# Phase One Planning Forum – Heritage Sub-Group Meeting Notes – 13<sup>th</sup> March 2018

Date & time:	13 <sup>th</sup> March 2018: 10.00-13.30
	2 Snow Hill, Queensway
	Birmingham B4 6GA
Chair:	Helen J Wass

Item	Торіс	Lead
1	Welcome and introductions	Chair
2	Heritage into the Design process	HS2
2	HS2 Landscape architect presented on the integrated design approach at HS2. HS2 highlighted three elements of the approach and illustrated works with case studies.  1. Design Vision & Design Handbook 2. Technical Standards, Assurance process and design development 3. Integrated and collaborative design  Case Studies:  Edgcote Curzon Station  Questions and discussion  1. HE asked how the EWC inputs into the design process. 2. HS2 explained that the different design elements were subject to review and options considered at an early stage 3. HE noted the importance of the landscape at Edgcote and the need to inform the mitigation process.  4. HS2 noted that the Design Panel recently visited the site and that the environmental synergies were considered. HS2 confirmed that interdisciplinary working at Edgcote and in other areas was ongoing.	ПЭД
	5. HE noted the recent useful meetings for the viaduct into the new Curzon Street station, and that good and exciting designs were being proposed. HE registered concern that the placement of the viaduct piers had not been considered sufficiently early. The design will not have been informed by the archaeological works, given the rapidity of the programme.	

- 6. HS2 noted that a heritage opportunities and constraints report has been prepared for the Curzon Street area to specifically inform design works.
- 7. HS2 to clarify the programme for archaeological works at this location. **HS2 ACTION** 
  - a. Post meeting note: The EWC have been undertaking an area wide assessment of the historic environment baseline, scoping in and out different sites, enhancing and creating information from differing surveys. This will feed into the design of the archaeological investigation programme with will commence later in the year. Further review and evaluation work by the Area North EWC historic environment specialists is underway in and around the Curzon Street area.
- 8. HS2 highlighted that there was a managed interface between the Main Works Construction Contractor (MWCC), the EWC and the HS2 Area North historic environment manager. There are ongoing workshops and regular meetings to ensure that communication, knowledge, programme and design information flows between HS2, the EWC and the MWCC.
- 9. WDC asked who the stakeholders for Curzon Street were and how their competing interests are managed.
- 10. HS2 stated that stakeholders included Birmingham CC, HE, transport companies, Birmingham City University, Birmingham Museum Trust and the Digbeth Business Community Forum.
- 11. SCC asked how the Design Panel (DP) views and comments were managed.
- 12. HS2 explained that there is a formalised process for tracking DP comments so that HS2 can manage comments, requests, responses and actions. The DP remit and membership can be found at:
  - a. <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-design-panel">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-design-panel</a>
- 13. HS2 noted that the emphasis of design work was to do better than the Environment Minimum Requirements.
- 14. SNDC/SBDC noted that some Common Design Elements were discussed at the November 2018 Planning Forum.
- 15. HS2 noted that the intention was to obtain a routewide view on principle design elements at the Planning Forum.
- 16. The Planning Forum has set up a working group to discuss this. Common Design Elements do not preclude other design being undertaken where appropriate to the location. Further common design elements will be discussed at future Planning Forum meetings, including noise barriers.
- 17. NCC asked at what point someone starts to consider when the design in a given area will be different; at what stage does this occur in the process?
- 18. HS2 stated that this was part of the ongoing dialogue between HS2 and the LPAs.

3 Schedule 17 HS2

HS2 outlined the requirements of Schedule 17 and its process, notably presubmission engagement and statutory consultation.

### **Questions and discussion**

- 1. There was a general concern regarding how the pre-application process had worked on the early submissions.
- 2. CDC noted that it was difficult to anticipate when these would occur from the Forward Plans and that a lot of discussion was required for the pre-application process.
- 3. HS2 confirmed that the pre-application stage was part of the Forward Plan programme and that some would require detailed discussion.
- 4. HE noted that they receive the lookahead list and that HE identifies those that HE will want to make comment/be involved with. It was up to the LPA how they consulted their local specialist advisors.
- 5. It was requested that the County Archaeologists receive the lookahead list.
- 6. HS2 confirmed that their email addresses would be added to the email send. **HS2 ACTION**
- 7. SCC is trying to work out from the lookahead list how they work with their districts. There is ongoing discussion as per the historic environment research and delivery strategy (HERDS), but there is a concern that at a county level there is a need to be involved in the pre-application process.
- 8. SCC requested that there be clear reference to any consultation with HE and to project plans/LS-WSIs. Making it clear what PP/LS-WSI was covered by what Schedule 17 would be helpful.
- 9. HS2 and HE to share with the LPAs and County Archaeologists, which Schedule 17 applications HE was interested in.
- 10. HS2 acknowledged that the consultation arrangements under Sch 17 need to be streamlined as much as possible.
- 11. GLAAS noted that Hillingdon had refused a Schedule 17 application partly on archaeological grounds. The interaction between the Act/Schedule 17 and the EMRs was an issue.
- 12. HS2 explained that Schedule 17 was not meant to duplicate anything in the EMRs.

## Post meeting note:

- 1. HS2 has sent the LPA Forward Plans to HE.
- 2. HS2 will be proactive in keeping sub-group members informed of relevant pre-application discussions.

## 4 Evaluation Strategies

Warks CC

WCC outlined its concerns regarding the use of geophysical survey in evaluation strategies and the Area Central EWC (Fusion) approach to blank areas.

### **Questions and discussion**

- 1. WCC didn't agree with the approach to only trial trench limited areas following the results of geophysical survey.
- 2. In the county there are many examples where archaeology was found in areas where there were no geophysics results.

- 3. WCC felt that their experience of undertaking geophysical survey in the county was not being listened to and that the EWC had not undertaken sufficient analysis of the wider landscape.
- 4. WCC wanted more analysis for the decisions taken and that it was premature to make decisions and exclude areas for investigation. There is a need to test models and more data is needed from this early stage of works.
- 5. WCC queried whether there was appropriate levels of trial trenching, although accepted that it could be used to test the results of geophysical survey.
- 6. WCC queried those sites for which we don't have any questions in HERDS.
  - a. Post meeting clarification: the HERDS includes questions for 'unknown' archaeology, i.e. the location of prehistoric settlement. But there could be known archaeology that we don't have questions for. There are mechanisms for Contractors to suggest new objectives. But it is not the intention to have an objective for every individual site.
- 7. HS2 noted that for some periods geophysics was not an appropriate technique. Other techniques are being employed by the EWCs according to need and that include a landscape scale approach. Results and knowledge between Contractors continue to be shared and there is a process in place to consider if areas are truly blank.
- 8. NCC noted that the work to date in the county was fine, but would like to see a visualisation of works done to date to enable a complete understanding of works and a proper assessment of the archaeological potential. NCC did not consider that one should be fixate on percentages.
- 9. WCC agreed that the results of works should be assessed so that fieldwork strategies can be amended.
- 10. HS2 noted that the EWC are in the process of completing the evaluation stage and that this will inform later strategies.
- 11. The early sites for investigation because of the need for early habitat creation is not dictating overall decision-making.
- 12. HS2 highlighted that it is in the process of going through the emerging evidence base as is Fusion.
- 13. Fusion estimated that in a couple of months there should be sufficient information to consider the landscape approach.
- 14. HS2 will review the level of consultation/engagement with WCC in particular to make sure that there has been sufficient. **HS2 ACTION**

## Post meeting note:

- a. Fusion had a detailed review of works with WCC on 19<sup>th</sup> April.
- The Area North Historic Environment Manager has also met with WCC to discuss the ongoing programme of work (15<sup>th</sup> March 2018).

5	Applying HERDS to Landscape Archaeology: a case study	GLAAS/BCC
	GLAAS; HE and Bucks CC gave a presentation on landscape archaeology, drawing on a case study along the route of HS2. Their paper detailing this research, entitled "Joining the Dots: Research into the landscape history of the Icknield Belt around Aylesbury", will be published in the 2018 edition of the county journal <i>Records of Buckinghamshire</i> .	
	GLAAS provided a theoretical introduction to assessing and sampling landscapes.	
	HERDS should be moving from a 'discovery phase' (with the Cooke and Banks analogy of collecting and observing everything) to recognising landscape scale archaeology, that there are different intensities of activity (analogy with the Cosmic Microwave Background) and questioning this through landscape scale theory. The emphasis is on testing theories from an existing knowledge base. He used Rumsfeldt's 'Known Unknowns' to highlight questions around 'blank' areas and how HS2 should be approaching them.	
	Abstract:  Aylesbury has expanded dramatically over the last century and continues to do so, resulting in numerous archaeological discoveries. For almost thirty years, major developments have been preceded by archaeological survey and investigation paid for by the developer, amassing a hitherto unprecedented body of information. This paper attempts to go beyond description of individual sites, to 'join the dots' by proposing a model of how this landscape functioned and developed over two thousand years from the later Bronze Age to the Norman Conquest. It argues for evolution from a co-axial landscape of trackways used for local transhumance between the Chilterns and the Vale into the medieval landscape characterised by strip parishes and centred on the royal manor of Aylesbury. It highlights the intensity of Roman rural settlement and poses some questions about that society. Above all though, we aim to present new ideas in a structured form that can inspire thought and be further tested and refined by future research.	
6	Woodland Grant Scheme	Staffs CC
	Staffs CC summarised the remaining concerns of the county archaeologists regarding the HS2 Woodland Grant Scheme, following responses and reassurance from the Forestry Commission.	
	Questions and discussion	
	<ol> <li>County archaeologists still consider that the Forestry Commission should point applicants to HERs for information directly and would prefer that they are not directed to use the Heritage Gateway and FEPs / HEFERs. This will ensure appropriate, accurate, up to date information with relevant specialist guidance is available at an early stage in the development of grant applications.</li> </ol>	

	<ol> <li>FC stated that they could make reference to existing sources.</li> <li>It would be helpful if there was some form of guidance on the Woodland Fund page explaining the process in relation to archaeology to potential applicants and perhaps pointing them towards contact details for HERs.</li> <li>HS2 ACTION.</li> </ol>
7	AOB

Doc Ref: PH1-HS2-EV-MRC-000-000045