has not been the case for the Colne Valley Panel and did not want the same experience for Planning Forum.</p> <p>HCC explained that the Colne Valley Viaduct (CVV) was a critical project and that consents were programmed for June 2018, but that there was uncertainty on the Schedule 17 programme for CVV. HS2 Ltd took an action</p> | |
|--|---|--|

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Generally, it seemed that LAs felt the submissions were of a good standard of information. However, further feedback included confusion around the statutory consultee process, fees and pre-app discussions. HS2 Ltd said all of this would be reviewed and any additional feedback welcomed.</p> <p>HCC said that they are processing Schedule 17s on behalf of Three Rivers District Council (TRDC). HCC explained that a Schedule 17 was submitted on 19th December with no warning nor had been included in pre-app discussions. HCC said that the application would be returned to HS2. HCC said that the context reports were useful but the content became out of date so it would be helpful to revise these quarterly and have a meetings with the Area Town Planning Manager to review the programme for consents. The Chair clarified that there is not a requirement to revise the context reports. HS2 Ltd said that the quarterly look aheads should include this information and would check who these are being distributed to at TRDC. HS2 Ltd took two actions away to ask the Area Town Planning Manager about the 19th December submission and determine who at TRDC the look aheads were being sent to. Action.</p> <p>Post meeting note: the application referred to was included in the planning submission 6-month look aheads to Three Rivers District Council and HCC on 3 August and 6 November 2017. There were numerous pre-application meetings on the submitted design.</p> <p>The 3 August look-ahead was issued to Jenny Foster of HCC; the 6 November look-ahead was issued to Jenny Foster and to Adam Ralton and Kimberley Rowley of Three Rivers DC.</p> <p>WDC reiterated that pre-app engagement was crucial to ensure a smooth process. They facilitate the 8 week target for determination as timeframes can be discussed during pre-app discussions. For example, scheduling for committee meetings needed to be considered.</p> <p>AVDC said they had a positive experience with pre-app engagement and said it would be helpful to link Schedule 4s with Schedule 17s.</p> <p>WCC said that the supply chain did not consistently understand the process for how schedule 4 applications relate to Schedule 17 applications. The Chair said that feedback on highway submissions were a lot more variable and HS2 Ltd had received much criticism at Highway Subgroup the previous day. It was queried whether the same quality control applied to schedule 4s as it did for Schedule 17s whereby every Schedule 17 was reviewed by a member of the HS2 Town Planning team. HS2 Ltd acknowledge the Forum's comments on the need for a central consenting team but explained that the way the organisation is structured means different teams are responsible for schedule 4 (Highways) and Schedule 17 consents (Town Planning).</p> | <p>HS2 Ltd</p> |
|--|----------------|

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| | <p>SNC said they had a positive experience although works were minor. Some confusion was caused in terms of the plans that were submitted for indicative mitigation purposes, so suggested that HS2 Ltd ensure the written statement could make clear what they are expecting the LA to respond with. HS2 Ltd took an action away to consider standard paragraphs to be included. Action.</p> <p>The Forum suggested that submissions include references to the relevant legislation as this would help officers dealing with submission who are not well informed of the planning regime. HS2 Ltd said they have had these conversations internally and took an action away to determine what progress had been made. Action.</p> <p>HCC asked the Town Planning team to highlight to the Highways team that some highway works required a bringing into use approval. HS2 Ltd took the action away. Action.</p> <p>The Chair said that this item should be a recurring agenda item.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted to the Forum that should a LA consider that certain physical works would make a lorry route safer the LA could condition that. However, this raised an issue whereby a scenario may occur that such works might be outside of limits. HS2 Ltd confirmed that it was possible to condition this as long as it relates to the grounds in Schedule 17 and that should such a scenario occur it would need to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>LDC said it would be useful to understand further to determine what can and cannot be mitigated against. HS2 Ltd took an action away to put this as a future agenda item. Action.</p> | <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> |
| <p>5</p> | <p>Engagement with statutory consultees - Dominic Moore, Senior Town Planning Manager, Phase One, HS2 Ltd</p> <p>DM presented slides that summarised the process for engagement with statutory consultees – the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England. HS2 Ltd reiterated that LAs must consult within 5 days of receiving the submission.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd explained that the statutory consultees will have the opportunity to review the quarterly look aheads that are issued to LAs to highlight the Schedule 17s they would consider require pre-app engagement so that this can be factored into the consenting programme. HS2 Ltd said they intended to produce a PFN to explain this process. Action.</p> <p>HCC asked if submissions could include a table stating what date pre-app (if any) had taken place with consultees. HS2 Ltd took an action away to consider this. Action.</p> | <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> |

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------|
| | <p>AVDC said it would be helpful to have their pre-app comments before the Schedule 17 is submitted to the LA. LDC reiterated that it would be useful to know when NE are being engaged.</p> <p>SNC said they had a Schedule 17 for works located near a battlefield and were unsure whether to consult Historic England so it would be helpful to understand what HE expects to be consulted on. HS2 Ltd took an action away to inform Historic England in advance of their attendance at the March meeting. Action.</p> <p>CDC said it would be helpful to know who the correct contact at the EA was. HS2 Ltd clarified that there was a central HS2 team at the EA and to use that contact for consultation purposes. The e-mail address was presented in the slides - hs2@environment-agency.gov.uk</p> <p>SNC pointed out that current planning systems will already have an EA contact and to include this contact as well would be difficult.</p> <p>HCC asked whether the statutory consultees have an obligation to auto-respond. HS2 Ltd clarified that there was not a statutory requirement.</p> | HS2 Ltd |
| 6 | <p>Common Design Elements – Ben Addy, Moxon Architects</p> <p>The HS2 Programme Director for Area North introduced the presentation and explained to the Forum that the designs to be shown on the slides had not been finalised and were very much a work-in-progress. The various civils designs had been split up between contractors and therefore Ben Addy was representing all the main works contractors for work which had been carried out so far in designing piers and parapets.</p> <p>The presentation illustrated various concept designs and reiterated that structures would have a common architectural language.</p> <p>CDC asked if the designs had been presented to the EHO Subgroup. HS2 Ltd clarified that it had not yet but engagement with the various officers would be considered.</p> <p>HCC asked if the pigment in the concrete would have the flexibility to contain local stone and for HS2 Ltd to confirm that the Chiltern South Tunnel Portal was a Key Design Element. Post meeting note: Align have been instructed that the Chiltern tunnel south portal is to be treated as a Key Design Element.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd said that the challenge would be to reach consensus on the designs with members of the Forum as it would be difficult to have detailed discussions with everybody. HS2 Ltd proposed that a small Working Group of LA representatives should be established to take forward the next stage of discussion.</p> | |

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

| | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | <p>HCC asked if LAs would have the opportunity to see details of lighting and labelling. Moxon Architects confirmed this and explained that the common design should be perceived as a methodology for design which allows flexibility for various construction conditions or requirements.</p> <p>HCC offered to represent LAs during discussions and said it would be useful to have a list of the viaducts and overbridges where CDEs may be used. HS2 Ltd took an action away to ensure the contractors put together this information for the relevant local authorities. Action.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd said that the intention was to present concept designs for noise barriers and handrails at the March Planning Forum meeting.</p> <p>LBB asked where vent shafts sit within the work and HS2 Ltd clarified that these would be designed individually to fit their context.</p> <p>SNC expressed concern regarding the concrete design being proposed and asked what assessment had been carried out to determine this use of material. Moxon Architects clarified that such structures can only be made of concrete due to the stringent technical requirements.</p> <p>LDC said that more emphasis should be put on creating a 'sleek modern' viaduct rather than stressing the local element as it is likely to build up stakeholder's expectations. Members need to know exactly what influence they have on the design, for example if it is only the brick which the public are unable to see from a distance it will seem as though HS2 Ltd have not met their commitments.</p> <p>WCC reiterated that much of the same was discussed at the Design Panel meeting last year, that there was not yet a clear understanding of what LAs could influence.</p> <p>AVDC supported the approach to discuss CDEs at a narrower meeting and volunteered to be party to those discussions. The Chair said how the final set of plans are signed off by the Forum needed to be considered. HS2 Ltd took an action away to consider how the CDE discussions could progress with LAs and would send proposals for the Chair to progress with the LAs, early next week. Action.</p> <p>CDC asked HS2 Ltd to include structure to clarify how LAs can be accountable to communities for this work and its objectives and how many meetings would take place.</p> <p>LBB said that from a highways perspective the main consideration is a structure's longevity and the ability to maintain it. The Chair reiterated that responsibility for maintenance would not lie with the LA.</p> | <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> |
|--|---|-------------------------------|

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>HCC asked HS2 Ltd to get buy-in from the Community Engagement team as IP D1 requires</p> <p>The Chair asked the Forum to raise their hand should they wish to volunteer – 10 LAs raised their hand. HS2 Ltd were concerned this was too many.</p> | |
| 7 | <p>HS2 Updates</p> <p>Categories of consents – Christian Bonard (CB), Head of Environmental Sustainability, Phase One, HS2 Ltd</p> <p>CB presented slides which clarified that HS2 Ltd review draft applications for consent for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 17 applications • Schedule 18 Heritage method statements • Schedule 33 CRT and EA consents • Protected Species Licenses <p>The slides also clarified that a risk-based approach determined the level of assurance for other consents such as S.61s and environmental permits whereby the level of assurance is driven by the level of risk of the asset, its setting or stakeholders and that GIS helps determine the risk – see slides for further detail.</p> <p>Project updates – Paul Gilfedder (PG), Head of Town Planning, Operations & Infrastructure, HS2 Ltd</p> <p>PG gave the updates on behalf of the DfT – see slides for further detail.</p> <p>Forward Plan – Dominic Moore, Senior Town Planning Manager, Phase One, HS2 Ltd</p> <p>The next meeting was scheduled on Wednesday 14th March at HS2 Ltd’s offices in Snow Hill. The agenda would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Subgroup update • Statutory Consultee Engagement discussion (Historic England attending) • Common Design Elements • Phase 1 update • Community Engagement: Local Community Investment <p>HS2 Ltd asked the Forum if they considered this venue suitable for future meetings. WCC said the quality of the presentations on the projector needed testing or suggested printing copies of slides.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted that LAs from the South did not attend the Planning</p> | |

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

| | | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| | <p>Forum pre-meeting in Leamington Spa and asked if LAs found it difficult to travel out of London. The response was limited so the Chair said he would monitor attendance.</p> <p>PFN11 Site Restoration – Matthew Dormer (MD), Senior Town Planning Manager, Phase One, HS2 Ltd</p> <p>MD said they had received comments from LAs and would circulate HS2’s response in due course. Action.</p> | <p>HS2 Ltd</p> |
| <p>8</p> | <p>AOB</p> <p>The Forum asked what would be discussed at the Green Corridor Workshops. HS2 Ltd said that a workshop was due to take place on 14th February to discuss enhancements to the environment and that invitees included NGOs and other environmental bodies. The Chair asked HS2 Ltd to obtain further information on the invitee list and at the very least copy in Planning Forum SPOCs so they are aware of such meetings taking place. HS2 Ltd took the action away to discuss with colleagues involved with this work. Action.</p> <p>The Chair said that informative slides were shown at Highway Subgroup the previous day on the Road Safety Fund and asked HS2 Ltd to share the slides with the minutes. Action.</p> <p>WCC highlighted to the Forum that the Design Panel had recently released their newsletter which detailed the relocation of bat houses and the use of language was interpreted negatively. HS2 Ltd clarified that this was related to a specific, substantial bat structure in Area Central.</p> | <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> |