



## INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2

<b>Guests</b>	██████████ ██████████	HS2 Independent Design Panel Chair HS2 Independent Interim Construction Commissioner
---------------	--------------------------	---

<b>Item</b>		<b>Action Owner</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions</b>	
	<p>The Chair gave attendees the opportunity to introduce themselves. ██████████ (CDC/SBDC), ██████████ (NWBC) and ██████████ (OCC) introduced themselves.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted that the location of the meeting was inconvenient as it was not within walking distance of Euston station so asked HS2 Ltd to try earlier to book venues in the Euston area for future meetings.</p>	
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Review of notes &amp; actions from last meeting</b></p> <p>The March minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the previous meeting and are to be published on the gov.uk website. <b>Action.</b></p> <p>The Chair reviewed the action log and the Forum discussed the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement with statutory consultees recorded on Schedule 17 written statements – HS2 Ltd said this work was ongoing but the action was marked complete as the contractors have been informed.</li> <li>Publish January meeting minutes – NCC highlighted that the Highway Subgroup minutes were not up-to-date on gov.uk. HS2 Ltd said they would pass this message to colleagues responsible for Highway Subgroup. <b>ACTION.</b></li> <li>Suggested item on broader consents – HS2 Ltd said they would need to have internal discussions with colleagues to determine how this would be presented to the Forum. HS2 Ltd in turn asked the LAs to e-mail comments regarding their experience on other consents (Schedule 4 for example) so that they could focus the proposed discussion. <b>ACTION.</b></li> </ul> <p>WCC explained that there was inconsistent quality between the various consents including how the contractors work with HS2 Ltd and the LAs, which was causing confusion. HS2 Ltd said that they need more specific detail to focus on the issue and resolve it so encouraged LAs to e-mail HS2 Ltd. The Chair encouraged LAs to do this as well.</p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p> <p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p> <p><b>LAs</b></p>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>HS2 Design Panel update</b></p> <p>Sadie Morgan presented an overview of the Design Panel’s remit, which highlighting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Panel members were independent and were from a range of professional backgrounds. As the project moves forward the Design Panel will pull in other expertise when required.</li> </ul>	

## INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Design Panel feel that relationships and communications between HS2 Ltd, contractors and stakeholders are improving but would like better feedback from communities.</li><li>• Opportunities ‘beyond the red line’ should be considered context when reviewing the detailed design both in rural and urban areas.</li><li>• The Design Panel were pushing for a design champion at board-level within HS2 Ltd.</li></ul> <p>SM invited questions and feedback.</p> <p>LDC said they had attended a Design Panel (Manchester Spur – Fradley) and felt that it was too heavily engineering led which resulted in questions being unanswered when the Design Panel discussed ecology and landscape issues. LDC suggested a more holistic approach. SM said that this was a reasonable observation and that the Design Panel’s role is to ensure the project is not delivered by engineers. Such feedback had been given to HS2 Ltd previously.</p> <p>SNC said that the Design Panel they attended was landscape led and contained much aspirational information which they felt was misleading. AVDC had a similar experience and added that although LAs are invited to Design Panel meetings, it is not clear what their role is, outside of context setting. The meetings were also arranged at very short notice. AVDC suggested that the Design Panel would benefit by giving LAs a greater role. The Chair said that he was aware other LAs did not feel their role was defined at the Design Panel meetings.</p> <p>WCC highlighted that the expectation to deliver ‘beyond the red line’ had the potential to cause confusion with Councillors and the community and makes it difficult politically for LAs to handle. SM responded that the Design Panel’s remit was to give advice to HS2 to deliver the HS2 Design Vision and have a ‘proper conversation’ about the impact of design more strategically. The politics are for HS2 Ltd and the LAs to work through.</p> <p>SM took an action away to speak to the Design Panel Secretariat regarding the scheduling of meetings. <b>ACTION.</b> SM said that the Design Panel expected community engagement to be fed back to them by contractors. HCC said that the Design Panel needed to push the red-line. SM said that the LAs have a responsibility to be a robust ‘client’ and push the relationship with HS2 Ltd.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd said tensions between HS2 Ltd, the Design Panel and LAs were natural as there are many aspirations and requirements for the design which would need working through. HS2 Ltd agreed that the administration of the meetings needed reviewing to ensure they were programmed in alignment with the Schedule 17 programme. HS2 Ltd</p>	<p>SM</p>
--	--	-----------

**INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>added that the project was aware there had been inconsistencies.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd also added that the approach to community consultation was set out in Information Paper D1, and that there was a sequence to how the process works in practice which is being worked out internally. With regard to the ‘beyond the red line’ comment, this presented a language problem as the Design Panel were not necessarily proposing works outside HS2 Act powers; there may be opportunities that other funders’ support should be considered.</p> <p>HCC said that they were disappointed to learn that the Design Panel had visited the location of the proposed Chiltern Southern Portal but HCC and TRDC were not included. HCC asked SM if the Design Panel received feedback from the community event in March. SM said they did not receive specific comments.</p> <p>BCC asked how the LAs’ comments are incorporated. The Chair asked if LAs saw the Design Panel’s comments and HS2 Ltd clarified that those who attend the meeting received copies of the reports.</p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Common Design Elements Working Group</b></p> <p>██████████ (EK) and ██████████ (BBV) presented an overview of the outcome of the first meeting of the Working Group looking at viaduct piers/ and bridge piers and parapets, and future actions.</p> <p>It was proposed that a Planning Forum Note (PFN) be drafted to summarise the design principles, to be shared in the first instance with the Working Group for comment. The Chair asked the Forum if they were content with this approach, which the Forum confirmed, and asked that the PFN be shared with the Forum following review by the Working Group. <b>ACTION.</b></p> <p>OP said that noise barriers were being developed through engagement on a range of technical issues with the supply chain. The Chair suggested that the contractor bring the work done on Noise Barriers to the next Forum meeting in July to decide if a working group was the best approach to take forward the noise barrier CDE workstream. <b>ACTION.</b> CDC/SBDC asked if the EHO Subgroup would be engaged on these Common Design Elements (CDE). HS2 Ltd confirmed that this was the intention and the EHO Subgroup would be consulted at their next meeting in July. <b>ACTION</b></p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p> <p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p> <p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Schedule 17 Consenting Review</b></p> <p>Dominic Moore gave an update to the Forum and said that 56 Schedule 17’s had been approved and that no specific negative feedback had been received. HS2 Ltd encouraged LAs to get in touch if this was not the case.</p> <p>CDC/SBDC highlighted that they had had their first pre-application discussion for the Colne Valley Viaduct and the presentation contained 135 slides which they were then expected to provide feedback on during the</p>	

**INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>meeting. They requested a more robust approach so that they have time to consider the information and provide more meaningful pre-application comments.</p> <p>LBC said that their first lorry route approval required additional time to consider prior to its submission as it was not aligned with the Local Traffic Management Plan (LTMP). HS2 Ltd said that several months of pre-application discussions were held in addition to draft submissions so felt the comment was unfair. HS2 Ltd did though recognise that the LTMP was a key document and unfortunately was not at a mature enough stage when the pre-applications discussions were taking place.</p> <p>WCC spoke on behalf of WDC and said that their experience with Schedule 17 approvals had been positive but there was an obvious disconnect with the Schedule 4 approvals. Although it is considered a 'planning matter', it is highway officers that deal with them. LDC suggested that there be better alignment with the contractors and HS2 Ltd working on Schedule 17 and Schedule 4 approvals. HS2 Ltd explained that they are separate processes but have instructed contractors to cross-reference such approvals to inform LA Officers. HS2 Ltd said that they had consenting meetings whereby all those working on approvals in an area are invited to discuss how the different approvals interface with one another.</p> <p>NWBC said they had dealt with minor approvals but hoped that the matters discussed would be resolved prior to the main works starting.</p> <p>SCC said they had not received any approvals but had started discussions with the contractor regarding lorry routes.</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Planning Forum Notes</b></p> <p><b>Engagement with Statutory Consultees</b>  DM updated the Forum on the process for engaging with statutory consultees on Schedule 17 approvals. The process has been developed with Natural England and Historic England using the LA forward lookaheads to highlight submissions where those bodies require pre-application engagement. HS2 Ltd said that the statutory consultees' comments would be shared during the pre-application stage. <b>ACTION.</b> HS2 Ltd to share the draft PFN for the Forum to comment on.</p> <p><b>Lorry Route Approvals</b>  ██████████ presented slides to the Forum to explain the use of conditions for Schedule 17 Lorry Route approvals. HS2 Ltd said they were unable to produce a suite of example conditions as the matters were very complex, however the slides contained a diagram to test the validity of a condition. HS2 Ltd said that key documents were the Environmental Minimum Requirements and the LTMP, so suggested referring to the commitments imposed on the nominated undertaker via those documents before considering conditions on a lorry route approval. HS2 Ltd said they</p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>

**INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>would update the PFN and share with the Forum. <b>ACTION.</b></p> <p>A LA member asked if the PFN would cover the circumstance whereby a lorry route crosses two local authority areas. HS2 Ltd clarified that this was covered in the Planning Memorandum which says that should this circumstance occur, the LA which the route crosses into would receive a copy of the submitted approval.</p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>
<p><b>7.1</b></p>	<p><b>Community Engagement update</b></p> <p>██████████ presented slides to the Forum and highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 Ltd felt the impact of construction is beginning to be experienced by communities more so now. There is the sense that work is ‘starting’ but not yet ‘started’.</li> <li>• Next stage of the Local Area Engagement Plans (LAEPs) are beginning.</li> <li>• Approach to hoardings has worked successfully around Drummond Street (Euston) and now HS2 Ltd are working with businesses around Digbeth (Birmingham).</li> <li>• The ‘commonplace’ websites and that individuals could sign up for notifications of updates to the website.</li> </ul> <p>NCC said communities were pleased more engagement was happening but there is a sense that their comments are disappearing into ‘thin air’ as they are unaware of any process. HS2 Ltd took an action away to respond. <b>ACTION.</b></p> <p>HCC acknowledged the progress and thanked HS2 Ltd.</p> <p>BCC highlighted that HS2 Ltd have engagement people and so do contractors. When an engagement individual approaches the LA, it is difficult to determine whether they are HS2 Ltd or the contractor and this in turn makes it difficult to know who to contact. HS2 Ltd said that there may be cases of double-handling. The Chair asked the Forum to take HS2 Ltd.’s updates on community engagement away and share with Communications colleagues. <b>ACTION</b></p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p> <p><b>LAs</b></p>
<p><b>7.2</b></p>	<p><b>Complaints Process update</b></p> <p>██████████ presented on the Complaints Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinction between a construction complaint and a service complaint. Both of which come through to the helpdesk so the public are not required to make the distinction.</li> <li>• A revised (extended) definition of construction complaints.</li> <li>• Some complaints are exempt from the process, such as the valuation of a property.</li> <li>• HS2 Ltd has received 101 complaints this year, 48% were construction focused whereas last year 95% were property related.</li> </ul>	

**INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2**

<p><b>7.3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly reports are being rolled out</li> </ul> <p>HCC asked how a property complainant would be dealt with. HS2 Ltd said they would be pointed in the direction of the process that is in place to handle those types of complaints.</p> <p><b>Prolonged Disturbance Scheme engagement</b>          ██████████ updated the Forum on the Disturbance Policy. <b>Section TBC.</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd said that they were using an editorial team to produce a document in ‘plain English’ so that the detail can be understood by the communities.</p>	
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Schedule 17 Consultation</b></p> <p>██████████ explained to the Forum that it was apparent that some LAs were not clear on the requirements under Schedule 17 regarding consultation. HS2 Ltd clarified that there were three statutory consultees – Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency. There is no legislative requirement to consult beyond these bodies, therefore there is not a new burden imposed on the LAs and it is at their discretion whether they consult local communities on Schedule 17 approvals. HS2 are not consulting the public on Schedule 17 submissions.</p> <p>AVDC said that similar to CDC/SBDC they were putting up notices stating that a Schedule 17 submission had been made, but were not inviting people to make comments. Queries on HS2 generally were being directed to the HS2 Help Desk.</p> <p>CDC/SBDC said that it was trying to be constructive and see how HS2 Ltd handle objections to Schedule 17 submissions. HS2 Ltd said that should a member of the public object to a submission, this would not be fed back into the Schedule 17 process as objections and comments should be picked up via the engagement process set out in Information Paper D1.</p> <p>HCC asked if the Helpdesk had a list of Schedule 17 approvals in an area so that when a member of the public makes contact they can direct them to a source of further information such as the LA’s website where the approval should be publically available. HS2 Ltd said they have not put such a system in place but thought it would be helpful for the HS2 Helpdesk to be able to direct an individual to the LA website for more information regarding a Schedule 17 approval. <b>ACTION.</b></p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>
<p><b>9.1</b></p>	<p><b>Phase 1 Construction – update</b></p> <p>██████████ gave a Project update to the Forum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DfT had approved the Phase 1 benefits baseline – measuring the lasting changes that will be felt by the UK as a result of delivering strategic goals.</li> </ul>	

**INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2**

<p>9.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biggest supply chain event to date held on 8<sup>th</sup> May.</li> <li>• Area North – Station Design Services contracts progressing with both Stations expected to have a single option by June; LA lookaheads issued April-end and EWC ecological mitigation sites progressing.</li> <li>• Area Central – M25 works continue; Align’s JV’s GI underway; habitat creation sites progressing at Tilehouse Lane, Chalfont St Peter and Harvil Road; first round of public engagement on Colne Valley Viaduct complete; Design Panel review taken place for C2 and C3 and engagement taking place for the Chipping Warden relief road.</li> <li>• Area South – Pre-application discussions continue with LBC, LBH, OPDC, LBB and LBE; design strategies for parts of Old Oak Station established with design and engagement to follow; Design Panels for Euston Station and Old Oak Station scheduled for 23<sup>rd</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> May; Lorry routes approved in Old Oak, LBH and LBC with further requests for approval in LBC and LBH imminent, and LA lookaheads issued April-end.</li> </ul> <p><b>SLA &amp; FA Invoice Template</b></p> <p>██████████ and ██████████ presented to the Forum, highlighting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAs are not required to amend historic timesheets</li> <li>• There are two alternative timesheets proposed by HS2 Ltd for LAs to specify which they will use.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair explained that the presentation HS2 Ltd gave was the response to the previous round of comments regarding the SLA timesheets. <b>ACTION.</b> HS2 Ltd to circulate revised timesheets for LAs to make comments.</p> <p>LBB asked HS2 Ltd to provide the e-mail address for HS2 accounts payable and the name of the relevant Third Party Agreements Manager. <b>ACTION.</b></p> <p>WCC asked if LAs were required to define when time is used for travel or meetings. HS2 Ltd clarified they are, as it ensures transparency.</p> <p>LBC asked if LAs could put time meeting with various HS2 staff in as one entry rather than separating out meetings, and include write-up time in this entry. HS2 Ltd said this would be clarified in a guidance documents.</p> <p>AVDC described a scenario whereby they were meeting with HS2 in the morning with another meeting scheduled much later in the day. HS2 Ltd acknowledged that this was a waste of time and money and encouraged AVDC to highlight this to the HS2 staff they were scheduled to meet.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd/LAs</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
------------	---	-----------------------------------

**INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2**

<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>The Green Corridor</b></p> <p>██████████ presented slides which included a video on Green Infrastructure (GI) and included HS2 Ltd’s approach to GI in the context of new Government Policy – The Green Future. The presentation proposed that LAs utilise existing funding streams, such as LEPs or LNPs, to match funds from the CEF and BLEF to deliver their own GI policies. The West Midlands Combined Authority have adopted such an approach.</p> <p>The Chair asked if there was any additional GI or if HS2 Ltd were rebranding what was already proposed. HS2 Ltd said that the aim was to explain what other synergies were available.</p> <p>HCC did not understand HS2 Ltd’s presentation because the timing was not aligned with their GI plans but did state that the contractor (Align) were going to get in touch with them to discuss LEPs.</p> <p>██████████ highlighted to the Forum that he sat on the Growth Delivery Board: HS2 should not be viewed as ‘just a railway’ and the West Midlands region were spending on the project. Therefore, if LEPs work with businesses and communities there is more chance of GI being delivered as it pools resources together to put to central government. The Chair suggested that it would be useful to cascade the West Midlands model to the Forum. <b>ACTION.</b></p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>Appointment of the Phase 1 Planning Forum Chair</b></p> <p>The Chair explained that he had been chairing the Forum for five years now, and since the Forum had appointed him it seemed good governance to give it the opportunity to consider whether they wanted him to continue in the role. The Chair handed over to WCC and left the room.</p> <p>WCC asked if the Forum were content with the existing Chair continuing his role. Nobody objected. WCC suggested a review date in three years.</p> <p>HCC asked if the Independent Construction Commissioner’s and Residents Commissioner’s roles would be reviewed. HS2 Ltd said their roles were not aligned to the Phase 1 Planning Forum Chair’s.</p>	
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Dft Update</b></p> <p>██████████ gave an update on behalf of the DfT who had given their apologies as they were unable to attend the meeting. Key points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 61 appeals guidance had been published</li> <li>• Removal of Qualifying Authority Status guidance was progressing</li> </ul> <p><b>Forward Plan</b></p>	

## INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>HS2 Ltd said that 'CDEs – Piers and Parapets' would be on the agenda for the July meeting, and 'CDEs – Noise Barriers' would be on the agenda for the July or September meeting.</p> <p>WCC asked for an update on the SLA and timesheets to be on the July agenda. <b>ACTION.</b></p> <p>HCC requested a map to illustrate how CEF and BLEF funds had been distributed geographically. HS2 Ltd confirmed that Groundwork UK were attending the meeting in July to give an update and would discuss this request with them. <b>ACTION.</b></p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p> <p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>
--	---	---