

## Phase One Planning Forum – Heritage Sub-Group Meeting Notes – 12<sup>th</sup> June 2018

<b>Date &amp; time:</b>	12 <sup>th</sup> June 2018: 10.30-13.00  2 Snow Hill, Queensway  Birmingham B4 6GA
<b>Chair:</b>	<b>Helen J Wass</b>
	<b>Presentations attached</b>

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Lead</b>
1	<b>Welcome and introductions</b>	Chair
2	<p><b>Area North</b> DJV presented on their activities across Area North.</p> <p><b>Questions &amp; Discussion</b></p> <p><b>SCC</b> asked when they would receive copies of the DDBAs, noting that those documents and the accompanying GIS data would assist their wider development control function.</p> <p><b>HE</b> queried the use of historic maps; had they used, for example enclosure maps?</p> <p><b>DJV</b> confirmed that they had.</p> <p><b>HS2</b> clarified that the technical standard for Historic Environment Investigations included, for DDBAs, the need to look at detailed historic map sources.</p> <p><b>HE</b> asked for an update on works at Park Street Gardens.</p> <p><b>DJV</b> outlined the works to date and forthcoming programme of site works.</p> <p><b>HE</b> asked if there was an intention to undertake more LIDAR re-analysis across a broader area.</p> <p><b>DJV</b> confirmed that they were continuing to re-analyse the LIDAR information. Their specialist is viewing differing angles and DJV intend</p>	DJV/LM

	<p>to produce a multi-angled view of the reviewed LiDAR data to provide more coherent images of the 'sites' already identified and new potential 'sites'; 18 have currently identified. This information will be provided to HS2 for review.</p> <p><b>HE</b> asked if Area Central intended to review the LIDAR data.</p> <p><b>Fusion</b> confirmed that they were re-evaluating the data for some locations and were discussing use of the raw point cloud data with HS2. Their efforts were focused on improving sites specific knowledge.</p> <p><b>HE</b> suggested that Fusion should review the LIDAR for the entire route.</p> <p><b>HS2</b> noted that it was useful to characterise the type of features – what was the value in greater identification of a field boundary?</p> <p><b>HE</b> asked about the comparison of the HS2 data with that from the EA.</p> <p><b>DJV</b> considered that on dataset provided better for woodland whereas the HS2 LIDAR provided a greater resolution. The main win was examining the different angles (using multiple light source processing).</p> <p><b>WCC</b> asked if the recent trial trench evaluation Project Plans (PP) received by WCC would be revised in light of WCC comments.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> LM is in the process of revising the PP following HS2 review and comment, as well as those from WCC; further justification of their evaluation methods will be provided in light of engagement comments.</p>	
3	<p><b>Area Central</b> Fusion presented on their activities across Area Central.</p> <p><b>Questions &amp; Discussion</b></p> <p><b>BCC</b> asked if evaluation survey work was complete and if they would be part of the discussion regarding any subsequent investigations.</p> <p><b>Fusion</b> confirmed that yes, BCC would be part of those discussions; this is a requirement of the Heritage Memorandum. Evaluation survey was continuing.</p> <p><b>NCC</b> stated that their engagement with contractors had been positive. <b>NCC</b> queried whether it was necessary to fence with Heras panels, every trench given the cost.</p> <p><b>Fusion</b> explained the security requirements, the vandalism that had already occurred and the responsibility for public safety. Each site is risk</p>	Fusion

	<p>assessed with each trench fenced only in place where a risk has been identified.</p> <p><b>CSJV</b> highlighted the requirements under CDM.</p> <p><b>WCC</b> asked if Fusion intended to look at site with no artefactual or environmental evidence.</p> <p><b>Fusion</b> outlined that the quality of the evidence was important; does the site move our knowledge on?</p> <p><b>HE</b> noted that some sites might be of value, but don't have a lot of evidence.</p> <p><b>HS2</b> stated that regional distinctiveness, which included artefact usage, was part of the Specific Objectives in the HERDS.</p> <p><b>HE</b> asked how the discussions with academia and OSL dating in relation to open fields was progressing now that fieldwork contractors had been identified, and how will that be integrated into design.</p> <p><b>Fusion</b> confirmed that works at a landscape level were progressing and that there would be an area wide project plan for how this will be addressed. They are considering targeting three locations and transitions.</p> <p><b>HE</b> asked how engagement, especially between contractors, was being managed to ensure that knowledge and ideas are exchanged.</p> <p><b>Fusion</b> stated that they are very aware of the issue and that their procurement methods include the design and delivery of works, providing guarantees for the supply chain in relation to resourcing, skills required and continuity.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> To date the work has largely been geophysics and a small amount of trenching. In respect of geophysics a Project Plan will be issued to review and learn from the success of results in relation to identifying archaeological remains and this will draw on results from all contractors. It is intended that Fusion will hold regular contractor meetings where information on results (from evaluation and mitigation phases) and methodologies are shared.</p> <p>Currently design work is largely supplied by a single contractor which, as Fusion points out, encourages a consistent approach. Going forward it is intended that single contractors be appointed to deliver evaluation, mitigation and reporting in distinct</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>geographical areas –again to encourage engagement and consistency.</p> <p><b>HS2</b> noted that the regular roundtable discussions held between the three areas (South, Central, North) helped to facilitate information and idea exchange. A key role for HS2 historic environment managers and the HERDS team is to ensure that the outcomes of such discussions are disseminated and, where necessary, instructed.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> The strategy for open fields has been discussed with Fusion following the round table, and a set of criteria for identifying key sites for investigation discussed.</p> <p><b>HE</b> noted their concerns regarding the development of design for the Edgcote viaduct and the surrounding ‘softer’ design elements e.g. landscaping. How will the archaeological investigation work feed into that design?</p> <p><b>Fusion</b> stated that their archaeological works since the environmental statement had included geophysical survey with further extensive geophysics and metal detecting planned for the battlefield site. Once the results of these works were available further investigation might be proposed.</p> <p><b>HS2</b> acknowledged the challenges around feeding into the design programme and delivery of the construction programme. Some of the archaeological works will be reprioritised. HS2 has emphasised to all parties the requirements for the results of the historic environment works to inform design.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> HS2, EK (MWCC) and Fusion (EWC) are meeting regularly to focus on heritage issues in design. In relation to the HE priority sites EK will identify the design programme and liaise with Fusion where survey work needs to be fed in (including any programme acceleration to facilitate this). Fusion are sharing their programme and survey results. In addition to the consultation meeting already held with HE for Grim’s Ditch, Hartwell and Edgcote a programme of meeting for other sites will be put together with information on follow up meeting also sent to HE.</p> <p><b>HE</b> highlighted the intermittent discussions regarding Grims Ditch.</p> <p><b>HS2</b> noted that there was a meeting in the diary for a Grims Ditch update.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p><b>BCC</b> noted that the sharing of Project Plans had been good but the receipt of the results of evaluation work was slow.</p> <p><b>Fusion</b> acknowledged that the delivery of final reports was behind programme, but they are seeking to improve that.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> HS2 to review delivery programme</p> <p><b>Post meeting note</b>  <b>HS2:</b> Contractors have already delivered a number of draft Interim Reports and draft Fieldwork Reports (mainly geophysics) are now also starting to arrive. These first draft are commented on in detail by HS2 and returned to the Contractors for amendment. This learning curve is expected as our Contractors develop their understanding of HS2's reporting requirements. When Code 1, these reports will be uploaded to Sharepoint.</p> <p><b>NCC</b> asked how priority sites were determined?</p> <p><b>Fusion</b> confirmed that it was according to the level of impact and programme requirements.</p>	
4	<p><b>Area South</b>  CSJV presented on their activities across Area South.</p> <p><b>Questions &amp; Discussion</b></p> <p><b>GLAAS</b> asked how questions between Area South and Area Central were discussing research questions around the Colne Valley, in particular.</p> <p><b>HS2</b> and Contractors are aware of the need to collaborate and, for example. As well as HERDS specific round tables there are follow up cross-area workshops planned.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> there have been two specific workshops on the Colne Valley, one with contractors from Areas Central and South and a second one which also included GLAAS (specifically in relation to Harvil Road but encompassing the wider Colne Valley context).</p> <p>HS2 held a contractor round table for route wide sampling strategies (23.04 2018) where each contractor presented their strategy. HE attended and contractors were able to discuss with each other. A follow up round table for HERDS objectives and methods was held in May (16.05.18), with all contractors and HE.</p>	CSJV

	<p><b>LBC</b> asked if the depth of the burial ground increased the number of individuals buried?</p> <p><b>CSJV</b> stated that the increased depth meant more volume of surrounding soil/infill, rather than an increased number of people buried. The implications of the depth relate more to engineering complexity.</p> <p><b>GLAAS</b> communicated HE questions about the design of Euston Station and the level of HE involvement.</p> <p><b>HS2</b> confirmed that there had been an introductory meeting with HE and the station architect and station design team where station design and process were discussed in detail and the feedback from HE was positive.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to make the next steps and station design engagement clearer to HE.</b></p> <p><b>HE</b> was concerned that the station design was moving on very quickly.</p> <p><b>HS2</b> highlighted that the masterplan for the oversite development is a separate entity; HS2 cannot dictate how the MDP engage with HE. HS2 has already introduced HE to the MDP team and highlighted to the MDP, the need to involve HE.</p>	
5	<p><b>HERDS update</b></p> <p>There was a brief presentation on progress on the HERDS digital platform.</p> <p>HS2, their supply chain and member of the Heritage sub-group would have access to it. Training will be provided.</p>	HS2
6	<b>AOB</b>	